

Another addition to Religious Statements

1. Go to Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament Initiative [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#disarmament>]

2. After the introductory paragraph, add the following paragraph in italic:

*Two years after release of the "Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement", 21 religious leaders and 13 military signed **"A REAFFIRMATION: Concerning Terrorism and U.S. Nuclear Policy"**. **[http://www.nrdi.org/reaffirmation.html** They rejected the idea that terrorists attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001 can used as a justification for use of nuclear weapons They also renewed their call for nuclear disarmament.*

3. In the caption under the photo add "June 2000" before "news conference" to read: "Participants in the June 2000 news conference...."

4. In the box add "2000" to read: "*Highlights of the 2000 statement include:*"

5. Add a new box with this text:

Highlights of 2002 Reaffirmation in response to 9-11-01 terrorist attack. [end italic]

Nuclear weapons are weapons of indiscriminate effect and terror. The threat of their use represents an abhorrent condition we seek to eliminate cooperatively. Nuclear weapons "constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, [and] a danger to the whole human family." We believe that verifiable arms control and non-proliferation efforts must become a top priority in order to safeguard nuclear facilities everywhere, to prevent the export of related materials and technologies, to persuade states to turn away from nuclear weapons, and to prevent terrorists from obtaining them.

Accordingly, we should not seize upon the events of September 11 as a justification for use of nuclear weapons. Domestic and international security cannot be obtained by answering terror with even greater terror. Strengthening international cooperation in bringing unlawful conduct to justice, in addressing the root causes of terrorism, and working through the rule of law to eliminate nuclear weapons is a path toward greater security consistent with international requirements and our basic American values.

[end box]

top of page

A news section for RELIGIOUS STATEMENTS, Denominations

There will be a new section called "Jewish". It will have this entree first, then the entree of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, now located elsewhere.

Central Conference of American Rabbis

*The **Central Conference of American Rabbis** [www.ccarnet.org] was founded in 1889. Its members are the body of rabbis who consider themselves and are considered to be the organized rabbinat of Reform Judaism. CCAR is represented in Washington, D.C. by the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, [<http://www.rac.org/>] which also represents the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. [<http://www.uahc.org/>]*

During the 1980s the Central Conference of American Rabbis adopted a series of resolutions dealing with the nuclear arms race and the danger of a nuclear holocaust. In a 1982 resolution on "Bilateral Nuclear Arms Freeze and Reduction" [<http://www.ccarnet.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nuclear&year=1982>], they expressed their concern in terms of Jewish traditions, as follows:

The Central Conference of American Rabbis expresses its extreme concern over the potential for destruction to our civilization that a nuclear war poses. A nuclear war, even a "limited" one, would result in death, injury, and disease on a scale without precedent. Civil defense and medical treatment would be totally inadequate. Our traditions speak to us of *Sakanat Nefashot*, the danger of exposing ourselves to health hazards; *Bal Tashchit*, the abhorrence of willful destruction of the environment; and *Yishuv Ha-arets*, the betterment and guardianship of the earth.

Inspired by the prophets, we raise our voices to call upon the United States government and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to adopt a mutual freeze on the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and new delivery systems for nuclear weapons. We further call upon the U.S. and USSR to work against the proliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons-grade nuclear materials, and to commit themselves to reducing their present levels of nuclear weapons and weapons-grade nuclear material.

In a 1983 resolution "On Nuclear Arms Control" [<http://www.ccarnet.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nuclear&year=1983>], CCAR called for Senate ratification of the SALT II Treaty and supported Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START).

In 1984 the Central Conference of American Rabbis adopted a resolution "On Preventing Nuclear Holocaust" [<http://www.ccarnet.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nuclear&year=1984>] in which they noted:

As Jews, we are called upon to witness to God's dominion and to vouchsafe the future of all the children of God.

The resolution supported the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, SALT II, and negotiation of a multilateral Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It opposed first-strike weapons, deployment of Pershing II missiles in Europe, and space-based weapons.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis expressed its concern again in a 1987 resolution on "Nuclear Holocaust" [<http://www.ccarnet.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nuclear&year=1987>] in which they urged other Jewish organizations "to join as one in calling for a bilateral freeze of testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons."

Religious Statements page
Additions to Canadian Council of Churches

1. Before the paragraph that begins, "*In April 2002....*", add the following paragraph:

"Reflecting that Canada is a member of NATO, the Canadian Council of Churches in April 1999 joined with the Conference of European Churches and the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA in a call to Reverse NATO's Nuclear Weapons Policy [<http://www.ploughshares.ca/content/ABOLISH%20NUCS/IntchurchLet.html>]. These three ecumenical bodies indicated:

We therefore call on the governments of all NATO members to ensure that the new NATO Strategic Concept:

- affirms NATO's support for the rapid global elimination of nuclear weapons and commits the Alliance to take programmatic action to advance this goal;
- commits 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
- renounces the first-use of nuclear weapons by any NATO members under any circumstances, and commits NATO to the pursuit of equivalent commitments from other states possessing nuclear weapons.

(2) In the sentence that reads:

This view was elaborated by Ernie Regehr, director of Project Ploughshares, a national peace and disarmament agency of the Canadian Council of Churches. He asked Canada to:

Put **Project Ploughshares** in bold and provide linkage to:
<http://www.ploughshares.ca/index.html>

Changes and additions to Religious Statements page

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html>

1. Change the order of INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL in index and the section where the statements are presented, as follows:

World Council of Churches

National Council of Churches (USA) [the "USA" is new]

Canadian Council of Churches

Conference of European Churches

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Religious Statements to NPT Meetings [this is change of wording]

1999 Parliament of the World's Religions [correct spelling of "Religions" here and below]

Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative (2000)

Chautauqua Appeal (2002) [this is new; see below]

2. At <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#npt>

(a) Change the heading and index items to read as follows:

Religious Statements to NPT Meetings

- Act Now for Nuclear Abolition (1998)

- A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons (1998)

- Nuclear Ethics, Morals and Law (1999)

[http://www.gsinsitute.org/resources/extras/gran_12-9-00.pdf]

- The Moral Imperative of the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons (2002) [<http://www.chautauqua-inst.org/religion/special.html>]

(b) After the third paragraph, add the following new paragraphs in italic:

At the 1999 NPT PrepCom meeting in New York Jonathan Granoff, president of the Global Security Institute, presented a paper entitled "Nuclear Ethics, Morals, and Law".

[http://www.gsinsitute.org/resources/extras/gran_12-9-00.pdf] It was later expanded into an article for the Brigham Young University Law Review (Vol. 2000, No. 4). Granoff said that for statesmen and citizens the "opportunity to lead the world in fulfilling nothing less than an ultimate moral imperative -- nuclear disarmament -- is ours if we meet the challenge."

"The Moral Imperative Of the Abolition Of Nuclear Weapons" [<http://www.chautauqua-inst.org/religion/special.html>] was the topic of an address to the 2002 NPT PrepCom by the Rev. Dr. Joan Brown Campbell. Formerly general secretary of the National Council of Churches, she is director, Department of Religion, Chautauqua Institution. She pointed out, "Not only does the buildup of nuclear weapons put our future at risk by tempting fate with its use, but it uses precious resources that must be put toward those things that will truly make for peace"

[in brown box: Interfaith and Ecumenical]

The Chautauqua Appeal

[pdf document]

In spring of 2002 the Religion Department of the Chautauqua Institution and the Global Security Institute convened twenty-five religious leaders from all parts of the country to share their concern for the deteriorating state of global relations and the current Administration's attitude regarding nuclear weaponry. The group delegated authority to Joan Brown Campbell, William Sloane Coffin and Stephen James Sidorak, Jr. to issue the following appeal.

[in box]

THE CHAUTAUQUA APPEAL TO THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES OF AMERICA

Indeed there is an "axis of evil." But it is hardly Iran, Iraq, and North Korea. A more likely and far more dangerous trio would be environmental degradation, pandemic poverty, and a world awash with weapons.

The three are closely linked. Governmental priorities that feed militarism starve the poor, while a nuclear war could transform the planet and all its inhabitants into a dreary waste of ash and cinder, silenced by death.

A nuclear war can happen, which is why nuclear weapons are the subject of this appeal. To people of faith God alone has the authority to end all life on earth. All we human beings have is the power. As such power is clearly not authorized, the mere possession of nuclear weapons must, in the sight of God, be an abomination. Further, to entrust the use of such destructive power to a handful of people, all of whom are fallible and some malicious, is reckless, to say the least.

During the Cold War it could be argued that nuclear weapons were for deterrence. But no longer. Today thoughtful people agree that nuclear proliferation is more an invitation than a deterrent to catastrophic conflict.

Nothing is served by minimizing the difficulties of disarmament. But we are persuaded that unless nuclear weapons are soon buried in history alongside of slavery, colonialism and apartheid, the human race is likely to go the way of the dinosaurs.

Religious leaders have more than once expressed their moral outrage at nuclear weapons. Likewise generals and admirals of many nations, our own included, such as General George Lee Butler, former commander of the U.S. Strategic Air Command and Admiral Andrew Goodpaster, former supreme allied commander of Europe, have called for the worldwide abolition of nuclear weapons under the most stringent possible inspection. Experience has told them that the possession of nuclear weapons by some states is the strongest stimulant for others to acquire them. Therefore these military leaders view the multi-lateral, verifiable abolition of nuclear weapons as the world's best chance to prevent further nuclear proliferation.

The International Court of Justice unanimously called for completing a treaty on nuclear elimination. Two years ago, pursuant to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the nuclear

weapons states, including the United States, pledged an “unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals.”

But the Bush administration has changed course—drastically. Far from furthering disarmament, the recently signed treaty with Russia calls only for the storing, not for the dismantling of nuclear weapons. Newspapers report plans to develop “usable” nuclear weapons for unilateral “pre-emptive action” against “evil states,” a policy that would be in blatant violation of international law, one certain to alienate allies and create more terrorists. Finally, the Administration is bent on spending now, of all times, billions of dollars building a missile shield when the enemy is less a rogue state than a band of stateless rogues, more apt to come to harm us by boat, bus, or small plane than by an intercontinental ballistic missile.

We therefore ask you, fellow believers, to give prayerful thought to the myriad liabilities and potential catastrophes of nuclear weapons. Our faith frequently compels us to see what we would rather ignore, and God surely would not have us wish for peace without working for it heart, soul, and mind.

We have no illusions. It will not be tomorrow or the next day that our government will be persuaded to accept a time-bound framework in which all nuclear weapons will be abolished. But if today, with a quickened sense of conscience, religious people speak out, joining with others in writing, lobbying, and demonstrating, then slowly, surely, the promise of a nuclear-free world will defeat the peril of a nuclear war.

We are blessed to live in a democracy. In a democracy dissent is not disloyal; what is unpatriotic is subservience. Apathy in the face of evil is morally unacceptable. Consequently, the sobering, demanding question is not “why abolish nuclear weapons?” but rather “why not?”

[end box]

[back to top](#)

<http://www.chautauqua-inst.org/religion/special.html>

The Moral Imperative Of the Abolition Of Nuclear Weapons

By Rev. Dr. Joan Brown Campbell

Director, Department of Religion, Chautauqua Institution

Speech to the U.N. NPT Preparatory Committee

United Nations, New York

April 9, 2002

Ladies and Gentle Men:

It is with a profound sense of responsibility that I stand to speak to you today on a subject of such urgency that no words are truly adequate. Native American wisdom teaches that every crucial decision must be made in full recognition of its impact on the seventh generation. It is in this light we must look at any nation's decision regarding the use of nuclear weapons. The threatened use of nuclear weapons by any nation for any purpose at any time in any place holds hostage the future of our children and grandchildren and their children. The actual use of weapons of mass destruction would be an end to life in this world and possibly even worlds yet unknown to us.

The World Council of Churches, an organization that I served for six years, spoke against deterrence and for abolition at their sixth assembly in Vancouver in 1983. "The concept of deterrence, the credibility of which depends on the possible use of nuclear weapons, is to be rejected as morally unacceptable and as incapable of safeguarding peace and security in the long term. The production and deployment of nuclear weapons, as well as their use, constitutes a crime against humanity." These are strong words from an international church body representing over 300 churches. In 1995, Pope John Paul II called for the banishment of all nuclear weapons through a workable system of negotiation, even arbitration. Archbishop Martino, representative of the Holy See to the U.N. said, "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st Century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the nonproliferation treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition. These are unambiguous statements. But despite these strong statements, the commitment of the religious community overall has been timid.

Martin Luther King, who seemed always to sense the urgency of time - I have often wondered if he knew that his life would be cut short at the youthful age of 39 - said these words for our time in his brilliant sermon, A Knock at Midnight. "It is midnight in the social order." He went on to say, "In this terrible midnight [of war], men have knocked on the door of church [temple synagogue, mosque] to ask for the bread of peace, but too often religious institutions have disappointed. What more pathetically reveals the irrelevancy of the church in present day world affairs. In a world gone mad and with arms buildup, chauvinistic passions and imperialist exploitation, the religious institutions have often remained approvingly silent" - or perhaps worse - have warred with one another. It is possible that there can be no world peace until there is religious peace. If this is true, then the world's religions must renounce proselytism and all attempts to claim any one religion's preference over another. Every faith and religion has its own extremists; these extremists set one religion against the other and thwart the inherent role of religion as peacemaker. We dare not impose any one religion on another. We dare not judge each other by extremists. The broad moderate voice must be energized.

So as representatives of the religious community, we must come on our knees confessing our failure to shine the light of love on the midnight darkness. But we would be twice wrong if we let our failures subdue our witness. There is a moral imperative to abolish nuclear weapons. It is a truth that must shatter the silence. Eli Wiesel said, "Indifference to evil is the enemy of the good, for indifference is the enemy of everything that exalts the honor of humanity."

Some of my colleagues when I speak to them of nuclear abolition look at me with what could be almost interpreted as pity. Some even say, "You are 70 years old. You have spoken up for a lifetime. Isn't it time for a rest?" Rest will come when God chooses for me to lie in peace. For now, there is work to be done.

Again, Martin Luther King is instructive. He understood his connection to issues on foreign policy. Drawing now on his prophetic speech at Riverside Church here in New York City on April 4, 1967, the speech in which he unequivocally joins the opposition to the war in Vietnam, his words resonate for our time just as powerfully as in that moment:

The eloquent words of that noble bard of yesterday, James Russell Lowell, were adapted in the hymn, "Once to Every Man and Nation." Lowell wrote these words in 1845 as a poem protesting America's war with Mexico.

The phrase "keeping watch over God's own" is a key phrase, and if not adequately understood, could easily be used as a justification to value some lives more than others - to protect some people over others. "God's own" is not a restrictive term, but an inclusive embrace. The meaning must be given its broadest ecumenical/interfaith interpretation. "God's own" includes every living creature and the environment that nurtures and feeds that life. The word ecumenical, which comes from the Greek word oikos, meaning house, is the same root as in the words economy and ecology. We are all of one household. As a wise Rabbi once said, "when interpreting the great commandment common to all faiths, 'love your neighbor,'" the Rabbi taught that "neighbor" is not a geographic term but a moral term. The moral argument against the use of nuclear weapons is rooted in this understanding of the ecumenical. An African-American preacher from Cleveland, Ohio preached a sermon on this point. His title was, "Do not poison the well from which you drink." His point was profound: we all drink from the same well. We dare not delude ourselves that "first strike" would poison only the well of the other. Nuclear poison turns the water in the well of life into blood and poison for all who drink from that well. This truth was powerfully and poetically stated by James Russell Lowell, "They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin."

This concept was made very clear to me during my attendance at a White House conference in 1998 on the subject, "Is there life on Mars?" The conference was the brainchild of the late scientist Carl Sagan. Carl and I were good though unlikely friends - believer and atheist. (Excuse this diversionary story.) When we would see each other, our mantra went like this. Carl to me, "You are so smart. How can you believe in God?" And I would answer back, "Carl,

you are so smart. Why don't you believe in God?" We never resolved this dilemma. Finally, it was not important for, as Carl used to say, you don't have to agree on how the earth was formed to agree to protect it."

Back to the conference. The room was filled with Nobel laureate scientists. Each sharing their wisdom, "Yes," they said, "life seems possible." Only two from the world of religion were there. (This was Carl's sense of humor.) Much of this discussion was beyond my capacity to understand, but I shall never forget the moment when one of the women scientists said to the group, "In the biosphere, independence is always death dealing. Interdependence is essential if life is to be sustained. And then she said, "Either our future will be an ecumenical interdependent future, or there will be no future at all." This is good science and very, very good religion. Indeed, as the preacher said, we all drink from the same well.

The moral principle that underlies our commitment to the future of humanity is the principle that acknowledges, rejoices, and holds as holy our interdependence. As the scientist said, it is life giving. The poorest peasant in the furthest, most remote corner of the world is our brother and sister. Together, we share a common responsibility for future generations. We need each other. Not only does the buildup of nuclear weapons put our future at risk by tempting fate with its use, but it uses precious resources that must be put toward those things that will truly make for peace:

...an end to abject poverty as we know it,

...an end to babies cradled in bone thin arms clasped to milkless breasts,

...an end to the unceasing wanderings of refugees,

...an end to racism that denies full humanity to God's children of colorful hue,

...an end to sexism that assures the endless servanthood of women who bear in their bodies future generations,

...and finally, an end to the assumption of privilege that comes from the belief that white and male and rich and western are the ones created in God's image;

that the privileged know best for the rest.

It is this assumption of privilege that gives rise to prejudice and economic superiority. It is this assumption of privilege coupled with power that makes the abolition of nuclear weapons imperative. We dare not risk humanity's future by placing it in the hands of any one nation, race, or gender. Speaking to my own nation, I would remind us of the Biblical imperative, "Unto whom much is given, much is required." When we declare to the world that we reserve to ourselves the right of first strike, then we as a nation give up the moral high ground that can only be claimed if we declare our commitment to abolish nuclear weapons. Then and then alone can we call the world to strive for peace. Then by our actions, not just our words, we will fire the moral imaginations of the nations and their leaders. We need to fire the moral imaginations of the nations and their leaders. A world at peace is possible, but it will require radical rethinking of the way resources are used. It is midnight in the social order, but if we can dream of daybreak, we can move past midnight. All life is risk. To risk on behalf of humanity is moral choice. To protect the future with weapons is highest risk without moral choice.

We can no longer afford to worship the god of hate or bow before the altar of retaliation. The oceans of history are made turbulent by the ever-rising tides of hate. History is cluttered with the wreckage of nations and individuals that pursued this self-defeating path of hate. As Arnold Toynbee says: "Love is the ultimate force that makes for the saving choice of life and good against the damning choice of death and evil. Therefore, the first hope in our inventory must be the hope that love is going to have the last word."

We are now faced with the fact, my friends, that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time. Life often leaves us standing bare, named, and dejected with a lost opportunity. The tide in the affairs of men does not remain at flood; it ebbs. We may cry out desperately for time to pause in her passage, but time is adamant to every plea and rushes on. Over the bleached bones and jumbled residues of numerous civilizations are written the pathetic words, "Too late." There is an invisible book of life that faithfully records our vigilance or our neglect. Omar Khayyam is right: "The moving finger writes, and having writ moves on."

Joan Brown Campbell
<http://www.chautauqua-inst.org/religion/campbell.html>

Contact Us

E-mail: (regarding Department of Religion schedule): sthayer@chautauqua-inst.com

E-mail: (regarding Joan Brown Campbell schedule): kbeeler@chautauqua-inst.com

Phone: 716.357.6274

Fax: 716.357.9014

Street Address: One Ames Avenue, Chautauqua, NY 14722

Conference of European Churches

<http://www.cec-kek.org/>

Who we are

<http://www.cec-kek.org/English/genflye.htm>

The Conference of European Churches (CEC) is a fellowship of 126 Orthodox, Protestant, Anglican and Old Catholic Churches along with 43 associated organisations from all countries on the European continent. CEC was founded in 1959 and has offices in Geneva, Brussels and Strasbourg.

History

<http://www.cec-kek.org/English/shortaccount.htm>

The movement which led to the creation of the Conference of European Churches dates back to the period of the cold war. The fragmented and divided Europe of the 1940s and 1950s needed to surmount political divisions to devote itself anew to the peoples torn apart by the Second World War.

At this time a small group of church leaders in East and West Europe began to consider together the possibility of bringing into conversation churches in European countries separated by different political, economic and social systems. Their aim was to enable the churches of Europe to become instruments of peace and understanding.

Exploratory and preparatory meetings took place in 1953 and 1957. In January 1959 representatives of more than 40 churches met in Nyborg Strand, Denmark for the first Assembly of CEC. A second Assembly was held in 1960 and a third in 1962, both in Nyborg.

At first the organisation represented a loose association of churches, but with the adoption of a Constitution at the 1964 Assembly a significant step was taken towards forming a regional conference of churches. This Assembly was held at sea, aboard the m.v. Bornholm, in order to overcome last-minute visa difficulties.

The fifth Assembly in 1967, held in Pörtlach, Austria, created a full-time secretariat as from April 1968. Subsequent Assemblies were held in Nyborg Strand (1971), Engelberg, Switzerland (1974), Chania, Crete (1979), Stirling, Scotland (1986), Prague, former CSFR (1992) when a radically revised Constitution was adopted, and Graz, Austria (1997). The next Assembly will be in Trondheim, Norway, from 25 June to 2 July, 2003.

Second European Ecumenical Assembly (EEA2)

Graz, Austria - 23 to 29 June 1997

FINAL DOCUMENT 1*

(Original Language: English)

<http://www.cec-kek.org/English/Graz1.htm>

We Christians and churches of Europe, confront these challenges conscious of our weakness and the scandal of our divisions. We do not have any simple solutions to offer. What moves us is our

Christian vision of reconciliation. The gift of reconciliation in Christ inspires us to commit ourselves:

to encourage disarmament and the development of nonviolent conflict management, and fostering without delay negotiation leading to complete elimination of nuclear arms, according to the Non Proliferation Treaty;

On 24 April 2002, the Executive Committee of the Church and Society Commission of the Conference of European Churches accepted this paper as the basis of the Commission's work on security questions.

A PAN-EUROPEAN SECURITY COMMUNITY

<http://www.cec-kek.org/English/PANEuroFinalFinal.htm>

The Church and Society Commission is the result of the merger of CEC's work on church and society issues and the European Ecumenical Commission for Church and Society (EECCS), which was completed on 1 January 1999.

On 24 April 2002, the Executive Committee of the Church and Society Commission of the Conference of European Churches accepted this paper as the basis of the Commission's work on security questions.

Questions of peace and security came to the forefront, with other questions, in the European Ecumenical Assemblies in Basel in 1989 and Graz in 1997. In the former, churches of all Christian traditions reflected together on the theological meaning and practical implications of the theme A Peace with Justice. In the Final Document of the Assembly is the following statement :

In many respects, the Cold War seems to be over. But with the exception of only a few neutral states, Europe remains organised in two antagonistic military blocks, with huge standing armies. The consumption of resources that supports these structures continues to impoverish millions of people both inside and outside Europe. As churches, we must contribute to finding new structures in Europe which reflect the problems of today and tomorrow, not of yesterday. Living together in Europe will require a common security system. We look with hope at the talks which have started this year on conventional forces and confidence building. (European Ecumenical Assembly 1989 Final Statement, part of paragraph 57)

The following Assembly in 1997, reflecting on the theme, "Reconciliation - Gift of God and Source of New Life" also took up the issue and its Basic Text made the following observation:

The realm of politics is an important area for reconciliation. We stand for the development of concepts of security which embrace all of Europe, and which avoid making Europe a threat to other parts of the world. The development of common democratic institutions, and of the political and economic cooperation of the whole European region, will strengthen its stability and diminish the danger of conflict. On the other hand, if parts of Europe are left in a security vacuum, opportunities for the political manipulation of old tensions could increase. The European institutions should serve as instruments of reconciliation, towards the creation of a

Europe without dividing lines, where security is sought in cooperation and not through deterrence. We reaffirm the statement of the Basel Assembly that there are no situations in our countries or our continent in which violence is required or justified (cf. N^o. 61). We will not be shaken in our conviction that reconciliation is possible between peoples, even though this term has been wrongly used. Therefore, we are in favour of promoting the development and furthering of voluntary service for justice, peace and the integrity of creation. (European Ecumenical Assembly 1997 Basic Text, paragraph A29)

10. A need for lower levels of military arms, restrictions of exports of conventional arms, and the phasing out of weapons of mass destruction.

In spite of considerable reductions since the end of the Cold War, many military resources and many ways of thinking about security from that era have survived. The road to a pan-European security order calls for a programme for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and a clear ambition in individual countries, alliances and Europe as a whole to seek to achieve their own military security in ways that do not imply insecurity for others.

This would call for a more restrictive arms export policy and it also means consciously seeking to avoid weapons systems, particularly weapons of mass destruction, that could be perceived as provocative.

It is also essential to keep agreements once made, in order to avoid returning into old patterns of accumulation of armaments or entering into new ones.

Conference of European Churches

*The **Conference of European Churches (CEC)** [<http://www.cec-kek.org/>] is a fellowship of 126 Orthodox, Protestant, Anglican and Old Catholic Churches along with 43 associated organizations from all countries on the European continent. CEC was founded in 1959 and has offices in Geneva, Brussels and Strasbourg.*

At a European Ecumenical Assembly in Basel, Switzerland in 1989, the Final Statement indicated:

In many respects, the Cold War seems to be over. But with the exception of only a few neutral states, Europe remains organised in two antagonistic military blocks, with huge standing armies. The consumption of resources that supports these structures continues to impoverish millions of people both inside and outside Europe. As churches, we must contribute to finding new structures in Europe which reflect the problems of today and tomorrow, not of yesterday. Living together in Europe will require a common security system. We look with hope at the talks which have started this year on conventional forces and confidence building.

*At the Second Ecumenical Assembly in Graz, Austria in 1997 the **Final Document** [<http://www.cec-kek.org/English/Graz1.htm>] expressed a commitment:*

to encourage disarmament and the development of nonviolent conflict management, and fostering without delay negotiation leading to complete elimination of nuclear arms, according to the Non Proliferation Treaty.

*On 24 April 2002, the Executive Committee of the Church and Society Commission of the Conference of European Churches accepted a paper entitled **A Pan-European Security Community** [<http://www.cec-kek.org/English/PANEuroFinalFinal.htm>] as the basis of its work on security questions. This paper spoke of a need for lower levels of military arms, restrictions of exports of conventional arms, and the phasing out of weapons of mass destruction.*

In spite of considerable reductions since the end of the Cold War, many military resources and many ways of thinking about security from that era have survived. The road to a pan-European security order calls for a programme for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and a clear ambition in individual countries, alliances and Europe as a whole to seek to achieve their own military security in ways that do not imply insecurity for others.

This would call for a more restrictive arms export policy and it also means consciously seeking to avoid weapons systems, particularly weapons of mass destruction, that could be perceived as provocative.

It is also essential to keep agreements once made, in order to avoid returning into old patterns of accumulation of armaments or entering into new ones.

Corrections to Religious Statements page

1. In the index the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) entree is fouled up. It should go after Methodist.
2. Under 1998 NPT PrepCom, "A Spiritual, Ethical and Humanitarian Perspective...." the photo of Bishop Gumbleton didn't come. The caption is missing: "Bishop Thomas Gumbleton"
3. Under Episcopal Church the URL is wrong for Comprehensive Test Ban. It should be <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eppn/display.asp?DocID=416>
4. Also under Episcopal Church the URL for Abolition of Nuclear Weapons has extra letters and numerals in the beginning.
5. Under Pax Christi, USA, the photo of Bishop Sullivan didn't come up. The caption is missing: Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi, USA.
6. The heading for the National Council of Churches is missing.
7. Methodist: Put the large "UMC" above "United Methodist Church". You did that once, but it has reverted to the old way.
8. "A Pastoral Letter to All United Methodists" The photo of Bishop White is distorted. The caption is missing: "Bishop C. Dale White was co-chair of the committee that drafted 'In Defense of Creation'."
9. For the photo of the United Methodist General Conference, bring the caption under the picture.
10. In the entree for Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) the heading is missing.
11. Union of American Hebrew Congregations. In the box for the statement by Rabbi Saperstein, his photo is missing.
12. The Sponsors list doesn't have the corrections for American Baptist Churches and Presbyterian Church.

Corrections to Religious Statements

9-19-02

On Religious Statements page the linkage to De-alerting should be <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#viewsorrelorgs>

NPR Index.

- a. Take out names of religious organizations and their linkage.
- b. Replace with three index items, linked to sub-sections below, as follows:
 - Pentagon Report
 - Faith Perspective
 - Civil Sector Perspective
- c. In first box that has NPR in caps, make a new heading: Pentagon Report
- d. Amend the heading for the second box to read:
Nuclear Posture Review: Faith Perspective
This follows the pattern of the third box on Civil Sector Perspective

Dalai Lama Millenium Message

<http://www.angelfire.com/wv/geoall/Dalai.htm>

This past century, in some ways, has been a century of wars and of bloodshed. It has seen a year-by-year increase in defence spending by most countries in the world. If we are to change this trend, we must seriously consider the concept of non-violence which is the physical expression of compassion. If one is to make non-violence a reality, we must first work on internal disarmament. And then proceed to work on external disarmament. By internal disarmament, I mean ridding ourselves of all the negative emotions that result in violence. This form of disarmament will also have to be done gradually ... step-by-step. We must work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total de-militarisation throughout the world. In the process of doing this, we also need to work towards stopping the arms trade which is still very widely practiced because it is so lucrative. When we do all these things, we can then hope to see in the next millennium, a year by year decrease in {transmission glitch} ... of the various nations and a gradual working towards de-militarisation.

Editing for Religious Statements, August 6, 2002

World Council of Churches

Statement to 1998 NPT Preparatory Committee

In introductory paragraph underline "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition" and link it to that statement under Religious Statements to 1998 PrepCom

Religious Statements to 1998 NPT PrepCom

A Spiritual, Ethical and Humanitarian Perspective...

In introductory section insert a photo of Bishop Thomas Gumbleton from <http://www.archdioceseofdetroit.org/>

Caption in smaller type: Bishop Thomas Gumbleton

Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative

In caption under photo, make type one size smaller. Remove quotation marks.

National Council of Churches in the U.S.A.

In the heading after "**Churches**" add "**of Christ**"

In the introductory paragraph put in bold: **National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.** and provide linkage to www.nccusa.org.

Canadian Council of Churches

In introductory paragraph put in bold **Canadian Council of Churches** and add linkage to <http://www.ccc-cce.ca/index.html>

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

In introductory paragraph put in bold **Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**. But no linkage is available.

American Baptist Churches

In third paragraph, remove comma after "lengthy".

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

In introductory paragraph put in bold **U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB)** and provide linkage to www.usccb.org.

In second paragraph underline "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response." and link to where summary is presented below.

In paragraph starting "Ten years later" underline "The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace" and link to where excerpt is presented below.

In section on "New Nuclear Treaty.....", add a caption in smaller type under photo: "Pope John Paul II greets Bishop Wilton D. Gregory."

Pax Christi USA

In opening paragraph put in bold **Pax Christi USA**

In second paragraph insert photo of Bishop Sullivan from <http://www.diocric.org/bishop/index.htm>

with caption in smaller type: Bishop Walter Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA.

Church of the Brethren

In opening paragraph put in bold **Church of the Brethren**.

Make complete resolution of 1984 a PDF document.

Mennonite Church USA

In opening paragraph put in bold **Mennonite Church USA**.

United Methodist Church

At the beginning put large letters of **UMC** above **United Methodist Church**

In third paragraph provide linkage from *In Defense of Creation* to pastoral letter below.

In photo of **General Conference Endorsement**, bring caption up under photo.

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

In opening paragraph put in bold **Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)**

In the boxed section on **The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race**, put the first paragraph in regular type, not bold face.

You probably don't need "top of page" at the end of this section. You haven't done this for similar sections.

The same applies to the next section.

Friends Committee for National Legislation

In opening paragraph put in bold **Friends Committee for National Legislation**

Unitarian Universalist Association

In introductory paragraph put in bold **Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations in North America**.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Can you enlarge their logo?

In opening paragraph put in bold **Union of American Hebrew Congregations**

In fourth paragraph take out "d" in "titled".

Statement by David Saperstein: find a picture of Rabbi Saperstein on www.rac.org.

Addition for Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

(A) On home page under sponsors add in alphabetical order:

➤ Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Division of Church in Society
[Linkage: <http://www.elca.org/dcs/>]

(B) On Religious Statements page

(1) In the index near the top, add in alphabetical order

- ***Evangelical Lutheran Church in America***

and link with entree below

(2) In proper alphabetical place add the following:

Denominations [in brown box]

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

*The **Evangelical Lutheran Church in America** [www.elca.org] consists of 5.1 million members in 10,851 congregations. It is governed by a Churchwide Assembly that meets every two years. ELCA is represented in Washington, D.C. by the **Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs** [www.loga.org].*

*The theological basis for ELCA's concern for nuclear disarmament is provided by a social statement on **For Peace in God's World**, [<http://www.elca.org/dcs/peacein.pf.html>] which was adopted by the Fourth Churchwide Assembly in 1995. In a section on "A Politics of Cooperation" this statement indicates:*

Give high priority to arms control and reduction. We particularly urge a sharp reduction in the number of weapons of mass destruction. We call for arms control agreements that are substantial, equitable, verifiable, and progressive. We support mutual confidence-building measures to improve mutually assured security. In particular, we give priority to:

- * agreements among the leading nuclear powers to reduce their nuclear stockpiles and to decrease the possibility of nuclear confrontation or accident;

- * the successful negotiation of a renewed Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, the strengthening of mechanisms to monitor and enforce nuclear treaties, and efforts that move toward the elimination of nuclear weapons;

- * treaties to ban the production, sale, and use of biological and chemical weapons; and
- * agreements to ban the production, sale, and use of land mines.

The Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs provides current information on nuclear disarmament issues [<http://www.loga.org/Arms.html>] on its web site.

top of page

FCNL

http://www.fcnl.org/issues/issue.php?issue_id=2

Issues we work on

[Donate Now](#)

Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.
Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.
Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.

Subjects

[New Nuclear Weapons Development](#)

[Nuclear Weapons Usage Policy](#)

[Nuclear Weapons Testing](#)

[Threat Reduction Programs \(Nunn-Lugar\)](#)

[Modern Pit Facility](#)

[De-Alerting Nuclear Weapons](#)

[Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty \(Moscow Treaty\)](#)

[Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty](#)

[Non-Proliferation Treaty](#)

An Argument for Nuclear Abolition

Joe Volk, FCNL Executive Secretary

http://www.fcnl.org/issues/item.php?item_id=784&issue_id=2

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#religioussocietyoffriends>

U. S. Nuclear Weapons Policies: The Choice Before Us

http://www.fcnl.org/issues/persp8_nuclear_1.htm

Dear Joe,

I like the recent broadening of your approach to nuclear disarmament by dealing with the broader picture as well as immediate, specific legislative issues. I would be interested in chatting with you some time about where you are going with this approach and relate it to some things I am working on.

I would like to provide linkage to two of your new items on our website, www.zero-nukes.org.

(1) I want to link "An Argument for Nuclear Abolition" as a new entree under Society of Friends at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#religioussocietyoffriends>. Incidentally I'll be updating the FCNL entree at that point.

(2) I want to link "U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policies: The Choice Before Us" in the section on "Scenarios for Achieving Zero Nuclear Weapons" at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero4.htm>. The broader "How to Get to Zero" page has references to things like the Canberra report that lays out an agenda similar to yours. So it would be appropriate to refer to your agenda in this context.

Lastly, I want to express disappointment that you have not included www.zero-nukes.org as a resource. I realize from your presentation at Advocacy Days that you want to stress the "practical" and not get involved in moral arguments. However, I believe that the religious statements on this website need to be kept in sight as we work for nuclear disarmament. That's where we are coming from, and public debate needs this element. Moreover, the site has statements by generals and admirals, and it refers to international bodies that have spoken on the issues and offered ideas on how to get to zero. This is a useful resource that you may want to provide linkage.

Shalom,
Howard

I. An addition to Holy See at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#holyse>

A. For the index, add:

- Global Security Requires Global Cooperation
[link this to entree below]

B. At the end of the introductory paragraphs (before the text of "There Has Been Regression), add:

In April 2003 Archbishop Diarmuid Martin presented the current views of the Holy See to a meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva. He stated:

Global security will only be guaranteed through global cooperation, within the framework of an authentically multilateral system.

C. At the end of the Holy See section (after the speech by Archbishop Martino), add (same format as Monsignor Chullikat and Archbishop Martino presentations):

"Global Security Requires Global Cooperation"

At the 2003 meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva, the views of the Holy See were presented by Archbishop Diarmuid Martin. He is permanent observer of the Holy See to the United Nations Office in Geneva. He indicated that "Global Security Requires Global Cooperation." [<http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/2003statements/HOLY.pdf>] He stated:

Global security will only be guaranteed through global cooperation, within the framework of an authentically multilateral system.

Archbishop Martin stressed three points in particular in relation to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty:

1. In the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review, all parties recognized that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only guarantee against the use of threat of use of nuclear weapons. . . .The preservation of the non-proliferation dimensions of the Treaty demands unequivocal action towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.
2. The fight against terrorism also requires enhancing our commitment to an integrated programme of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. The threat of terrorist attacks using nuclear weapons of mass destruction ought to galvanize the community of nations to ensure that the NPT, the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime, is strengthened.
3. Neither must we lose sight of the goal of universal adherence to the Treaty. . . . The peace process in the Middle East should thus aim at rapidly consolidating the necessary security presuppositions which will permit the establishment there of a zone verifiably free of all weapons of mass destruction.

II. An addition to Religious Statements to NPT Meetings at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#npt>

A. At the end of the index, add:

- Global Security Requires Global Cooperation (2003)
[link this to this section under Holy See]

B. At the end of the introductory paragraphs (after the one re Joan Campbell), add a new paragraph:

At the 2003 meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva, the representative of the Holy See, Archbishop Diarmuid Martin emphasized that "Global Security Requires Global Cooperation." [<http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/2003statements/HOLY.pdf>] He stressed (1) the need for unequivocal action towards the elimination of nuclear weapons, (2) the importance of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament in the fight against terrorism, and (3) the desirability of a zone verifiably free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Marie,

Here is an insert under Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

1. Go to <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#interfaithcommittee>

2. Scroll down to the list of four letters. Add in similar fashion: bold, underline, linked to below:

Letter to President George W. Bush on Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction, December 2002

3. Go to the end of the March 2002 letter to President Bush -- <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#march152002> -- and insert the following in a box and make into a PDF file.

**Letter to President George W. Bush on Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction
December 20, 2002**

The Honorable George W. Bush
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations note the release of "National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction." We share the premise of the report that the potential use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is a grave concern to citizens of the United States, indeed to all people on Earth.

Therefore, we favor a strong nonproliferation program that emphasizes diplomacy, reliance on multilateral regimes, controls on nuclear materials, and cooperative nuclear threat reduction, such as the Nunn-Lugar program. However, we strongly disagree with elements of the National Strategy related to counter-proliferation. In particular we have two major concerns.

First, we are greatly disturbed by the idea of unilateral preemption by U.S. military forces. Many of us have articulated this concern in relationship to Iraq. We believe that unilateral military intervention is a dangerous precedent which could have disastrous effects if pursued by other nations in diverse situations. Rather we favor strict observance of international law and collective security through the United Nations and multilateral regional organizations.

Second, we strongly oppose threatened and actual use of nuclear weapons in dealing with chemical and biological weapons. Such a policy is immoral because it would be disproportionate, would harm innocent civilians, and would have negative environmental effects. Further, this approach extends the role of nuclear weapons at a time when the world should be

working for their elimination. It is contrary to previous policy of not threatening first use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states. It adds to the appearance that the use of nuclear weapons is legitimate, thus encouraging other nations to develop their own nuclear arsenals. We note the disastrous effects in South Asia as India and Pakistan have copied the superpowers in believing that nuclear weapons have utility for deterrence and war-fighting.

Therefore, we urge you to reconsider the policies of unilateral preemption and first use of nuclear weapons.

Sincerely yours,

[Place signers in double column]

Signers

James Matlack, Director
Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

David Radcliff
Director, Brethren Witness
Church of the Brethren General Board

Rev. Barbara Green, Executive Director,
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy

Rev. Joel J. Heim, Ph.D. , Moderator
Disciples Peace Fellowship

David Culp, Legislative Representative
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Marie Dennis, Director
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

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

Dick Ullrich, Director
P. Francis Murphy Justice and Peace Initiative

Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar
General Secretary
National Council of Churches

Jean Stockan, Policy Director
Pax Christi USA

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory
Director, Washington Office
Presbyterian Church (USA)

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Rob Cavanaugh, Director
Washington Office for Advocacy
Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations

Rev. Lois M. Powell
Justice and Witness Ministries
United Church of Christ

Jim Winkler, General Secretary
United Methodist General Board
of Church and Society

[end of box]

Marie,

You made a good start on the Methodist section. There are, however, some things I wanted that you didn't notice. Furthermore, there are some refinements I want after seeing it on line.

At the very top, line up "Methodist" above "United Methodist Church".

Opening paragraph

Don't put the opening paragraph about the Methodist Church in a box. The model is the Catholic section.

I want to re-write the opening paragraph to read as follows:

The Methodist Church grew out of the preaching and organizing of John Wesley in 18th century England. It spread to the American colonies in the 1760s and expanded around the globe in the 19th century. Today the World Methodist Council has 77 member churches from the Wesleyan tradition with more than 33 million members in 138 countries.

Photo of World Methodist Council displayed at
<http://www.umns.umc.org/photos/wmc/WM01046.JPG>.

If that doesn't work, go to <http://www.umns.umc.org>, click on photo gallery, then World Methodist Council photos, then July 29, 2001, then thumb nail photo of convention hall with caption " The 18th World Methodist Conference is being held...."

Our caption: Meeting of 18th World Methodist Conference in Brighton, England in July 2001.
Credit in smaller type: Photo by Mike DuBose, courtesy United Methodist News Service.

United Methodist Church

Begin box.

Use the following monogram in lieu of a logo.

UMC

For the three subheads, follow the Holy See model with colored bullets, bold type, linkage to statements found below, as follows:

Methodist Church

- **In Defense of Creation**
- **Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence**
- **In the Aftermath of 9-11**

Paragraph 1. Put **Methodist Church** in bold face.

Paragraph 2. Put **General Conference** and **General Board of Church and Society** in bold face. When I clicked the latter, I didn't connect with the GBCS web site.

Paragraph 3. Make linkage with *In Defense of Creation* with statement below.

Paragraph 4. Put **Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence** in bold face and link with resolution below.

Paragraph 5. Rewrite as follows, putting "In Aftermath of 9-11" in bold face and linking with resolution below.

*At their spring 2002 meeting the United Methodist Council of Bishops took up the issue of nuclear weapons in a resolution entitled "**In the Aftermath of 9-11**". Witnessing the renewed interest in developing and possibly using new nuclear weapons, they stated:*

In Defense of Creation

Open paragraph in italic except for title. Then indented quote in plain type, as follows:

In 1986 after two years of study the United Methodist Council of Bishops issued a foundation document and pastoral letter entitled In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. In the pastoral letter, after summarizing a theology for peace with justice and the threat of nuclear weapons to the human family and planet earth itself, the bishops 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.

In the foundation document the United Methodist bishops outlined a set of policies for a just peace, including:

- Comprehensive test ban to inaugurate a nuclear freeze.
- Consolidation of existing treaties and phased reductions leading to the eventual goal of a mutual and verifiable dismantling of all nuclear armaments.
- Bans on space weapons.
- No-first-use agreement as a transitional measure.

Here is the pastoral letter in its entirety.

Near the top of this section, insert photo of Bishop C. Dale White, found at <http://umns.umc.org/photos/bishops/DWhite.jpg>. If that doesn't work go to <http://www.umns.umc.org>, click on photo gallery, then head shots.

Our caption: Bishop C. Dale White co-chaired the Bishops' committee that wrote *In Defense of Creation*.

General Conference Endorsement

At the end of this section, insert a photo of the 2000 General Conference found at <http://www.umns.umc.org/gc2000news/photos/gcb/gc2kb14.jpg>. If that doesn't work, go to <http://www.umns.umc.org>, click on photo gallery, then General Conference Photos, then May2, 2000, then thumb nail photo of whole conference with caption " OPENING -- Delegates and visitors...."

Our caption: "The 2000 United Methodist General Conference endorsed nuclear abolition."
Credit in smaller type: Photo by John C. Goodwin, courtesy of United Methodist News Service.

Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence

This box is okay.

In the Aftermath of 9-11

Some place near the top insert photo of Bishop Sharon Brown Christopher found at <http://umns.umc.org/photos/bishops/Christopher.jpg>. If that doesn't work go to <http://www.umns.umc.org>, click on photo gallery, then head shots.

Caption: Bishop Sharon Brown Christopher is President, United Methodist Council of Bishops for 2002-2003.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Use logo that I mailed to you.

Handle subheads as suggested for Methodist Church and as done for Holy See: colored bullets, bold face, linked to statements below.

- **Letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review (April 2001)**
- **Nuclear Posture Review: A Flawed Proposal (April 2002)**

Insert my photo, which I mailed you, as indicated.

In opening paragraph, put "Peace Leaf" in plain type. Begin the last sentence: *"The organization can be reached...."*

In paragraph beginning *"During the last two years...."*, put in bold with capitalization: ***A Letter to President Bush*** and link to letter below.

In paragraph beginning *"When the conclusions...."*, put ***"A Flawed Proposal"*** in bold and link to article below.

Make "Letter to President Bush" a PDF document

Make "A Flawed Proposal" a PDF document and rearrange heading as follows:

Nuclear Posture Review: A Flawed Proposal
by Howard W. Hallman

from Peace Leaf, April 2002

Marie, I know this is a lot of revision but its a complicated section.

Thanks for your efforts,

Howard

Morality And Nuclearism

by Bishop C. Dale White

Keynote Address to Nuclear Disarmament Track,
Ecumenical Advocacy Days, 2004
March 6, 2004

Bishop C. Dale White served as co-chair of the Episcopal Initiative of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#indefenseofcreation>] in 1986. In this address he reflects upon nuclearism as the peak of the “pyramid of violence”.

Conventional weapons are at the heart of the pyramid, proliferating worldwide and fueled by the industries of the “arms merchant of the world”, the US. At the base of the pyramid, the runaway proliferation of automatic weapons and handguns infect our violent urban streets and even filter into our schools. Bishop White challenges the morality of war-making systems that produce these results. He concludes by discussion the role of communities of faith in opposing nuclearism.

We gathered in the Nevada desert at the entrance to the nuclear test site. As usual, we gathered before dawn. We wanted to be at the site to bring our witness to the employees as they came to work. We were part of the *Nevada Desert Experience*. Starting small years ago, with only the faithful Franciscan religious standing in a prayer vigil week after week, the witness has swelled to thousands. As many as 5,000 pilgrims have come at times. Protestants of all stripes have made pilgrimage there, as well as Roman Catholic and Orthodox believers. Jewish groups have come, and Buddhists, Moslems, Hindus and Jains. Devotees of the world’s great religions have arrived to bear witness and to pray. Many Japanese delegations, some survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, have traveled across the globe to bear witness to the madness of nuclearism. On this day, we are solemnly processing, with representatives of most of the organized religions of the world carrying symbols of their faith. I brought a large cross. The Shoshone religious leader, who never tired of reminding us that the government was illegally squatting on their land, brought a smoldering sweet-grass torch. We place our symbols on the altar, a great pile of stones gathered from sites affected by nuclearism all over the world. Some cross the cattle guard onto the nuclear grounds to be arrested.

During the 1980’s, the communities of faith overcame their “nuclear numbness” and spoke again and again to denounce the nuclear arms race. The historic peace churches issued their *1980 New Call to Peacemaking*. In the same year the Presbyterian Church (USA) released *Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling* and organized a national action program for peace. The next year the World Council of Churches held its *Amsterdam Public Hearing*. In 1983, the Roman Catholic Bishops issued *The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and Our Response*, a remarkable study of nuclear issues and a pastoral letter detailing the moral and spiritual impact of nuclearism on the faith. In 1986, the Council of Bishops, after two years of intensive study and debate, released *In Defense of Creation*, declaring:

“We write in defense of creation. We do so because the creation itself is under attack. Air and water, trees and fruits and flowers, birds and fish and cattle, all children and youth, women and men live under the darkening shadows of a threatening nuclear winter. We call The

United Methodist Church to more faithful witness and action in the face of this worsening nuclear crisis. It is a crisis that threatens to assault not only the whole human family but planet earth itself, even while the arms race itself cruelly destroys millions of lives in conventional wars, repressive violence, and massive poverty. Therefore, we say a clear and unconditioned *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."

In concert with communities of faith world wide, we declared the *deterrence* doctrine, the only rationale for holding nuclear weapons, morally bankrupt. Over and over again, in language unique to their ethnic and religious traditions, people of faith have over these decades insisted that the holding of nuclear weapons and the threat to use them violates every value of the spiritual wisdom of the ages. Then the Cold War was over; the Soviet Union collapsed. "Now that is behind us", we said, "we can think about other things." The foundation money for peace action dried up. We spoke of a "peace dividend". We drifted back into "nuclear numbness". Nuclearism was last century's issue. Now see what has happened while we looked the other way!

In February, 2002, the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* moved the minute hand of the "Doomsday Clock" from nine to seven minutes to midnight, the same setting at which the clock debuted 55 years ago. Since the end of the Cold War in 1991, this is the third time the hand has moved toward doomsday. The Board of Directors declared:

We move the hands taking into account both negative and positive developments. The negative developments include too little progress on global nuclear disarmament; growing concerns about the security of nuclear weapons materials world wide; the continuing U.S. preference for unilateral action rather than cooperative international diplomacy; U.S. abandonment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and U.S. efforts to thwart the enactment of international agreements designed to constrain proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons; the crisis between India and Pakistan; terrorist efforts to acquire and use nuclear and biological weapons; and the growing inequality between rich and poor around the world that increases the potential for violence and war. If it were not for the positive changes highlighted later in this statement, the hands of the clock might have moved closer still.

The Atomic Scientists listed troubling trends: More than 31,000 nuclear weapons are still maintained by the eight known nuclear powers, a decrease of only 3,000 since 1998. Ninety-five percent of these weapons are in the US and Russia, and more than 16,000 are operationally deployed. Even if the US and Russia complete the announced reductions over the next 10 years, they will continue to target thousands of nuclear weapons against each other.---Most of the US warheads being removed from the active stockpile will be placed in storage rather than dismantled. Russia seeks a verifiable, binding agreement to destroy those weapons---Despite a campaign promise, the Bush administration keeps enough weapons on alert status to incinerate more than 2,000 Russian targets in as little as 30 minutes.---U.S. weapons laboratories are hard at work refining existing warheads and designing entirely new weapons, while the U.S. government refuses to recognize the overwhelming international support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and refuses to participate in international meetings to discuss implementing the treaty.---Russia and the U.S. continue to maintain enormous stockpiles of

fissile material, much of it in Russia poorly guarded, with growing cadres of terrorists eager to get their hands on it.

The New York Times of March 12, 2002, carried the startling caption: “*America as Nuclear Rogue*”. The editor wrote: “If another country were planning to develop a new nuclear weapon and contemplating pre-emptive strikes against a list of non-nuclear powers, Washington would rightly label that nation a dangerous rogue state.”

The editorial was in response to a new Pentagon planning paper, *The Nuclear Posture Review*. It recommends to the President that the number of nuclear weapons be reduced, but that the number of countries considered nuclear targets, the “Axis of Evil”, be expanded. The report went on to encourage the development of a new class of nuclear weapons, deep-burrowing weapons designed to “hold at risk” any nation’s hardened, underground nuclear or biological weapons and laboratories. One official held that the weapons are needed “to make sure there is no safe place to develop nuclear and biological weapons, and to discourage countries from even trying.”

A follow-up op-ed piece by David Sanger in the *Times* on March 18 carried the caption “Thinking the Unthinkable, Again”. He writes that the discussion now ensuing in Washington is to create a specialized weapon “harnessing a nuclear blast to dig deep underground and cause a seismic wave that would collapse an underground nuclear site”. The idea would be to penetrate even deeper into a bunker than the B61 Mod 11 gravity bomb can do, and at the same time to “keep nuclear fallout to a minimum.” Critics raised the warning that such thinking treats a nuclear weapon as just one more weapon available in the arsenal.

Secretary of State Colin Powell tried to calm the waters by insisting that the American nuclear policy has not changed. The United States would never use a nuclear weapon preemptively against a state that had promised not to build nuclear weapons of its own. Such an act would be a violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. But administration officials, preserving a stance of ambiguity, said all bets would be off if a country that has signed the treaty, such as Iraq, secretly built a nuclear weapon. But President Bush said that it is important to keep “rogue nations” guessing. It has long been an aspect of American policy to “keep them guessing”. President Bush said: “We’ve got all options on the table, because we want to make it very clear to nations that you will not threaten the United States or use weapons of mass destruction against us or our allies.”

Critics of the “*Nuclear Posture Review*” were not reassured by the administration’s insistence that “nothing has changed.” Jim Wallis wrote in *Sojourners*, *May-June, 2002*: “Reversing more than two decades when nuclear weapons were seen as a last resort, to be used only if the nation’s existence were threatened in a doomsday confrontation with another superpower, the new approach changes everything. It clearly plans the ‘first use’ of nuclear weapons, targets them against non-nuclear states, integrates ‘nuclear capacity’ into conventional military strategies and foreign policy objectives, and virtually erases any former restraints against their use by now justifying nuclear war against contingencies as vague and unspecified as ‘surprising military developments’.” Such recommendations clearly cross the nuclear threshold. Nuclear weapons are themselves weapons of terror, since they erase all distinctions between

military and civilian casualties. This violates a central requirement for a Just War, deliberately targeting civilians.

How can we possibly understand the mad, mad, mad resurgence of nuclearism? We need to reflect on the nature of all military systems. Military systems are *domination systems*. The term comes from Dr. Walter Wink's three-volume work on "principalities and powers", as defined in the New Testament. In warning of principalities and powers, he says, the early Christians were "discerning the actual spirituality at the center of the political, economic, and cultural institutions of their day." They intuited the demonic inner spirituality of the repressive and cruel institutional life of the Roman Empire. The people suffered terribly from the taxation that bled their resources, the totalitarian reign that stifled all attempts at reform, the sacred emblems of the Romans that violated their religious sensitivities. Their cosmology forced them to project the evil in the system in visionary form as a spiritual being residing in the heavens. Today we would withdraw the projections and see that the powerful and cruel spiritual forces we intuit emanate from the actual institutions that oppress us. The demons are *not up there, but over there* in the actual corporate entities and social mores that come under the control of exploitative power centers. They reflect the inner life of social and economic systems gone wrong.

Domination systems are truly demonic; they are mass killers. An analysis of the powerful systems threatening justice, peace, and the integrity of creation reveals the characteristics of domination systems: Deviant values of greed, lust for power, and brutality are the operative forces driving them, crushing all hope for human advance. These systems take on a destructive, self-generating life of their own, so powerful that they seem almost beyond human control. The early Christians knew that the demons disguise their true identity; they hide behind self-justifying mythologies that so permeate a culture that they seem to be absolute truth. Domination systems seduce, beguile or force decent people to do beastly things. Domination systems finally assume the guise of an idolatrous religion, a deviant belief structure that attracts zealous and influential devotees. (Navy War College in Newport, R.I.—Learning to do with great efficiency what shouldn't be done at all.)

If the word "demonic" seems too strong in describing these interlocking systems, recall the atmosphere in the nation in the late 80's that led to the Council of Bishops' study *In Defense of Creation*. The word "nuclear winter" entered our lexicon, as 100 scientists gathered in Washington after two years of study to warn that in a major nuclear interchange, smoke and dust would rise rapidly on the fire storm and circumnavigate the globe, blocking sunlight over much of the earth for weeks and threatening all life over much of the planet. *Boutros-Boutros Ghali*, Secretary General of the UN, cried: "What right does the US and the Soviet Union have to decide the fate of mankind?"

Powerful voices were crying alarm, as the firepower of a million Hiroshima's was poised and ready not only to incinerate millions of people, but also to threaten civilization and even the biosphere. We began to speak not only of genocide, but *omnicide* and *biocide*, all in the name of the great god "national security."

Dr. Bernard Lawn of Harvard, receiving the Nobel Peace Prize for the International Physicians for Social Responsibility, said: "This build-up is like a cancer, the cells of which

multiply because they have been genetically programmed to do no other. Pointing nuclear-tipped missiles at entire nations is an unprecedented act of moral depravity.” *Bertrand Russell* wrote: “Our world has sprouted a weird concept of security and a warped sense of morality. Weapons are sheltered like treasures while children are exposed to incineration.” *George Kennan*, receiving the Albert Einstein Peace Prize said: “We have gone on piling weapon upon weapon, missile upon missile....We have done this helplessly, almost involuntarily; like the victims of some sort of hypnotism, like men in a dream, like lemmings headed for the sea.”

We need to reflect that nuclearism is the peak of the “pyramid of violence”. Conventional weapons are at the heart of the pyramid, proliferating worldwide and fueled by the industries of the “arms merchant of the world”, the US. Our country sells over 70 percent of all the weapons purchased by developing nations, 90 percent to undemocratic states. At the base of the pyramid, the runaway proliferation of automatic weapons and hand guns infect our violent urban streets and even filter into our schools. What is the morality of this vast system of death-making devices?

Military systems thrive on lies.

As is often said, "The first casualty of war is the truth." We can also say that truth is in jeopardy in any society that is engulfed in preparations for war. Chinese General Sun Tzu said more than 2,000 years ago: "All warfare is based on deception."

Winston Churchill is reported to have said: "Lying finds its highest expression in war-time, when truth must be shielded by a body-guard of lies." Unfortunately, when we spin a fabric of lies to deceive an enemy, we end up deceiving ourselves. The General Accounting Office assessment of the first Gulf War concluded:

"The smoke the Pentagon blew in Mr. Hussein's eyes wafted back to the US. Many of the stories about infallible, invisible, almost invariably accurate weapons--selectively detailed, carefully crafted tales told to the American people and the Congress--were at best 'noble lies.'"

The GAO concluded that the reports of the military and the arms-makers were "overstated, misleading, inconsistent with the best available data, or unverifiable." The Pentagon response is that the GAO Report is outdated, since all of the defects in weaponry it reported have "now been fixed."

The Pentagon uses the phrase "*perception control*" for its "noble lies". It is nothing new. In the 1950's the Air Force warned of a "bomber gap" and a "missile gap" in order to win the budget presumably to fill those gaps. In 1961, General Eisenhower said the gaps were a "fiction", and made his solemn warning of a "military-industrial complex" which had taken on a life of its own, bereft of public accountability or even rationality. To justify continuing to spend billions of dollars on the ill-starred "Star Wars" projects, the Pentagon staged fake tests. Their purpose: "To justify future weapons spending."

Helen Caldicott, in her recent book *The New Nuclear Danger*, says the spoke from the Pentagon is wafting into our eyes again. She describes “a second ‘Manhattan Project’—a

massive scientific undertaking costing 5 to 6 billion dollars annually for the next ten to fifteen years, to design, test, and develop new nuclear weapons under the guise of ensuring the safety and reliability of the U.S.'s current stockpile of nuclear weapons." (p. 4) She argues persuasively that this project, due to cost twice the outlay of the original Manhattan Project, is not only in violation of international treaty obligations, but is built upon a foundation of lies.

"Funny, they don't look like guinea pigs!" Beverly Walker used those words on a poster of her children that she showed us in a *Symposium on Nuclear Radiation and the Environment* in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Beverly, a pastor's wife and a professional archivist, grew up near the Hanford Nuclear Complex. The poster was part of a campaign to alert the public to the health crises emerging among those who were children during the years when pink clouds of radioactive smoke were released into the atmosphere from the Hanford Complex. Beverly said that as children they loved to play in the pink snow, and even make ice cream from it. "They lied to us!" Beverly exclaimed. "They told us it was safe!" Beverly told us of the birth defects her children had suffered, and the multiple health problems she and thousands of others continue to suffer.

We were briefed on the medical work the Houston Methodist Hospital Complex is doing with hospitals in Kazakhstan. In the Semipalatinsk region of Kazakhstan the Soviets had exploded some 500 nuclear warheads, 300 of them in the atmosphere. More than 400,000 persons were exposed repeatedly to radiation released into the atmosphere or seeping into the ground water. The people were told there was no danger. The medical consequences of the fallout have been horrendous. All forms of cancer proliferate in the region; stillbirths, retardation and other birth defects are of epidemic proportions.

Slovoj Zizek, in the January-February, 2004 *Foreign Policy*, offered a tongue-in-cheek interpretation of the rationale for invading Iraq: "To understand why the Bush administration invaded Iraq, read Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*, not the National Security Strategy of the United States....To illustrate the weird logic of dreams, Sigmund Freud used to evoke a story about a borrowed kettle: When a friend accuses you of returning a borrowed kettle broken, your reply is, first, that you never borrowed the kettle; second, that you returned it unbroken, and third, that the kettle was already broken when you borrowed it. Such an enumeration of inconsistent arguments, of course, confirms precisely what it endeavors to deny: that you, in fact, did borrow and break the kettle.

"A similar string of inconsistencies characterized the Bush Administrations' public justifications for the U.S. attack on Iraq in early 2003. First, the administration claimed that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD), which posed a 'real and present danger' to his neighbors, to Israel, and to all democratic Western states. So far, no such weapons have been found (after more than 1,000 U.S. specialists have spent months looking for them). (*Note:* David Clay recently concluded that the Administration was wrong). Then, the administration argued that even if Saddam does not have any WMD, he was involved with al Qaeda in the September 11 attacks and therefore should be punished and prevented from launching future assaults. But even U.S. President George W. Bush had to concede in September 2003 that the United States 'had no evidence that Saddam Hussein was involved with September the 11th. Finally, there was the third level of justification, that even if there was no

proof of a link with al Qaeda Saddam's ruthless dictatorship was a threat to its neighbors and a catastrophe to its own people, and these facts were reason enough to topple it. True, but why topple Iraq and not other evil regimes, starting with Iran and North Korea, the two other members of Bush's infamous 'axis of evil.'

"What were the real underlying reasons for the attack? Effectively, there were three: first, a sincere ideological belief that the destiny of the United States is to bring democracy and prosperity to other nations; second the urge to brutally assert and signal unconditional U.S. hegemony; and third, the need to control Iraqi oil reserves.

"The second reason is the most important: The urge to demonstrate unconditional U.S. hegemony. The *National Security Strategy* calls for translating America's 'position of unparalleled military strength and great economic and political influence' into 'decades of peace, prosperity, and liberty'. Thus the administration is using Iraq as a pretext or exemplary case to establish the parameters of the new world order, to assert the right of the United States to launch preventive strikes and thus to cement its status as the sole global policing power."

Iraq was already a secular state. "What is likely to emerge as a result of the U.S. occupation in Iraq is precisely a fundamentalist Muslim anti-American movement, directly linked to such movements in other Arab countries or countries with a Muslim presence. It is as if, in a contemporary display of the 'cunning of reason', some invisible hand of destiny repeatedly ensures that the U.S. intervention only makes more likely the outcomes the United States sought most to avoid."

What happens when government systematically lies to its people? Cynicism and alienation tear the fabric of democracy. The truth is the "oxygen" of democracy. When government lies, many decent people drop out of the political process altogether. They leave the field under the control of highly disciplined one-issue coalitions or ideologues of extreme persuasion. Civility becomes a casualty to strident, destructive rhetoric. Not only governments lose credibility; corporations that manipulate public opinion for their own greed cause a loss of confidence in all large corporate systems. Hate groups begin to proliferate. As we saw in Eastern Europe and the Philippines, the people may rise up *en masse* and declare a lying government illegitimate. It is disturbing to read the article by Robert Kagan in the March/April *Foreign Affairs*, under the title "Crisis of Legitimacy".

Military systems fatten on greed.

The Congressional Budget Resolution of 1997 provided an extravagant \$266 billion for defense, some \$12 billion more than the Pentagon requested. As children we were taught that we are unique among great nations. Our military is under the strict control of the civilian branch of government, we were told. For years now we have seen a reversal of this principle. Defense contractors and others who profit from military systems pressure the Congress to manufacture weapons systems, even over the objections of Pentagon strategists. For instance, the Salt II Treaty for a nuclear weapons role-back was strongly supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but opposed by the President and the Secretary of State.

Again and again local commercial interests have supported unwise military procurements. For many, the military is seen as a jobs program. Deliberately distributing sub-contracts for the production of strategic weapons systems into a range of congressional districts, the Pentagon garners political support. Large donations to the re-election campaigns of members of congress from arms manufacturers are clearly a conflict of interest. Read Helen Caldicott's book *The New Nuclear Danger* to see a thorough documentation of the interlocking systems of the military-industrial-scientific complex at work, in the chapter on "Corporate Madness and the Death Merchants."

Even before the terrorist attack, and the fear mongering that is driving the vast re-arming of America, the Pentagon, with its political and corporate supporters, insisted that we should continue wartime spending for the military so that we can "modernize our forces in order to retain technological dominance in weaponry." The credibility of that claim vanished with the demise of the Soviet Union. The Pentagon insists that we must be ready to fight two major wars at the same time, with no help from our allies. Who are these enemies? What happened to the allies who have supported us in every major war in this century? The late Admiral Eugene Carroll of the *Center for Defense Information* wrote, "Now it appears that America is engaged in an arms war with itself!"

Whatever happened to the *Peace Dividend*? Why are we spending so much on the military when we are trying to balance the Federal budget and reduce huge deficits, while at the same time insisting that we can no longer support the safety net for the poor? Admiral Carroll offers an answer:

"The not-so-hidden agenda of many members of Congress is delivering federal spending to their districts, and there are few better ways to do that than fattening the Pentagon budget and ordering expensive new weapons systems. The cold war provided political cover for this wasteful practice, but it is now indefensible."

If we need any further proof of the influence of greed on military systems, think only of Abdul Khan enriching himself and his cronies by secretly transporting nuclear secrets and technologies to Iran, Libya and North Korea.

Military systems are driven by pride.

For generations, the Church has warned of the venal sin of "hubris"; pride leading to disaster. Is it possible that the strongest military power in human history might be brought down by its own hubris?

Now commentators are speaking openly, warning of *America's Age of Empire*. The newly announced *US National Security Strategy* doctrine, the "Bush Doctrine", according to Todd Gitlin in the January/February issue of **Mother Jones**, "is internationalism imperial-style—as in Rome, when Rome ruled. Its scope is breathtaking. There were large parts of the world that Rome couldn't reach, but the Bush doctrine recognizes no limits.

“The government of the United States will ask not so much as a by-your-leave. It will know when threats are emerging, partly formed, and it will not have to say how it knows, or be convincing about what it knows. The doctrine affirms all of the comforts and recognizes none of the dangers of empire. It ignores the costs of unbounded deployment and war. It acknowledges no danger that reckless swashbuckling helps recruit terrorists. It forgets that all empires fall—they cost too much, they incite too many enemies, they inspire contrary empires. The new imperialists think they are different. All empires do.” (Pew Global Attitudes Project—the US is alienating 19 of 27 countries polled—not only Moslem countries, but Canada, Britain, Germany, South Korea. All admire our values, and hate our policies.)

Michael Ignatieff writes in the January 5th, 2003 New York *Times* Magazine, “With a military of unrivaled might, the United States rules a new kind of empire. Will this cost America its soul—or save it?”

Some weeks ago, I saw Bill Moyers interviewing Robert Woodruff, author of *Reverence: Renewing a Forgotten Virtue*. Woodruff quoted from his book: “As I write, the United States is at the supreme moment of its power. Not far from where England was in 1897, when Rudyard Kipling wrote *Recessional*, as a reminder that power leads to arrogance and arrogance to a fall: “The tumult and the shouting dies, the captains and kings depart, still stands thine ancient sacrifice and a humble and a contrite heart. If drunk with the sight of power, we loose wild tongues that have not thee in awe, Lord God of hosts, be with us yet, be with us yet.”

War-making systems turn on their masters.

War-making systems are Frankenstein monsters; once unleashed, they run an unpredictable course. Jesus said, "Those who live by the sword will die by the swords." Often, sad to say, they die by their own sword. This is the "boomerang effect" so often discussed.

Against the Soviets, for instance, we armed and trained the Mujahedin in Afghanistan. Now the weapons we provided are being used to destabilize the Punjab in India. The explosives we provided and the explosives experts we trained are in the hands of terrorists, many of whom see the United States as the enemy. As of this writing, Kabul has been over-run by a rebel group using arms left over from the East-West struggle. Now a million people, who long enjoyed one of the most liberal ways of life of any Muslim community in Central Asia, is under the control of a fanatical faction. A repressive code of conduct is being ruthlessly enforced. Women's rights are now a fiction; they are no longer allowed to hold jobs; they are covered from head to toe with the "chedori" when venturing out. Even the most ardent supporters of our involvement in the Afghan war can hardly believe this was our dream for the Afghan people.

Long ago, President Eisenhower said: "It is a question how far we can go in defending ourselves from without, without destroying ourselves from within." For centuries, war-making elites have devised ways to protect their own societies from brutalization as a result of their military adventures. As we ponder the gun-fetish on television, the unbridled power of the National Rifle Association, the growth of illegal militia, the violence on urban streets and in the homes of America, is it not clear that in brutalizing others we have brutalized ourselves?

War-making systems war against the earth.

The venerable watchdog of the planet's life-giving systems, the *Worldwatch Institute* concluded that the world's armed forces are the single largest polluters on earth. Modern warfare devastates vast areas. We need only to look at the effects of defoliation in Vietnam, or remember the burning oil wells in the Persian Gulf to confirm the Institute's judgment. Or we might ponder the horrifying, lingering effect of 100,000,000 land mines left over from conflicts in Africa and Asia to concede the point. The cost in malnutrition and even starvation in areas where thousands of acres cannot be farmed adds insult to the grave injury of thousands of men, women, and children who have lost limbs or life.

Moreover, the production, testing, and maintenance of conventional, chemical, biological and nuclear weapons generate enormous quantities of toxic and radioactive substances, and contaminate soil, air, and water. Vast areas in Eastern Europe are wastelands, with water and soil so polluted that they cannot support human life.

According to the *World Watch Institute*, the military use of aluminum, copper, platinum and other non-renewable resources exceeds the entire Third World demand for these metals. The US military burns enough fossil fuel each year to run the entire mass transit system in America for 14 years! This is a sobering thought, since the Institute predicts that within the lifetime of young people today, fossil fuel costs will rise beyond the purchasing power of even the wealthier nations.

Clearly we must make hard choices, and make them now. The biosphere cannot sustain forever our over-heated, highly militarized industrial economies. We often say that war is bad for children and other living things. War-making systems are also bad for the life-giving forces of Creation on planet earth.

The Role of Communities of Faith.

My message today is this: as leaders and prophets of communities of faith, we dare not let our people "be at ease in Zion" until they become involved in movements to free our people from the idolatry of systems of violence. What do we have to offer? History is replete with illustrations of the vital role church groups have played in awakening civil society. --Christian disciples are well equipped to confront the false theology of idolatrous institutional systems. -- We are skilled in articulating coherent visions for new futures, guided by the accumulated wisdom of the ages. --We symbolize in our very being the finest values of the human experience. --We can call upon a host of committed and courageous persons of good will. -- Constant litanies of repentance and forgiveness keep us in touch with the sinfulness of the human condition and the wonders of God's grace. --Most of all, prayer focuses our attention on the hurts of the human family, softens our attitudes of even our "enemies", and empowers us both to expect and to envision new futures.

Gary Gardner wrote a provocative article in the *State of the World 2003*, the annual publication of the World Watch Institute: "The quickening of religious interest in environmental issues suggests that a powerful new political alignment may be emerging that could greatly

strengthen the effort to build a sustainable world.” Science can write an objective story about “what is”, but we need an emotive story of “what ought to be”, the strength of religion. “A sustainable world cannot effectively be built without full engagement of the human spirit.”

Gardner says that communities of faith bring at least five strong assets to the effort to build a sustainable world: the capacity to shape cosmologies (worldviews), moral authority, a large base of adherents, significant material resources, and community-building resources. Religions are experienced at informing our perspectives on issues of ultimate concern. They know how to inspire people and how to wield moral authority.” Thomas Berry points out that religion is one of the major societal drivers of change in the world, along with education, business, and government.

Clearly Walter Wink was right on target when he wrote: “Churches, which continually complain about their powerlessness to induce change, are in fact in a privileged position to use the most powerful weapon of all: the power to delegitimize. But it is a spiritual power, spiritually discerned and spiritually exercised.”

The Council of Bishops agreed: “The Church of Jesus Christ, in the power and unity of the Holy Spirit, is called to serve as an alternative community to an alienated and fractured world—a loving and peaceable international company of disciples transcending all governments, races, and ideologies; reaching out to all ‘enemies’; and ministering to all the victims of poverty and oppression.” (*In Defense of Creation*, p. 37.)

Note: A fuller discussion of the moral nature of military systems may be found in my volume *Making a Just Peace: Human Rights and Domination Systems* (Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1995).

**Defense and Disarmament:
New Requirements for Security
A Policy Statement
Adopted by the General Board
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
September 12, 1968**

INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this statement to address the issues of national defense and security in Christian perspective in an effort to provide a new concept of, and a new context for, national security. We believe that a new international community is coming into being in the midst of the system of nation-states, which for so long have been preoccupied with their own security. This new system of increasingly global interdependence is one in which security just be seen more and more in its international dimension -- bound up with technology, finance, trade, and cross-cultural encounter -- and less in strictly military terms. The world view that provides the context for present United States defense policies seems to be an inadequate reflection of this reality. An increase in military power is not necessarily an increase in security or any other value.

The National Council of Churches, in setting forth its views concerning the imperatives of just peace and the requirements of a responsible use of power, has stated that "to secure such a peace, new presuppositions of thought and attitude, and new policies of action are required."¹ Nowhere is this more valid than in the area of national defense. In the quest for a just peace and a responsible use of United States power, Christians must therefore examine seriously the questions raise by the United States emphasis on military power in the pursuit of security.

THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Christian concern with the uses of United States power is based on the Christian belief that:

- God is Lord of creation, and men and women are to tend and develop this creation for the common good.
- God is sovereign over creation, both limiting national sovereignty and giving a degree of legitimacy to the nation-state as a major instrument today for shaping the conditions of community.
- God is active in creation through the reconciling act in Christ whereby we are called to be agents of reconciliation.

Within this theological framework, Christians are not united in their convictions concerning military power. Especially in our present situation of a severe and threatening arms race, however, we are agreed that these theological convictions place qualifications on the use of military power:

- Responsibility for the created order is a responsibility to preserve and develop it, not to abuse and destroy it.

- God's sovereignty places limits on the moral autonomy of any aspect of the political order.
- God's reconciling act in Christ denies the ultimacy of the parochial political community and affirms that the "enemy" is the person for whom Christ died.

The function of politics, and the legitimate concern for security must, according to Christian faith, be controlled by God's creative, ordering, and reconciling work. The Christian vocational concern in this area is to provide better conditions for an effective work of love -- conditions under which the mission of reconciliation can be carried on in relatively better circumstances.

SECURITY AND THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

In seeking the conditions for reconciliation there must be a clear perception of the international situation to which people are to respond. In the search for national security, the United States has accumulated massive military power. There is real evidence, however, that security sought by this massive accumulation of power has not been fully achieved.

In *theological* terms, the adequacy of present defense policies must be questioned in view of the following dangers:

- (1) They threaten to destroy the created order for which people are responsible.
- (2) The requirements of present policies seem to have become self-validating in actual practice, subordinating other values to military necessities.
- (3) The possibility of advanced escalation in an actual nuclear war implies the destruction of the adversary's population and social order, denying thereby the inclusiveness of the human community.

In *political* terms, the adequacy of present defense policies must be questioned in the light of the following criticisms by many knowledgeable observers:

- (1) The national security of the United States has declined as the nuclear arms race has increased.
- (2) The arms race has resulted in an enormous outlay of money and resources for military purposes.
- (3) The power and influence that inevitably accompany the control of such a large portion of our national resources mean that defense considerations now influence virtually all other national decisions.
- (4) There are dehumanizing elements in the nuclear strategies.
- (5) An overly ideological approach to the world's ills on both sides influences the perception of events and causes distorted interpretations of the facts to fit preconceived ideology.

A NEW CONTEXT FOR SECURITY

The demands of the Christian faith, and the most salient features of the international situation to which Christians must respond, lead us to ask for a new approach to national defense and security issues on the part of the citizens and the Government of the United States. Such an approach encompasses at least three requirements:

1. A first requirement is a new understanding of security. National security is integrally related not only to direct threats from other nations but in our time even more profoundly to the needs of the developing world, and must be supplied by international processes and institutions rather than by vast defense establishments.

2. A second requirement is a new approach to the use of national resources. The building of our own nation and the use of our resources to help others build their nations are the two primary tasks, requiring a major shift in national policies.
3. A third requirement is a new emphasis on human rights and values. Defense should never become an end in itself, but should always serve the purpose of providing the stability required to enable life on earth to become human. This means, among other things, that defense policy must not be removed from effective political processes. Citizens must have an increased voice in defense policy and demand that resources be used to meet human needs.

It is necessary, in reappraising the meaning of security, to acknowledge the ultimate futility of the attempt to maintain nuclear superiority. There is no advantage to be gained by it when each side is admittedly capable of inflicting overwhelming damage on the other, even after being attacked first. In addition, the present international situation includes positive political forces that encourage a movement toward a decline in the importance of nuclear weapons, and that provide opportunities to strengthen the bonds of the international community. The Christian political vocation must seek to utilize these positive elements as it seeks to restore defense to its proper limits and to subordinate it to the demands of justice and the work of reconciliation among peoples and nations.

ⁱ Policy Statement, "Imperatives of Peace and Responsibilities of Power," adopted by the General Board, February 21, 1968.

An addition to Religious Statements

1. In the index at the top in the block under INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL, add a new section as follows. Type size and style should match the other index sections.

FAITH PERSECTIVE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

- *[bold face, italic] Nuclear Posture Review (U.S.A.)* [link to section below]

[Note: we'll be adding other issues later]

2. After the long section on Denominations, create a new section with a similar format.

Faith Perspective on Nuclear Issues [in brown box, like Denominations]

[bold face, italic] Nuclear Posture Review (U.S.A.) [bold, italics continue]

- *Holy See*[this and other items linked to text below]
- *U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops*
- *Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament*
- *Mennonite Central Committee*
- *Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)*
- *United Church of Christ*
- *United Methodist Bishops*
- *Methodists United for Peace with Justice*

[space]

- *Civil Sector Perspective*

[begin box]

[As inset to first paragraph, NPR in bold, 36 pt. serif type]

NPR

On January 8, 2002 the U.S. Department of Defense sent to Congress a secret report on its Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Mandated by Congress, the NPR lays out the direction for American nuclear forces for the next ten years and beyond.

The Defense Department released to the public only the Foreword

[<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/d20020109npr.pdf>] of the NPR report. However, at a Special Briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review

[<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/arms/stories/review.htm>] at the Pentagon on January 9, defense officials presented a series of slides that outline elements of the report. This included:

Sizing the Nuclear Force

- A new approach to U.S. nuclear requirements to address the spectrum of immediate and potential contingencies.
 - **Operationally deployed force** for immediate and unexpected contingencies
 - **Responsive force** for potential contingencies
 - **Preplanning** is essential for immediate and potential contingencies
- Goal of 1,700-2,200 operational deployed warheads by 2012 to meet requirements of new defense policy goals
 - Force sizing not driven by immediate contingency involving Russia
- Force structure and downloaded warheads preserved for the responsive force

Sustainment of Current Nuclear Forces

- Current force project to remain until 2020 or longer
 - Life extension programs for all systems
 - Study alternatives for follow-ons
- Accelerate test readiness of the Department of Energy

In March news stories in the Los Angeles Times

[<http://www.clw.org/control/nukereview02press2.html>], based upon a leak of the classified version of the Nuclear Posture Review, divulged greater details. Subsequently

GlobalSecurity.org put Excerpts

[<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>] of the classified Nuclear Posture Review on its web site.

This fuller revelation of the Nuclear Posture Review disclosed the following:

- 1) United States would retain nuclear strike capability to deal with two nuclear-weapon states, China and Russia, and five states currently without nuclear weapons, North Korea, Iraq, Syria, and Libya.

Comment: This would be an expansion of the previous doctrine that nuclear weapons are used primarily to deter other nuclear-weapon states.

- 2) "The need is clear for a revitalized nuclear weapons complex that will... be able, if directed, to design, develop, manufacture, and certify new warheads in response to new national requirements; and maintain readiness to resume underground nuclear testing if required."

Comment: This means development of new nuclear weapons and the possible renewal of nuclear testing, not done since a 1992 moratorium.

- 3) "New capabilities must be developed to defeat emerging threats such as hard and deeply buried targets, to find and attack mobile and relocatable targets, to defeat chemical or biological agents, and to improve accuracy and limit collateral damage."

Comment: This give support for a new "bunker buster" weapon and raises the possibility of using nuclear weapons to counter chemical and biological weapons and attack production facilities.

[end box]

[begin new box]

Faith Perspective

[We need a graphic here. Could we used a reduced version of the dove and "Nuclear Weapons -- A Moral Issue" from the top of the page?]

A variety of religious organizations have offered their views and raised concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review. They are summarized here with linkages to fuller statements.

[bold face, italic] Holy See

*Although the Holy See hasn't issued an official statement on the U.S. Nuclear Posture Review, remarks by Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of a Holy See delegation to the United Nations, to the 2002 NPT Preparatory Committee touched on issues related to the NPR. Excerpts from his speech entitled "There Has Been Regregration" *[end underlining]* [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#holysee>] are as follows:*

Even more serious than the lack of progress [in nuclear disarmament] is the overt determination of some nuclear weapon states to maintain nuclear weapons in a critical role in their military doctrines.

My Delegation is deeply concerned about the old posture of nuclear deterrence that is evolving into the possibility of use in new strategies.

There can be no moral acceptance of military doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear weapons.

[extra space]

[bold face, italic] U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

*In a May 2002 Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy *[end underlining]* [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>], the Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, president, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, indicated:*

Much deeper, more irreversible cuts, in both strategic and tactical weapons, are both possible and necessary.

We oppose the continued readiness of the United States to use nuclear weapons, especially against non-nuclear threats, and the potential development of new weapons for this purpose.

[extra space]

[bold, italics] *Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament*

Representatives of 25 religious organizations that participate in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament wrote [underline] a letter to President Bush [end underlining] [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#march152002>] in March 2002 to express six concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review.

(1) Reductions. We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. . . We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat. The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United States keeps so many warheads in reserve, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater the risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. . . .

(3) Mutual assured destruction. . . . The approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover hundreds of targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

4) De-alerting. Not only is MAD continuing but also the practice of keeping large numbers of missiles on hair-trigger alert. . . . True friends do not keep nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert targeted at each other. Therefore, we call for zero alert.

(5) Expanded role. . . . The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of . . . immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of biological or chemical weapons. . . . We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

(6) Testing. . . . While we welcome reaffirmation of your commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, we are bothered by the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing. . . . This is compounded by the NPR's indication that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 and that in the meantime the Department of Defense will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for

nuclear delivery systems. Preparation to resume testing appears to be part of this scheme. This sounds like a commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We find this objectionable.

Accordingly, the signers of the letter to President Bush asked him to

send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon planners come up with a plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will steadily reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy. We propose that nuclear disarmament objectives be incorporated into the Nuclear Posture Review in accordance to the U.S. obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

[extra space]

[bold face, italic] Mennonite Central Committee

In a Washington Comment on [underline] "The news behind the nuclear news" [end underlining] [http://www.thirdway.com/wv/article.asp?A_ID=93&Submit=Go], J. Daryl Byler, director of the Mennonite Central Committee Washington Office, notes:

The administration recently conducted a major review of U.S. nuclear policy. Its 56-page classified report -- leaked to several major newspapers -- calls for a new generation of miniature nuclear weapons and suggests that the United States may need to resume nuclear testing in order to produce them.

The report also says that the United States should be prepared to launch pre-emptive nuclear attacks to destroy stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons.

Byler contrasts this new policy with Mennonite policy statements:

A 1979 Mennonite Church General Assembly statement says: "Modern militarism . . . tempts the nations to assume the power of God. With their devastating arsenals of nuclear weapons, nations today hold destructive power over every living cell on earth."

Two years later, another Assembly statement – which could well have been written in 2002 – says, "We . . . feel called at this time to a particular witness against nuclear weapons because of the enormous consequences of decisions confronting world leaders regarding [their] testing, production, and deployment . . ."

[extra space]

[bold face, italic] Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

The Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has offered its analysis of [underline] "The New U.S. Nuclear Posture Review" [end underlining] [http://www.pcusa.org/washington/issuenet/gs-020401.htm]. This report indicates:

The NPR is more than an inventory of nuclear and conventional arsenals. It is a compilation of current nuclear capabilities, post-Cold War nuclear strategy, and the military imperative to prepare for a world envisioned by Strangelovian nuclear-war planners. It covers every circumstance in which the President might wish to use nuclear weapons.

In accordance with this construct, the Review has called for developing a new generation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, which has undermined all efforts toward nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation.

The NPR outlined three situations for which the U.S. would use nuclear forces:

- Nuclear weapons could be deployed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack,
- In retaliation for the use of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons, and
- In the event of surprising military developments.

Under these circumstances, the NPR named Russia, China, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya and North Korea as countries that the United States would most likely use nuclear weapons against. In the event of surprising military developments, the report recommends that the Pentagon be prepared to use nuclear weapons against hostile regimes or terrorist groups that might suddenly acquire unknown weapons.

The NPR has also drafted contingency plans in case of military confrontation and mirrored nuclear weapons development in the future. These plans outline possible U.S. military intervention in an Arab-Israeli conflict, in an attack from North Korea on the south, or a hostile takeover of Taiwan by China.

Of the seven countries, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya and North Korea are non-nuclear parties to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The Treaty was first signed in 1972 in hopes of keeping nuclear weapons from spreading across the world. The five nuclear states (the U.S., Britain, the Soviet Union, China and France) had pledged never to use nuclear weapon against non-nuclear countries that were parties to the treaty, except in the case of an attack in alliance with a nuclear state. This pledge and the treaty were reaffirmed in April 1995, in connection with a U.N. Security Council resolution.

The United States has avoided the use of nuclear weapons in times of crisis. But the NPR directed by the administration is inconsistent with the commitment to build a secure world through nuclear reduction and disarmament. . . .

The Review also calls for developing low-yield, tactical nuclear weapons to be used against hardened or deeply buried targets (HDBTs). Developing "usable" weapons is a significant change in U.S. policy that could seriously hamper U.S. non-proliferation efforts by encouraging other states to pursue similar capabilities. Moreover, even the use of "small" nuclear weapons will invite retaliation against the U.S. with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons.

Development of new nuclear warheads would require testing before deployment. The Review contains provisions that would lift the self-imposed moratorium on U.S. nuclear testing. Although the Review does not explicitly advocate lifting the moratorium, it proposed a plan that would enable resumption of testing if the President decided such tests are needed.

[extra space]

[bold face, italics] **United Church of Christ**

In a March 2002 Action Alert on [underline] Continue Nuclear Disarmament [end underling] [linkage to be added], the Justice and Witness Ministries, United Church of Christ indicated:

General Synods 14 and 17 called for the reduction and ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, for a "no first strike" policy, for unilateral initiatives to freeze the testing, development and deployment of nuclear weapons, and for the withdrawal of all short-range nuclear weapon from Europe.

Although the Cold War is over, the 2002 Nuclear Posture Review returns to the Cold War position of sustaining enough nuclear weapons on high alert status so that any nation which attacks the United States could be totally destroyed. To make matters worse, the Review lays the groundwork for justifying the use of nuclear weapons against nations involved in terrorism against the United States or its allies. At a time when Russia is actively reducing its nuclear arsenal with our financial assistance, when China is not engaged in a nuclear build up, and when terrorist threats come from groups or nations with limited strategic capacity, the report of the Nuclear Posture Review may be fairly characterized as moving from peace-making to threatening and bullying behavior.

The 2002 Nuclear Posture Review represents the wrong direction to take if the goal is to radically reduce nuclear weapons in the world.

[extra space]

[bold face, italics] **United Methodist Council of Bishops**

In May 2002 the United Methodist Council of Bishops adopted a resolution on [underline] "In the Aftermath of 9-11" [end underling] [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#911>] in which they stated:

Whereas, we now witness: (a) the potential development and testing of new nuclear weapons; (b) the cancellation of the ABM agreement, and (c) the threatened utilization of first strike nuclear weapons, and

Whereas, under the heading of "war against terrorism," ethical restraint has been compromised;

Therefore, the bishops resolved to seek an audience with President Bush to share their concerns and to seek ecumenical and interfaith venues to express and embody the values, principles and positions of the United Methodist Church.

[extra space]

*[bold, italics] **Methodists United for Peace with Justice***

In an article on [underline] "Nuclear Posture Review: A Flawed Proposal" [end underlining] [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#frompeaceleaf>], Howard W. Hallman, chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, identifies four major flaws in the NPR.

Reductions Insufficient. On the positive side the Nuclear Posture Review offers the goal of 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed strategic warheads for the United States by 2012. . . . [But] the Nuclear Posture Review reveals an intent to preserve the delivery vehicles and warheads for possible redeployment. This goes against the principle of irreversibility that the United States agreed to during the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

MAD Continues. [Although President Bush and other administration officials speak of moving away from the doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD)], their words... are contradicted by the level of the nuclear force to remain deployed and held in reserve. . . . Because Russia retains the capability of launching a massive attack on the United States, the U.S. must maintain a counter capability. This means that mutual assured destruction remains in effect between two nations now said to be friends. The only way to end the MAD doctrine is to substantially reduce capability far below the numbers considered in the Nuclear Posture Review, perhaps to fewer than 200 or 100, and eventually to zero.

Expanded Role. The Nuclear Posture Review . . . indicates that nuclear strike capability should be available for various contingencies. It specifies: "North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya are among the countries that could be involved in immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies." The NPR also indicates that nuclear weapons should be used to deter attack by biological and chemical weapons. It adds that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack, such as, deep underground bunkers and bio-weapon facilities.

When asked about this at a news conference, President Bush explained, "We've got all options on the table." This is a dangerous approach. The expanded role for nuclear weapons suggests greater legitimacy and encourages other nations to respond in kind. Moreover, it is immoral, for all options should not be on the table. Genocide is not a legitimate option. Slaughter of the innocent is not an acceptable option.

Testing and New Weapon Development The desire to expand the role of nuclear weapons leads the Nuclear Posture Review to give consideration to return to nuclear weapon testing and development of new nuclear weapons. . . . The NPR indicates that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Meanwhile the

Department of Defense will study alternatives for follow-ons. This could include a new intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) to be operational in 2020, a new SLBM (submarine-launched ballistic missile) and a new SSBN (ballistic missile submarine) in 2030, and a new heavy bomber in 2040 as well as new warheads for all of them. Thus, the Bush Administration assumes that nuclear weapons will be part of U.S. military forces for at least the next 50 years. This is clearly in conflict with the goal of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

[end box]

back to top

[new box]

[bold, italic, larger type] ***Civil Sector Perspective***

In addition to the religious organizations raising concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review, a number of civil sector organizations that favor nuclear disarmament have expressed their concerns. For instance, see the views of:

[Arms Control Association](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_03/panelmarch02.asp) [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_03/panelmarch02.asp]

[Center for Defense Information](http://www.psr.org/NPRfactsheet.html) [http://www.psr.org/NPRfactsheet.html]

[Council for a Livable World](http://www.clw.org/control/npr02response.html) [http://www.clw.org/control/npr02response.html]

[Global Security Institute](http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000086.shtml) [http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000086.shtml]

[Nuclear Age Peace Foundation](http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/02.01/020110kriegerposturereview.htm)

[http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/02.01/020110kriegerposturereview.htm]

[Peace Action](http://www.peace-action.org/pub/releases/rel0313.html) [http://www.peace-action.org/pub/releases/rel0313.html]

[Physicians for Social Responsibility](http://www.psr.org/NPRfactsheet.html) [http://www.psr.org/NPRfactsheet.html]

[Union of Concerned Scientists](http://www.ucsusa.org/security/NPR_review.pdf) [http://www.ucsusa.org/security/NPR_review.pdf]

For further information see [Resources on the Nuclear Posture Review](#)

[<http://www.wslfweb.org/nukes/npr.htm>] on the web site of the Western States Legal Foundation.

[end box]

back to top

"From now on it is only through a conscious choice and through a deliberate policy that humanity can survive."

Pope John Paul II, Address in Hiroshima, 1981

New entree for Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

In initial index under Denominations add in alphabetical order:

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

It should be linked to entree, placed below in alphabetical order

This entree should follow the model of other denominations in terms of boxes, etc.

logo from <http://www.pcusa.org/washington/index.htm>

[This is the one that is down a few inches from the top. It shows the capitol dome, surrounded by the words, Presbyterian Church Washington Office.]

[no box for introductory paragraphs]

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) [link each index item with entree below]

- ***The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race***
- ***Threats to the International System Controlling Arms and Their Deveopment***
- ***The New U.S. Nuclear Posture Review***

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) [<http://www.pcusa.org>] has 2.5 million members and 11,200 congregations. It is governed by a General Assembly that meets annually but will start meeting every other year after 2004. The ***Presbyterian Washington Office***

[<http://www.pcusa.org/washington.htm>] is the public policy information and advocacy office of the General Assembly.

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) was formed in 1983 as a result of reunion between the Presbyterian Church in the U.S., the so-called "southern branch," and the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the so-called "northern branch". By then the General Assemblies of both branches had a thirty year history of policy positions on nuclear weapons, including opposition to massive retaliation, atmospheric testing, anti-ballistic missile systems, all nuclear testing, the B-1 bomber.

Since reunion in 1983 the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has repeatedly affirmed its long-standing call to end the arms race. General Assembly resolutions and statements of the Washington Office have gone on record to:

- Urge ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- Oppose deployment of a missile defense system.
- Advocate adherence to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Support negotiations for arms control and disarmament.
- Oppose expanded use of nuclear weapons.
- Oppose and development of new nuclear weapons.

[begin box, linked with index above]
[title in bold face]

The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race

In 2000 the 212th General Assembly considered and adopted a lengthy resolution entitled "The Challenge of Security in the 21st Century: The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race". Among the conclusions were the following:

The 212th General Assembly (2000) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) reaffirms its long-standing call to end the arms race and urges:

- Ratification of and adherence by the United States to those existing international treaties that it has not yet accepted, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Treaty on Land Mines;
- Adherence to and implementation of the treaties already ratified, such as the Chemical Weapons Treaty, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, or the Biological Weapon Convention; and the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties I and II;
- Termination of efforts to build and deploy a Missile Defense System because its unnecessary and destabilizing military character;
- Reexamination by the United States of both its domestic and international policies, and the seeking of informed public review of its foreign policy perspective and goals for the 21st century will be based on the extension of the rule of law, the development of strengthened instruments of nonviolent conflict resolution, not on the continued enhancement of technological instruments of destruction, shaped originally in the context of the cold war...

[close box, start a new box linked to index above]

PDF document
[title in bold face]

Threats to the International System Controlling Arms and Their Development

The 214th Presbyterian General Assembly (2002) revisited nuclear weapons issues and enacted a resolution on "The Challenges to Global Security: Threats to the International System Controlling Arms and Their Development." It is as follows:

A. Introduction

In 2000, at the beginning of the 21st century, the 212th General Assembly (2000) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) approved a "Statement of Concern Regarding the Challenge of Security in the 21st Century: The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race" (Minutes, 2000, Part I, pp. 276*81). Numerous dynamics were identified with suggestions of their potential impact on national and global security. The General Assembly expressed concern about developments/trends in United States foreign policy and its military developments, noting that the arms race, often thought dead because of the "end of the cold war," was still very much alive. It called on the United States to reexamine both its domestic and international policies, and the seeking of informed public review of its foreign policy perspective and goals

for the 21st century, to the end that the building of security for the 21st century will be based on the extension of the rule of law, the development of strengthened instruments of international governance, the strengthening of arms control and disarmament agreements, the enhancing of instruments of nonviolent conflict resolution, not on the continued enhancement of technological instruments of destruction, shaped originally in the context of the cold war (Ibid, p. 281).

The events of September 11, 2001 (9/11), have made it clear that achieving security for the country within the context of global security is still and will remain a challenge. In some ways, those events should have made clear that devastation can come in unexpected ways, that methods of prevention are not always successful, that violence usually begets violence, and that technological fixes are problematic.

B. Recent Developments

Recent developments and decisions in the United States have justified and heightened the importance of the call of the 212th General Assembly (2002). While it is clear that major decisions with far-reaching consequences have been made, their import seems the opposite of the concerns expressed. The rule of law and international instruments of governance have been weakened. Arms control and disarmament agreements are increasingly under threat. The arms control regime that took decades to develop is increasingly at risk. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been sidetracked and the U.S. is contemplating abandoning its own voluntary moratorium and resuming tests. The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has been abrogated and an opportunity to strengthen the Biological Weapons Treaty has been lost. The nation's response to the crimes committed on September 11 has been a massive use of destructive power leveled against the Taliban, an unpopular government controlling a country already in the throws of desperation, and the Al Qaeda.

Among recent actions of the United States are its refusal to ratify the Ottawa Treaty (the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction) and its refusal to ratify The Rome Statute (the International Criminal Court), partly on the grounds that it poses a threat for our military. While the United States has opposed these two treaties and has tried to weaken them in the negotiation process, it has taken no formal action on them.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT): On October 13, 1999, by a 51 to 48 vote, the United States Senate voted on and rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a decisive legal action and statement to the world. Sought by every U. S. president and General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and its predecessor bodies for almost thirty years, the CTBT was an effort to complete a partial ban achieved in 1963, which included testing in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. The earlier treaty had allowed the continued testing underground

and simulation tests. The CTBT would have included the underground tests. This defeat for a long-sought treaty endorsed by all earlier presidents, while not irreversible, certainly contains a more strident message to the rest of the world than simply allowing the treaty to float in legislative-political limbo. The testing of nuclear weapons by India and Pakistan and the increased tensions between those now nuclear powers reveal the importance of both the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the CTBT.

National Missile Defense System: While the Strategic Defense Initiative (Star Wars) was shelved, work continued on missile defense technology. After the end of the cold war, focus turned to a limited version of the earlier challenge, a limited National Missile Defense system, proposed to prevent "rogue states" or "terrorist groups" from limited missile attack. More than twenty years and \$95 billion have been invested in research and testing without proving the ability to successfully deploy such a system. Another \$60 billion in expenses for the program is expected. Whether either provided credible threats or whether such would be probable scenarios seems irrelevant. In the presidential campaign in 2000, President Clinton chose to make the National Missile Defense System an issue, promising continued support for research and development and a recommendation of deployment should initial tests succeed. President Bush, in his election campaign and in his first year in office, made the building of a National Missile Defense system the keystone in his asserted effort to provide homeland protection, despite the fact that it would violate the terms of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty agreed to in 1972. Since that time, the ABM Treaty has been regarded by most as an important cornerstone of the nuclear control system. The events of 9/11 have not deterred President Bush from that commitment even though the National Missile Defense System would provide no defense for an attack like that suffered. On December 13, 2001, President Bush announced that the United States was giving the six-month required notice that it was going to abrogate the treaty, something neither country had found necessary during the height of the cold war. This marks the first time that a major post-World War II arms control treaty has been abrogated by a major participant, and in this situation that abrogation has effectively destroyed the treaty since there are only two parties.

The abrogation came after a legal analysis ultimately concluded that building a limited National Missile Defense System would violate the ABM Treaty. The United States opted to abrogate the ABM Treaty, informing its allies of the decision, in opposition to the concerns of Russia and China.

Abrogation is an international method often built into treaties that allows, after a specified time, for ratifiers to withdraw from the obligations of the treaty. The question is not the legality of the decision but its symbolism and the potential consequences both for the United States and global security. The government's own 2002 Intelligence Assessment report suggested that the greatest danger of a nuclear attack on the U.S. would come from planes and ships, not missiles. Greater security

would be provided by addressing these other threats.

Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention: Over thirty years ago, the United States took the lead in trying to prevent the development of biotoxin weapons, achieving in 1972 the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC), a treaty subscribed to by 144 governments. In principle, such weapons have been banned since 1925, recognizing their inherent dangers and risks. A few highly publicized terrorist efforts in recent years have shown both the risks and the difficulties of chemical and biological terrorism and the difficulties of preparing for them. For over seven years, the adherents to that treaty have sought a protocol providing for a new inspection mechanism to help monitor compliance.

As with many treaties, a regular review process takes place. At the five-year review conference that took place in Geneva in December 2001, the U.S. effectively blocked further work on the protocol. This decision stunned other countries, particularly since the United States was reeling from the internal impact of the anthrax scare and caught up in speculation and rumor about a terrorist attack spreading smallpox. The U.S. chose not to try to develop international monitoring mechanisms, efforts its own country specialists had worked on. Yet, little evidence is available in the public domain that the United States, despite decades of consideration, is able to provide protections or even rapid responses for its own people in the light of chemical or biological attack. The United States told the conference that it was not in this country's business and defense interests to have any kind of monitoring or enforcement agreement, thus bringing the conference work to a halt. Conference chairman, Hungarian diplomat Tibor Toth, managed to obtain an adjournment of the meeting until November 2002 rather than to have it end, in effect, in failure.

Small Arms and Light Weapons: At the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, the United States was active in expressing concerns about the trafficking, but was also instrumental in blocking the creation or development of any instrumentation with the capacity to monitor or control the flow. Therefore, more than five hundred million small arms and light weapons are in circulation, with more in the pipeline. There are few international mechanisms in place that keep them from the hands of terrorists deemed to be the source of our insecurity and the focus of our open-ended war.

Arms Control Decisions at the United Nations General Assembly: The 56th General Assembly of the United Nations (2001) dealt with a usual array of arms control and security issues. One pattern is worth noting, though, in fact, it is not new. On the major resolutions that were adopted by vote related to nuclear weapons, development, use, etc., the United States voted in the negative on ten of twelve votes, with one abstention and one affirmative. The ten all related to matters that seek to move the world toward nuclear disarmament, including the United States. The affirmative vote was for a resolution on the Non-Proliferation Treaty

because its application had been basically aimed at preventing others from gaining what we are legally bound by that same treaty to give up. The abstention, marking a switch from some previous years where the vote had been negative, was on a resolution designed to assure non-nuclear states would not be the victims of nuclear attack from nuclear states. The U.S. was one of four countries to abstain on a resolution seeking to prevent an arms race in outer space (of particular concern for those who feel that the development of the National Missile Defense System will be the first major step in the weaponization of space, reflecting well-circulated U.S. commitments to control space, to fight in, from, and through space).

C. Key Questions for Discussion and Reflection

United States policy and practice in recent years pose concerns for public discussion and reflection. The Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy (ACSWP) drafted some conclusions regarding U.S. actions, which are shared as questions for discussion.

- Has the United States adopted a unilateralist approach to the whole question of armaments and military developments (in its treatment of allies, its former stated enemies, and its current list of enemies)?
- Is the United States seeking freedom from any international restraints or instruments, no matter how beneficial they may be perceived to be by others? (This includes freedom to build its own military establishment without restrictions. It also includes the option to impose by force, if necessary, its will on those countries that displease it.)
- Does the United States commitment to an extensive military buildup, costly in nature, skew its national priorities? Does it destabilize others in implication? Does it represent a potential stimulus to others, including the fueling of a new global arms race?
- Does the United States' decision-making reflect a disconnect between a critical analysis of security needs and the efforts to meet those needs? (A so-called rogue state, seeking to attack the United States with nuclear weapons, is more apt to choose a less risky method of delivery, exploring the openness of ports as most container ships arrive without inspection.)
- Has the United States manipulated both the domestic and international climate created by the events of September 11? Has the U.S. counted on the reticence of its political establishment, the U.S. media and public, and its allies to question its actions?
- Is the United States caught in a paradox of its own making? In the name of enhancing national security, is it undermining international efforts at control and restraint developed to provide an increased context of confidence and security? Is the United States seeking to achieve peace by intimidation?
- What price is U.S. "military" security at home and abroad? What cost in addressing critical social needs at home as military budgets escalate?

- What relevance does the development of the international rule of law have to the issues raised by 9/11?

D. Need for Criteria for Evaluation

Over the years, criteria have been set for judging the rightness or wrongness of the use of force. Guidelines embodied in "just war doctrine," and "just peace principles" and "nonviolent intervention principles" have provided the basis for both rational and irrational support of military action. They also provide the basis for challenging those same actions. Discuss whether the following provide a set of criteria to evaluate or judge decisions that are made in the realm of arms development and foreign policy decisions?

- Does the action-program development promote restraint and build confidence instead of engendering fear and mistrust in the world community at large or among states where there has been previous conflict, where there is current tension, or where there are growing issues that could ensue in conflict?
- Does the action-program development tempt other countries to follow suit with similar developments, thus raising the potential level of future conflict? Or does it stimulate efforts to develop countervailing options that stimulate an increased cycle of research, expenditure, and development of other weapons?
- Are the action-program development goals to be achieved at the expense of weaker countries and people, imposing economic, military, or political burdens on them, with or without their informed consensual and participatory acceptance?
- When does a response to a threat/strategy set into motion irreversible, unintended consequences? What is the possibility that the decision, deployment, dare, or defiance will set in motion things that were not intended?
- Does the action-program development tempt or encourage a country or a group of countries to unilaterally exercise power just because it has it; increasing the likelihood, as has usually been the historic case, that in the quest for security, those with the power have become the threat to the security of others?
- Is the action-program development built on worst-case scenario developments, which, if pursued, could be self-fulfilling or on informed understanding of probabilities coupled with deliberate political and diplomatic efforts to resolve sources of potential conflict through nonviolent methodologies?
- Has there been an honest, transparent effort to consult with the United Nations and other appropriate international organizations about the implications and consequences of steps that are contemplated?
- What additional criteria would you add?

E. Conclusion and Reflection

The 214th General Assembly (2002) presents this study to the constituency of the church and, for whatever benefit, to the larger society. At the beginning of the 21st century, the American people must learn from the tragedies of the present and the legacies of the past

and engage in a full discussion of our country's role and responsibility in the world community. We urge our members to prayerfully study these concerns.

With prayer we lift up our country, which represents but one part of God's good creation, with prayers for its peace and security, with prayers for its leaders and all who are called to serve it, with compassion for all who have suffered from the violence of criminal acts and of war and from the systemic oppressions of economic, social, cultural, and political power. We pray that America, so richly blessed, will use its gifts as they bestow special responsibility, not as they signify special privilege. We pray for all peoples what we would pray for ourselves: the opportunity to live free from fear, free from want, and in the fullness of life intended by God in the creation.

[end box, start a new box linked to index above]

[title in bold face]

The New U.S. Nuclear Posture Review

In January 2002 the Bush Administration completed its Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Some of the conclusions were made public, others were leaked to the press. In response 2 the Presbyterian Washington Office offered its analysis of "[The New U.S. Nuclear Posture Review](http://www.pcusa.org/washington/issuenet/gs-020401.htm)". [http://www.pcusa.org/washington/issuenet/gs-020401.htm] Highlights of this analysis include the following concerns:

Whereas the United States has avoided the use of nuclear weapons in times of crisis, the NPR outlined three situations for which the U.S. would use nuclear forces:

- Nuclear weapons could be deployed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack.
- In retaliation for the use of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons, and
- In the event of surprising military developments.

Previously, during the Cold War period, U.S. nuclear weapons and policy were designed to deter a deliberate large-scale nuclear attack from the Soviet Union. Having witnessed the horrific impact on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, U.S. nuclear weapons remained the last resort and would be used only if the nation's survival depended on it. Now, the New Triad calls for using our nuclear capability to strengthen the credibility of our non-nuclear offensive force, in order to deter the enemy. This approach has undermined efforts toward nuclear disarmament and has exacerbated the risk of more aggressive nuclear capability development by other states.

The Review also calls for developing low-yield, tactical nuclear weapons to be used against hardened or deeply buried targets (HDBTs). Developing "usable" weapons is a significant change in U.S. policy that could seriously hamper U.S. non-proliferation efforts by encouraging other states to pursue similar capabilities. Moreover, even the use of "small" nuclear weapons will invite retaliation against the U.S. with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons.

Development of new nuclear warheads would require testing before deployment. The Review contains provisions that would lift the self-imposed moratorium on U.S. nuclear testing. s Although the Review does not explicitly advocate lifting the moratorium, it proposed a plan that would enable resumption of testing if the President decided such tests are needed.

[end of box]

[back to top](#)

Religious Statements -- initial page

1. In introductory paragraph strike first four words so that it reads:

"We present a collection of"

2. Place the index on the right below the opening paragraph. Abbreviate the index by omitting most details so that it reads:

DENOMINATIONAL STATEMENTS

INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL

FAITH PERSPECTIVE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

* De-alerting

* Moscow Treaty of 2002

* Nuclear Posture Review (USA)

New sub-pages for DENOMINATIONS, INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL, De-alerting, Moscow Treaty of 2002, and Nuclear Posture Review (USA).

Index details go to sub-pages for DENOMINATIONAL STATEMENTS and INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL.

3. On the left side under the dove and "NUCLEAR WEAPONS -- A MORAL ISSUE" place the following quotations with linkages as underlined. Box them like quotes on home page or like those on How to Get to Zero or as how else you want to try.

"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." -- World Council of Churches, [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#wcc>] 1983.

"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." -- Monsignor Francis Chullikat, [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#holysees>] Deputy Head of a Holy See delegation to the United Nations, April 2002.

"We must work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarisation throughout the world." -- Dalai Lama [<http://www.angelfire.com/wv/geoall/Dalai.htm>] in Millennial Message, December 31, 1999.

"Genuine disarmament and true peace require that reliance upon nuclear deterrence end and that nuclear weapons be eliminated." -- Union of American Hebrew Congregations, [<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nucleararms1&year=1989>] 1989.

"We in the United States must take lead to stop the nuclear arms race. . . . We must say to ourselves first and then to the world that we want a total and universal ban on the possession and production of nuclear weapons." -- Dr. Muzammi H. Siddiqi,
[<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/NuclearP02.html>] president, The Islamic Society of North America, June 2000.

Shalom Center

A division of
[Aleph:](#)
[Alliance for Jewish](#)
[Renewal](#)

War against Iraq — Rushing or Reflecting?
<http://www.shalomctr.org/html/peace.html#wariniraq>

Tikkun Magazine
The Case Against War
It's Not Good for the World
by Rabbi Michael Lerner
<http://www.tikkun.org/magazine/index.cfm/action/tikkun/issue/tik0211/article/021111b.html>

BISHOPS' RESOLUTION ON IRAQ

(adopted Nov. 8, 2002)

We have gathered as Bishops of the United Methodist Church in prayer, discernment, and conferencing at our Fall 2002 meeting in Puerto Rico. We have been especially blessed by the session on the theme of children and poverty in Latin America and the Caribbean with our colleague bishops and presidents from Latin America and the Caribbean.

We affirm the letter calling for peace sent to the Church by the president of the Council of Bishops. Recalling the biblical witness and our United Methodist tradition with respect to the issues of war and peace, we invite United Methodists to prayer, fasting, and sign acts for peace.

<http://umns.umc.org/02/nov/517.htm>

Addition to U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB)

1. At top Religious Statements page, click on U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. Then at beginning of USCCB, (a) add dates to indexed items and (b) add a third item, as follows:

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

- The Challenge of Peace (1983)
- The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace (1993)
- Statement on New Nuclear Treaty (2002) [link to new section, item 3 below]

2. As part of the introductory section of USCCB, add a paragraph after where it says:

They also insisted:

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

In May 2002 the U.S. Catholic bishops applied these teachings in a statement on the new nuclear treaty [link to new section below] between the United States and Russia. They favored the treaty but advocated further cuts in nuclear weapons, abhorred any use of nuclear weapons, supported ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and called for more assistance on nuclear threat reduction.

3. At the end of The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace, add a new section, as follows:
[in box]

New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy

[inset a photo of Bishop Gregory: <http://www.diobelle.org/directory/leadership/bishop.html>]

On May 24, 2002 the Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, President, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, issued a Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>]. This was the day on which President Bush and President Putin signed the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty between the United States and Russia. The Catholic bishops stated:

We welcome the new treaty. . . . The treaty should contribute to non-proliferation efforts and a safer world.

However, they added that

we are concerned that U.S. planning and policies keep pace with the dramatic changes in world politics since the end of the Cold War, and move away from reliance on nuclear weapons as a central part of our nation's military doctrine.

Bishop Gregory's statement cited four issues of particular importance.

Further cuts in nuclear weapons. Much deeper, more irreversible cuts, both in strategic and tactical weapons, are both possible and necessary.

The use of nuclear weapons. We oppose the continued readiness of the United States to use nuclear weapons, especially against non-nuclear threats, and the potential development of new weapons for this purpose. . . . We abhor any use of nuclear weapons.

Ratification of the test ban treaty. We urge the President to support the ratification of the comprehensive test ban treaty.

Treat reduction. More must be done to assist nuclear nations, particularly Russia, in dismantling and safeguarding their weapons and nuclear materials.

These ideas were further developed in Testimony on the Moscow Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/tstjul23.htm>] before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 23, 2002. The testimony was presented by Fr. Drew Christiansen, S.J., counselor on international affairs, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops.