

**Meeting of  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
2:00 to 3:30 p.m., Friday, September 5, 2003  
Room 1, Methodist Building  
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.**

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Legislative issues
3. December 3 Consultation
  - a. Invitees
  - b. Program content and schedule
  - c. Strategy option papers
  - d. Theological outline
  - e. Food and drink
  - f. Finance
4. Ecumenical Advocacy Days 2004
  - a. Program content and schedule
  - b. Speakers for plenary sessions
  - c. Workshop leaders
  - d. Promoting attendance
5. Meeting dates for October, November

**Meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
2:00 p.m., Friday, October 10  
Room 2, United Methodist Building,  
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.**

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Legislative update
3. December 3 Consultation
  - a. Invitees
  - b. Program
4. Advocacy Days 2004
  - a. Overall schedule
  - b. Nuclear disarmament track
    - i. Program
    - ii. Speakers, resource persons
  - c. Promotion of attendance
5. Global initiative: A Moral Appeal

Next meeting will be on Monday, November 10, Room 2, United Methodist Building

## Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

### Accepted Invitation to Participate (? = maybe)

American Baptist Churches	Dwight Lundgren
Baptist Peace Fellowship	Jim Lowder
American Friends Service Committee	Mary Lord (?), Heather Foote (?)
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office	Phil Jones or Bryan Hissong
Church of God (Anderson, Indiana)	Bill Ferguson
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy	Barbara Green, Rich Killmer,
Episcopal Church, USA	Maureen Shea
Episcopal Peace Fellowship	Tyler Miller
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Mark Brown
Fellowship of Reconciliation	Ibrahim Ramey
Friends Committee on National Legislation	David Culp, Joe Volk, Kathy Guthrie
Islamic Society of North America	Mohamed Majid Ali
Leadership Conference of Women Religious	Marie Lucey
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	Glen Gersmehl or representative
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns	Tim O'Connell
Mennonite Central Committee	Daryl Byler
Mennonite Church, USA	Susan Mark Landis
Methodists United for Peace with Justice	Howard Hallman
National Council of Churches	Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman
Pax Christi USA	Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Society of Friends	Susan Campbell
Presbyterian Church, USA	Catherine Gordon, Mark Koenig
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	Bill Galvin
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	David Saperstein, Barbara Weinstein
Sojourners	Duane Shank (?)
Unitarian Universalist Association	Larry Egbert
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries	Pat Conover
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society	Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson, Mark Harrison
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	Jerry Powers
World Conference of Religions for Peace	Jonathan Granoff
Colorado coalition	Bob Kinsey
Christian Conference of Connecticut	Steve Sidorak
Coalition for Peace Action (NJ)	Bob Moore
Georgia Coalition	Ed Arnold
Kentucky Council of Churches	Nancy Jo Kemper
Maine Council of Churches	Sally Breen
Minnesota Council of Churches	Peg Chamberlin
Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska	Marilyn Mecham
New Hampshire Council of Churches	David Lamarre-Vincent

November 18, 2003

A Personal Invitation II -- Please do not forward or circulate.

Dear Friend:

Plans are shaping up for the Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled for Wednesday, December 3, 2003. It will take place from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. We hope that you will be able to participate.

An outline of the program is attached. It is designed to draw on the knowledge of recognized experts and also to provide opportunity for discussion and consensus building.

Please let us know whether you plan to attend. You can reply to this message with "yes", "no", or "maybe". Please respond even though you replied earlier to our initial invitation .

The purpose of the Consultation is to develop strategies for the faith community for dealing with retrogressive policies on nuclear weapons and for advancing the cause of nuclear disarmament. Invited are representatives of denominational offices, peace fellowships, national religious associations, and state ecumenical organizations. At the end of the day we expect to achieve agreement on common strategies and to obtain commitments on what the participating organizations are willing to undertake in 2004.

If you have any questions, please reply by e-mail or call me at 301 896-0013. You can also address your questions to David Culp at [dculp@fcnl.org](mailto:dculp@fcnl.org) or Rich Killmer at [rkillmer@wesleysem.edu](mailto:rkillmer@wesleysem.edu).

With best regards,  
Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Also: Chair

## Invited to Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

Alliance of Baptists	Stan Hastey
American Baptist Churches	Dwight Lundgren, Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
American Friends Service Committee	Mary Lord, Joseph Gerson, Heather Foote
Baptist Peace Fellowship	Jim Louder
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office	Phil Jones
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)	Chris Hobgood
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy	Rich Killmer, Barbara Green
Conference of Major Superiors of Men	Stan DeBoe
Episcopal Church, USA	Martha Gardner, Maureen Shea, Jerre Skipper
Episcopal Peace Fellowship	Jackie Lynn
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Mark Brown
Evangelicals for Social Action	Ron Sider
Friends Committee on National Legislation	Joe Volk, David Culp
Islamic Society of North America	Dr. Syyid Syeed
Leadership Conference of Women Religious	Marie Lucey
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	Glen Gersmehl
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns	Marie Dennis
Mennonite Central Committee	Daryl Byler
Methodists United for Peace with Justice	Howard Hallman
National Council of Churches Washington Office	Bob Edgar, Tony Kireopoulos
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby	Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman
Pax Christi USA	Anne Curtis
Presbyterian Church, USA	Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan
	Elenora Giddings Ivory, Catherine Gordon, Sara Lisherness
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	Len Bjorkman
Reformed Church in America	Rev. Seth Kaper-Dale
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	David Saperstein, Barbara Weinstein
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities	Andrew Greenblatt
Sojourners	Duane Shank
Unitarian Universalist Association	Rob Cavanaugh, Larry Egbert
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries	Loey Powell, Ron Stief, Pat Conover
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society	Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	Jerry Powers
Washington National Cathedral	Alan Geyer
World Peacemakers	Bill Price
Christian Conference of Connecticut	Steve Sidorak
Coalition for Peace Action (NJ)	Bob Moore
Colorado coalition	Bob Kinsey
Georgia Coalition	Ed Arnold
Maine Council of Churches	Tom Ewell
New Hampshire Council of Churches	David Lamarre-Vincent
Rhode Island Council of Churches	Tom Holt

September 5, 2003

## Invited to Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

Alliance of Baptists	Stan Hastey
American Baptist Churches	Dwight Lundgren, Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
American Friends Service Committee	Mary Lord, Joseph Gerson, Heather Foote
Baptist Peace Fellowship	Jim Lowder
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office	Phil Jones
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)	Anna Bradley
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy	Rich Killmer, Barbara Green
Conference of Major Superiors of Men	Stan DeBoe
Episcopal Church, USA	Martha Gardner, Maureen Shea, Jerre Skipper
Episcopal Peace Fellowship	Jackie Lynn
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Mark Brown
Evangelicals for Social Action	Ron Sider
Friends Committee on National Legislation	Joe Volk, David Culp
Islamic Society of North America	Dr. Syyid Syeed
Leadership Conference of Women Religious	Marie Lucey
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	Glen Gersmehl
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns	Marie Dennis
Mennonite Central Committee	Daryl Byler
Methodists United for Peace with Justice	Howard Hallman
National Council of Churches Washington Office	Bob Edgar, Tony Kireopoulos
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby	Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman
Pax Christi USA	Anne Curtis
Presbyterian Church, USA	Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan
	Elenora Giddings Ivory, Catherine Gordon, Sara Lisherness
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	Len Bjorkman
Reformed Church in America	Rev. Seth Kaper-Dale
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	David Saperstein, Barbara Weinstein
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities	Andrew Greenblatt
Sojourners	Duane Shank
Unitarian Universalist Association	Rob Cavanaugh, Larry Egbert
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries	Loey Powell, Ron Stief, Pat Conover
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society	Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	Jerry Powers
Washington National Cathedral	Alan Geyer
World Peacemakers	Bill Price
Christian Conference of Connecticut	Steve Sidorak
Coalition for Peace Action (NJ)	Bob Moore
Colorado coalition	Bob Kinsey
Georgia Coalition	Ed Arnold
Maine Council of Churches	Tom Ewell
Minnesota Council of Churches	Peg Chamberlin
Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska	Marilyn Mecham
New Hampshire Council of Churches	David Lamarre-Vincent
Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon	David Leslie
Rhode Island Council of Churches	Tom Holt
Washington Association of Churches	John Boonstra
Wisconsin Council of Churches	Scott Anderson

## Invited to Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

**Yes -- Maybe (?)**

**No response**

**No**

Alliance of Baptists			Stan Hastey
American Baptist Churches	Dwight Lundgren	Curtis Ramsey-Lucas	
American Friends Service Committee	Joseph Gerson, Heather Foote-?	Mary Lord	
Baptist Peace Fellowship		Jim Lowder	
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office		Phil Jones	
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)		Anna Bradley	
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy	Rich Killmer, Barbara Green		
Conference of Major Superiors of Men	A representative-?		Stan DeBoe
Episcopal Church, USA	Maureen Shea	Martha Gardner, Jerre Skipper	
Episcopal Peace Fellowship	Jackie Lynn or representative		
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Mark Brown		
Evangelicals for Social Action		Ron Sider	
Fellowship of Reconciliation	Ibrahim Ramey		
Friends Committee on National Legislation	David Culp	Joe Volk	
Islamic Society of North America		A representataive	
Leadership Conference of Women Religious		Marie Lucey	
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	Glen Gersmehl or representative		
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns	Tim O'Connell		
Mennonite Central Committee	Daryl Byler		
Methodists United for Peace with Justice	Howard Hallman		
National Council of Churches	Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman		Bob Edgar Tony Kireopoulos Anne Curtis
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby			
Pax Christi USA	Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan		
Presbyterian Church, USA	Catherine Gordon	Sara Lisherness	Elenora Giddings Ivory
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	Len Bjorkman or representative		
Reformed Church in America		Rev. Seth Kaper-Dale	
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	David Saperstein, Barbara Weinstein		
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities			Andrew Greenblatt
Sojourners		Duane Shank	
Unitarian Universalist Association	Larry Egbert	Rob Cavanaugh	
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries	Pat Conover	Ron Stief	Loey Powell
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society	Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson Mark Harrison		
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	Jerry Powers		
Washington National Cathedral	Alan Geyer (?)		

## Invited to Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament, p 2.

	<b>Yes -- Maybe (?)</b>	<b>No response</b>	<b>No</b>
Christian Conference of Connecticut	Steve Sidorak		
Coalition for Peace Action (NJ)	Bob Moore (?)		
Colorado coalition		Bob Kinsey	
Georgia Coalition	Ed Arnold		
Maine Council of Churches			Tom Ewell
Minnesota Council of Churches		Peg Chamberlin	
Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska	Marilyn Mecham (?)		
New Hampshire Council of Churches	David Lamarre-Vincent		
Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon		David Leslie	
Rhode Island Council of Churches		Tom Holt	
Washington Association of Churches		John Boonstra	
Wisconsin Council of Churches	Scott Anderson		

October 30, 2003



## Invited to Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament (11-3-030)

**Yes -- Maybe (?)**

**No response**

**No**

Alliance of Baptists			Stan Hastey
American Baptist Churches	Dwight Lundgren	Curtis Ramsey-Lucas	
American Friends Service Committee	Mary Lord-?.Heather Foote-?		Joseph Gerson
Baptist Peace Fellowship		Jim Lowder	
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office	Phil Jones or Brian Hissong		
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)		Anna Bradley	
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy	Rich Killmer, Barbara Green		
Conference of Major Superiors of Men			Stan DeBoe
Episcopal Church, USA	Maureen Shea	Martha Gardner, Jerre Skipper	
Episcopal Peace Fellowship	Jackie Lynn or representative		
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Mark Brown		
Evangelicals for Social Action		Ron Sider	
Fellowship of Reconciliation	Ibrahim Ramey		
Friends Committee on National Legislation	David Culp, Joe Volk, Kathy Guthrie		
Islamic Society of North America		A representative	
Leadership Conference of Women Religious	Marie Lucey-?		
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	Glen Gersmehl or representative		
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns	Tim O'Connell		
Mennonite Central Committee	Daryl Byler		
Methodists United for Peace with Justice	Howard Hallman		
National Council of Churches	Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman		Bob Edgar Tony Kireopoulos Anne Curtis
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby			
Pax Christi USA	Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan		
Presbyterian Church, USA	Catherine Gordon, Mark Koenig		Elenora Giddings Ivory Sara Lisherness
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	Bill Galvin		
Reformed Church in America		A representative	Rev. Seth Kaper-Dale
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	David Saperstein, Barbara Weinstein		
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities			Andrew Greenblatt
Sojourners	Duane Shank-?		
Unitarian Universalist Association	Larry Egbert	Rob Cavenaugh	
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries	Pat Conover	Ron Stief	Loey Powell
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society	Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson Mark Harrison		
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	Jerry Powers		

**Invited to Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament, p 2.**

	<b>Yes -- Maybe (?)</b>	<b>No response</b>	<b>No</b>
Washington National Cathedral	Alan Geyer (?)		
Christian Conference of Connecticut	Steve Sidorak		
Coalition for Peace Action (NJ)	Bob Moore		
Colorado coalition		Bob Kinsey	
Georgia Coalition	Ed Arnold		
Kentucky Council of Churches	Mary Jo Kemper		
Maine Council of Churches	Sally Breen		Tom Ewell
Minnesota Council of Churches		Peg Chamberlin	
Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska	Marilyn Mecham (?)		
New Hampshire Council of Churches	David Lamarre-Vincent		
Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon		David Leslie	
Rhode Island Council of Churches		John Holt	
Washington Association of Churches		John Boonstra	
Wisconsin Council of Churches			Scott Anderson

October 30, 2003

## Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

### Accepted Invitation to Participate

American Baptist Churches	Dwight Lundgren
Baptist Peace Fellowship	Jim Lowder
American Friends Service Committee	Mary Lord (?), Heather Foote (?)
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office	Phil Jones or Bryan Hissong
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy	Rich Killmer, Barbara Green
Episcopal Church, USA	Maureen
Episcopal Peace Fellowship	Jackie Lynn or representative
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Mark Brown
Fellowship of Reconciliation	Ibrahim Ramey
Friends Committee on National Legislation	David Culp, Joe Volk, Kathy Guthrie (?)
Islamic Society of North America	A representative
Leadership Conference of Women Religious	Marie Lucey (?)
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	Glen Gersmehl or representative
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns	Tim O'Connell
Mennonite Central Committee	Daryl Byler
Methodists United for Peace with Justice	Howard Hallman
National Council of Churches	Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman
Pax Christi USA	Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan
Presbyterian Church, USA	Catherine Gordon, Mark Koenig
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	Bill Galvin
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	David Saperstein, Barbara Weinstein
Sojourners	Duane Shank (?)
Unitarian Universalist Association	Larry Egbert
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries	Pat Conover
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society	Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson, Mark Harrison
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	Jerry Powers
Washington National Cathedral	Alan Geyer (?)
Christian Conference of Connecticut	Steve Sidorak
Coalition for Peace Action (NJ)	Bob Moore
Georgia Coalition	Ed Arnold
Kentucky Council of Churches	Mary Jo Kemper
Maine Council of Churches	Sally Breen
Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska	Marilyn Mecham (?)
New Hampshire Council of Churches	David Lamarre-Vincent

### Pending

American Baptist Churches	Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
Baptist Peace Fellowship	Jim Lowder
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)	Anna Bradley
Episcopal Church	Martha Gardner, Jerre Skipper
Evangelicals for Social Action	Ron Sider
Islamic Society of North America	A representative
Reformed Church in America	A representative
World Conference of Religions for Peace	Jonathan Granoff

**Pending (cont.)**

Colorado coalition  
Minnesota Council of Churches  
Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon  
Rhode Island Council of Churches  
Washington Association of Churches

Bob Kinsey  
Peg Chamberlin  
David Leslie  
John Holt  
John Boonstra

**Regrets**

Alliance of Baptists  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men  
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby  
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities  
Wisconsin Council of Churches

November 10, 2003

# Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

November 11, 2003

## Accepted Invitation to Participate (? = maybe)

American Baptist Churches	Dwight Lundgren
Baptist Peace Fellowship	Jim Lowder
American Friends Service Committee	Mary Lord (?), Heather Foote (?)
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office	Phil Jones or Bryan Hissong
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy	Rich Killmer, Barbara Green
Episcopal Church, USA	Maureen Shea
Episcopal Peace Fellowship	Tyler Miller
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Mark Brown
Fellowship of Reconciliation	Ibrahim Ramey
Friends Committee on National Legislation	David Culp, Joe Volk, Kathy Guthrie
Leadership Conference of Women Religious	Marie Lucey
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	Glen Gersmehl or representative
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns	Tim O'Connell
Mennonite Central Committee	Daryl Byler
Mennonite Church, USA	Susan Mark Landis
Methodists United for Peace with Justice	Howard Hallman
National Council of Churches	Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman
Pax Christi USA	Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Society of Friends	Susan Campbell
Presbyterian Church, USA	Catherine Gordon, Mark Koenig
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	Bill Galvin
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	David Saperstein, Barbara Weinstein
Sojourners	Duane Shank (?)
Unitarian Universalist Association	Larry Egbert
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries	Pat Conover
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society	Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson, Mark Harrison
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	Jerry Powers
World Conference of Religions for Peace	Jonathan Granoff
Christian Conference of Connecticut	Steve Sidorak
Coalition for Peace Action (NJ)	Bob Moore
Georgia Coalition	Ed Arnold
Kentucky Council of Churches	Mary Jo Kemper
Maine Council of Churches	Sally Breen
Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska	Marilyn Mecham (?)
New Hampshire Council of Churches	David Lamarre-Vincent

## Pending

American Baptist Churches	Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
Baptist Peace Fellowship	Jim Lowder
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)	Anna Bradley
Episcopal Church	Martha Gardner, Jerre Skipper

**Pending (cont.)**

Evangelicals for Social Action  
Islamic Society of North America  
Reformed Church in America

Ron Sider  
To be determined  
To be determined

Colorado coalition  
Minnesota Council of Churches  
Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon  
Virginia Council of Churches  
Washington Association of Churches

Bob Kinsey  
Peg Chamberlin  
David Leslie  
Jim Paine  
John Boonstra

**Regrets**

Alliance of Baptists  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men  
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby  
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities  
Rhode Island Council of Churches  
Washington National Cathedral  
Wisconsin Council of Churches

Stan Hastey  
Stan deBoe  
Anne Curtis  
Andrew Greenblatt  
John Holt  
Alan Geyer  
Scott Anderson

November 11, 2003

**Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament**  
**Wednesday, December 3, 2003**  
**United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NW**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**Gathering**

9:30 a.m. Sign-in, continental breakfast  
9:55 In your seats

**Setting the Stage**

10:00 Welcome  
*Invocation*  
Outline of day  
10:10 Theological Themes  
Presentation (10 min.) -- Barbara Green  
Comments from floor (10 min.)

**Key Issues**

10:30 Nuclear weapons doctrine of Bush Administration  
Presentation (15 min.) -- Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists  
Questions and comments (10 min.)  
What to do about it (5 min.)  
11:00 Proposals for new nuclear weapons (including testing)  
Presentation (15 min.) -- David Culp  
Questions and comments (10 min.)  
What to do about it (5 min.)  
11:30 Reducing nuclear dangers (de-alerting, deep cuts, nuclear threat reduction)  
Presentation (15 min.) -- Laura Holgate, Nuclear Threat Initiative  
Questions and comments (10 min.)  
What to do about it (5 min.)  
12:00 noon *Blessing for lunch*  
Break

12:15 p.m. **Luncheon**  
Speaker: "A Political Perspective" Senator Carl Levin invited

**ACTION STRATEGIES**

Carry over of what to do about the key issues

**Focusing on Decision Makers**

1:30 President and Executive Branch  
Presenter: "Outline of Strategic Options" (3 min.)  
Two initial respondents (3 min. each)  
Discussion (22 min.)  
Straw vote (2 min.)

- 2:00 Congress  
Presenter: "Outline of Strategic Options" (3 min.)  
Two initial respondents (3 min. each)  
Discussion (22 min.)  
Straw vote (2 min.)
- 2:30 Break
- Building the Base for Action**
- 2:40 Grassroots Organizing  
Presenter: "Outline of Strategic Options" (3 min.)  
Two initial respondents (3 min. each)  
Discussion (22 min.)  
Straw vote (2 min.)
- 3:10 2004 Election Campaign  
Presenter: "Outline of Strategic Options" (3 min.)  
Two initial respondents (3 min. each)  
Discussion (12 min.)  
Straw vote (2 min.)
- 3:30 Break
- Mobilizing the Religious Community**
- 3:40 Increasing Priority for Nuclear Disarmament  
Panel (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim) (3 min. each)  
Discussion (18 min.)  
Segue into
- 4:10 Making Commitments  
Commitments from participants  
Summation  
*Benediction*
- 4:30 Adjourn

September 9, 2003



- 2:00 Congress  
Presenter: "Outline of Strategic Options" (3 min.)  
Two initial respondents (3 min. each)  
Discussion (22 min.)  
Straw vote (2 min.)
- 2:30 Break
- Building the Base for Action**
- 2:40 Grassroots Organizing  
Presenter: "Outline of Strategic Options" (3 min.)  
Two initial respondents (3 min. each)  
Discussion (22 min.)  
Straw vote (2 min.)
- 3:10 2004 Election Campaign  
Presenter: "Outline of Strategic Options" (3 min.)  
Two initial respondents (3 min. each)  
Discussion (12 min.)  
Straw vote (2 min.)
- 3:30 Break
- Mobilizing the Religious Community**
- 3:40 Increasing Priority for Nuclear Disarmament  
Panel (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim) (3 min. each)  
Discussion (18 min.)  
Segue into
- 4:10 Making Commitments  
Commitments from participants  
Summation  
*Benediction*
- 4:30 Adjourn

September 9, 2003

**Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament**  
**Wednesday, December 3, 2003**  
**United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NW**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**Gathering**

9:30 a.m. Sign-in, continental breakfast  
9:55 In your seats

**Setting the Stage**

10:00 Welcome  
*Invocation*  
Outline of day  
10:10 Theological Themes  
Presenter -- Barbara Green, Churches Center for Theology and Public Policy

**Key Issues**

10:30 Nuclear weapons doctrine of Bush Administration  
Presenter -- Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists  
11:00 Proposals for new nuclear weapons (including testing)  
Presenter -- David Culp, Friends Committee on National Legislation  
11:30 Reducing nuclear dangers (de-alerting, deep cuts, nuclear threat reduction)  
Presenter -- Laura Holgate, Nuclear Threat Initiative  
12:00 noon *Blessing for lunch*  
Break

12:15 p.m. **Luncheon**

Speaker: "A Political Perspective" Senator Carl Levin invited

**ACTION STRATEGIES**

**Focusing on Decision Makers**

1:30 President and Executive Branch  
2:00 Congress  
2:30 Break

**Building the Base for Action**

2:40 Grassroots Organizing  
3:10 2004 Election Campaign  
3:30 Break

**Mobilizing the Religious Community**

3:40 Increasing Priority for Nuclear Disarmament  
4:10 Making Commitments  
*Benediction*  
4:30 Adjourn

**Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament**  
**Wednesday, December 3, 2003**  
**United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NW**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**Gathering**

9:30 a.m. Sign-in, continental breakfast  
9:55 In your seats

**Setting the Stage**

10:00 Welcome  
*Invocation*  
Outline of day  
10:10 Theological Themes  
Presenter -- Barbara Green, Churches Center for Theology and Public Policy

**Key Issues**

10:30 Nuclear weapons doctrine of Bush Administration  
Presenter -- Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists  
11:00 Proposals for new nuclear weapons (including testing)  
Presenter -- Madeline Creedon, staff, Senator Armed Services Committee  
11:30 Reducing nuclear dangers (de-alerting, deep cuts, nuclear threat reduction)  
Presenter -- Laura Holgate, Nuclear Threat Initiative  
12:00 noon *Blessing for lunch*  
Break

12:15 p.m. **Luncheon**

Speaker: "A Political Perspective" Senator Carl Levin invited

**ACTION STRATEGIES**

**Focusing on Decision Makers**

1:30 President and Executive Branch  
2:00 Congress  
2:30 Break

**Building the Base for Action**

2:40 Grassroots Organizing  
3:10 2004 Election Campaign  
3:30 Break

**Mobilizing the Religious Community**

3:40 Increasing Priority for Nuclear Disarmament  
4:10 Making Commitments  
*Benediction*  
4:30 Adjourn

**Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament**  
**Wednesday, December 3, 2003**  
**United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NW**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**Gathering**

9:30 a.m. Sign-in, continental breakfast  
9:55 In your seats

**Setting the Stage**

10:00 Welcome -- Howard Hallman  
*Invocation* (to be chosen)  
Outline of day -- Hallman

10:10 Theological Themes  
Presentation -- Barbara Green  
Churches' Center for Theology & Public Policy  
Brief comments from floor

**Key Issues -- Daryl Byler presiding**

10:30 Nuclear weapons doctrine of Bush Administration  
Presentation -- Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists  
Questions and comments  
What to do about it

11:00 Proposals for new nuclear weapons (including testing)  
Presentation -- David Culp, Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Questions and comments  
What to do about it

11:30 Reducing nuclear dangers (de-alerting, deep cuts, nuclear threat reduction)  
Presentation -- Laura Holgate, Nuclear Threat Initiative  
Questions and comments  
What to do about it

12:00 noon *Blessing for lunch* (to be chosen)  
Break

12:15 p.m. **Luncheon**

Presiding: Catherine Gordon  
Introduction of speaker: Rabbi David Saperstein  
Speaker: "A Political Perspective" Senator Carl Levin invited

**ACTION STRATEGIES -- Howard Hallman presiding**

1:30 Summary of what to do about the key issues -- Daryl Byler

**Focusing on Decision Makers**

1:35 President and Executive Branch  
"Outline of Strategic Options"  
Presenter to be chosen  
Two initial respondents  
Discussion  
Straw vote on tactics

- 2:00 Congress  
"Outline of Strategic Options"  
Presenter to be chosen  
Two initial respondents  
Discussion  
Straw vote on tactics
- 2:30 Break
- Building the Base for Action**
- 2:40 Grassroots Organizing  
"Outline of Strategic Options"  
Presenter: Rich Killmer, Churches' Center for Theology & Public Policy  
Two initial respondents  
Discussion  
Straw vote on tactics
- 3:10 2004 Election Campaign  
"Outline of Strategic Options"  
Presenter: Ira Shorr, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Two initial respondents  
Discussion  
Straw vote on tactics
- 3:30 Break
- Mobilizing the Religious Community**
- 3:40 Increasing Priority for Nuclear Disarmament  
Panel: Jerry Powers, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops  
Rabbi David Saperstein, Religious Action Center  
Representative of National Council of Churches  
Muslim if present  
Discussion  
Segue into
- 4:10 Making Commitments  
Commitments from participants  
Summation  
*Benediction* (to be chosen)
- 4:30 Adjourn

October 8, 2003

**Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament**  
**Wednesday, December 3, 2003**  
**United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**Gathering**

9:30 a.m. Sign-in, continental breakfast  
9:55 In your seats

**Setting the Stage**

10:00 Welcome -- Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
& Chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
*Invocation* -- Sister Marie Lucey, Leadership Conference of Women Religious  
Outline of day  
10:10 *Theological Themes*  
Presentation -- Barbara Green  
Churches' Center for Theology & Public Policy  
Brief comments from floor

**Key Issues** -- Presiding: Daryl Byler, Mennonite Central Committee

10:30 *Nuclear Weapons Doctrine of Bush Administration*  
Presentation -- Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists  
Questions and comments  
11:00 *Proposals for New Nuclear Weapons and Testing*  
Presentation -- Madeline Creedon\*, staff, Senate Armed Services Committee  
Questions and comments  
11:30 *Reducing Nuclear Dangers (de-alerting, deep cuts, nuclear threat reduction)*  
Presentation -- Laura Holgate, Nuclear Threat Initiative  
Questions and comments  
12:00 noon *Blessing for Lunch*: Ibrahim Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation

**Lunch**

12:45 p.m. **Luncheon Program**  
Presiding: Catherine Gordon, Presbyterian Church (USA), Washington Office  
Introduction of speaker: Rabbi David Saperstein, Religious Action Center  
Speaker: "A Political Perspective" Senator Jeff Bingaman (invited)

**ACTION STRATEGIES** -- Howard Hallman presiding

1:30 Reprise: Main Points of "Key Issues" Discussion --  
Larry Egbert, Unitarian Universalist Association

**Focusing on Decision Makers**

1:35 *Influencing the President and Executive Branch*  
Outline of Strategic Options -- Maureen Shea, Episcopal Church,  
Washington Office  
Initial respondents: Jim Winkler, United Methodist General Board of  
Church and Society  
Joe Volk\*, Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Discussion

- 2:00 *Influencing Congress*  
Outline of Strategic Options -- David Culp, Friends Committee  
on National Legislation  
Initial respondents: Mark Brown, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs  
Barbara Weinstein\*, Religious Action Center for  
Reform Judaism  
Discussion
- 2:30 Break
- Building the Base for Action**  
2:40 *Coordinated Grassroots Organizing for the Faith Community*  
Outline of Strategic Options -- Rich Killmer, Churches' Center for Theology &  
Public Policy  
Initial respondents: Dave Robinson\*, Pax Christi, USA  
Ed Arnold, Atlanta, Georgia  
Discussion
- 3:10 *2004 Election Campaign: Non-partisan Involvement*  
Outline of Strategic Options -- Ira Shorr, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Initial respondents: Pat Conover, United Church of Christ  
Bob Moore, Coalition for Peace Action, New Jersey  
Discussion
- 3:30 Break
- Mobilizing the Religious Community**  
3:40 *Increasing Priority for Nuclear Disarmament*  
Panel: Jerry Powers, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops  
Rabbi David Saperstein, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Brenda Girton-Mitchell, National Council of Churches  
A Muslim leader  
Discussion  
Segue into
- 4:10 *Making Commitments*  
Commitments from participants  
Summation  
*Benediction:* Dwight Lundgren, American Baptist Churches
- 4:30 Adjourn

\* Invited or to be invited

November 10, 2003

**Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament**  
**Wednesday, December 3, 2003**  
**United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**Gathering**

9:30 a.m. Sign-in, continental breakfast  
9:55 In your seats

**Setting the Stage**

10:00 Welcome -- Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
& Chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
*Invocation* -- Sister Marie Lucey, Leadership Conference of Women Religious  
Outline of day

10:10 *Theological Themes*  
Presentation -- Barbara Green  
Churches' Center for Theology & Public Policy  
Brief comments from floor

**Key Issues** -- Presiding: Daryl Byler, Mennonite Central Committee

10:30 *Nuclear Weapons Doctrine of Bush Administration*  
Presentation -- Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists  
Questions and comments

11:00 *Proposals for New Nuclear Weapons and Testing*  
Presentation -- Madeline Creedon, staff, Senate Armed Services Committee  
Questions and comments

11:30 *Reducing Nuclear Dangers (de-alerting, deep cuts, nuclear threat reduction)*  
Presentation -- Laura Holgate, Nuclear Threat Initiative  
Questions and comments

12:00 noon *Blessing for Lunch*: Ibrahim Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation  
Turn in ballots on issue priorities

**Lunch**

12:30 p.m. **Luncheon Program**  
Presiding: Catherine Gordon, Presbyterian Church (USA)  
Introduction of speaker: Rabbi David Saperstein, Religious Action Center of  
Reform Judaism  
Speaker: "A Political Perspective" Representative John Spratt

**ACTION STRATEGIES** -- Howard Hallman presiding

1:15 Reprise: Main Points of "Key Issues" Discussion --  
Larry Egbert, Unitarian Universalist Association

**Focusing on Decision Makers**

1:20 *Influencing the President and Executive Branch*  
Outline of Strategic Options -- Maureen Shea, Episcopal Church,  
Washington Office  
Initial respondents: Jim Winkler, United Methodist General Board of  
Church and Society  
Joe Volk, Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Discussion



- 1:45 *Influencing Congress*  
Outline of Strategic Options -- David Culp, Friends Committee  
on National Legislation  
Initial respondents: Mark Brown, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs  
Barbara Weinstein, Religious Action Center for  
Reform Judaism  
Discussion
- 2:15 **Building the Base for Action**  
*Coordinated Grassroots Organizing for the Faith Community*  
Outline of Strategic Options -- Rich Killmer, Churches' Center for Theology &  
Public Policy  
Initial respondents: Dave Robinson, Pax Christi, USA  
Ed Arnold, Atlanta, Georgia  
Discussion
- 2:45 *2004 Election Campaign: Non-partisan Involvement*  
Outline of Strategic Options -- Ira Shorr, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Initial respondents: Pat Conover, United Church of Christ  
Bob Moore, Coalition for Peace Action, New Jersey  
Discussion
- 3:10 Break  
Vote on preferred action strategies
- 3:30 **Mobilizing the Religious Community**  
*Increasing Priority for Nuclear Disarmament*  
Panel: Jerry Powers, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops  
Rabbi David Saperstein, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Brenda Girton-Mitchell, National Council of Churches  
Mohamed Majid Ali, Islamic Society of North America  
Discussion  
Segue into
- 4:00 *Making Commitments*  
Commitments from participants  
Summation  
*Benediction:* Dwight Lundgren, American Baptist Churches
- 4:30 Adjourn

December 1, 2003

**Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament**  
**Wednesday, December 3, 2003**  
**Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NW**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**Gathering**

10:00 a.m. Registration, coffee +  
10:15 Assemble, self-introductions  
*Invocation*

**Key Issues**

10:30 Nuclear weapons doctrine of Bush Administration  
11:00 Proposals for new nuclear weapons (including testing)  
11:30 Reducing nuclear dangers (de-alerting, deep cuts, Nunn-Lugar)  
12:00 noon *Blessing for lunch*

12:15 p.m. **Luncheon**

Speaker: Senator Levin invited

**Action Strategies Related to:**

1:30 President and Executive Branch  
2:10 Congress  
2:50 Break  
3:00 Grassroots mobilization  
3:30 2004 election campaign

**Making Commitments**

4:00 Commitments from participants  
*Benediction*  
4:30 Adjourn

September 2, 2003

# ANNUAL ARMS CONTROL RETREAT AT COOLFONT IN WEST VIRGINIA

In order to plan the two day arms control retreat for 2003/2004 at Coolfont, please return this form no later than October 15th to Suzy Kerr at SuzyKerr@msn.com or hand it to John Issacs at Monday Lobby. Please make sure that others from your organization who may attend also get a copy of this form.

NAME Howard Hallman

ORGANIZATION Methodists United for Peace with Justice

NUMBER OF PEOPLE TO ATTEND FROM YOUR ORGANIZATION one

E-MAIL ADDRESS hhallman@mupwj.org

THE FOLLOWING THREE ISSUES SHOULD BE ON THE AGENDA (Examples, Iraq, 2004 Presidential election, lobbying on Capitol Hill).

1. Faith community initiatives on nuclear disarmament and interface with civic sector organizations. (We are having an all-day strategy session on December 3 and will have much to report. There will be a disarmament track during Ecumenical Advocacy Days in March 2003. Also, there is a global faith initiative on ND underway.) The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, could organize such a session. Rich Killmer and David Culp are important resources on this matter.

2. Nuclear weapons policy & 2004 elections

3. Strengthening grassroots cooperation

I AM WILLING TO HELP ORGANIZE THE RETREAT

Yes

No

THE FOLLOWING DATES ARE NOT GOOD (please put XXXX beside the dates that do not work for you)

Tuesday-Thursday - January 6-7-8

Wednesday-Friday - January 7-8-9

Monday-Wednesday - January 12-13-14

Tuesday-Thursday - January 13-14-15

Wednesday-Friday - January 14-15-16

Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>, Curtis Ramsey-Lucas <ograbc@aol.com>, Mary Lord <peace@afsc.org>, Bal Pinquel <bpinguel@afsc.org>, Heather Foote <hfoote@afsc.org>, Jim Lowder <jim@bpfna.org>, Phil Jones <pjones\_gb@brethren.org>, Bryan Hissong <bhissong\_gb@brethren.org>, Anna Bradley <abradley@nationalcitycc.org>, Bill Ferguson <nmchog@hotmail.com>, Rich Killmer <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>, Barbara Green <bgreen@wesleysem.edu>, Stan DeBoe <sdeboe@cmsm.org>, Martha Gardner <mgardner@episcopalchurch.org>, Maureen Shea <mshea@episcopalchurch.org>, Jerre Skipper <jskipper@episcopalchurch.org>, Ron Sider <rsider@speakeasy.net>, Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>, David Culp <david@fcnl.org>, Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>, Scott Stedjan <scott@fcnl.org>, Jacqueline Lynn <epfnational@ameritech.net>, Tyler Miller <drktyler202@earthlink.net>, Mohamed Majid Ali <hagmagid@aol.com>, Mark Brown <marsusab@aol.com>, Ibrahim Ramey <disarm@forusa.org>, Marie Lucey <mlucey@lcwr.org>, Glen Gersmehl <lpf@ecunet.org>, Marie Dennis <mdennis@maryknoll.org>, Tim O'Connell <timellen@members.mkl-mmef.org>, Daryl Byler <J. Daryl Byler@mcc.org>, Brenda Girton Mitchell <bgirtonm@nccusa.org>, Brian Hinman <bhinman@churchworldservice.org>, Tony Kireopoulos <tkireopoulos@nccusa.org>, Anne Curtis <networklobby.org>, Dave Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>, Jean Stokan <jeanstokan@hotmail.com>, Susan Campbell <suspeace@aol.com>, Catherine Gordon <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>, Sara Lisherness <slisherness@unidial.com>, Bill Galvin <galvinbill@hotmail.com>, David Saperstein <dsaperstein@rac.org>, Barbara Weinstein <bweinstein@rac.org>, Zach Rosenberg <zrosenberg@rac.org>, Duane Shank <dshank@sojo.net>, Larry Egbert <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>, Rob Keithan <rcavenaugh@uua.org>, Pat Conover <conoverp@ucc.org>, Loey Powell <Powelll@ucc.org>, Ron Stief <stiefr@ucc.org>, Jim Winkler <jwinkler@umc-gbcs.org>, Jaydee Hanson <jhanson@umc-gbcs.org>, Mark Harrison <mharrison@umc-gbcs.org>, Jonathan Granoff <JGG786@aol.com>, Jerry Powers <jpowers@usccb.org>, Bob Kinsey <bobkinsey@earthlink.net>, Bob Moore <cfpa@peacecoalition.org>, Steve Sidorak <ssidorak@aol.com>, Ed Arnold <edarnold@mindspring.com>, Nancy Jo Kemper <njk@kycouncilofchurches.org>, Sally Breen <sallybreen@msn.com>, Peg Chamberlin <pegchamberlin@mnchurches.org>, David Lamarre-Vincent <david@nhchurches.org>, John Boostra <boonstra@thewac.org>

hasteystan@cs.com <hasteystan@cs.com>, Curtis Ramsey-Lucas <ograbc@aol.com>, Mary Lord <peace@afsc.org >, JGerson@afsc.org <JGerson@afsc.org>, mgardner@episcopalchurch.org <mgardner@episcopalchurch.org>, mshea@episcopalchurch.org <mshea@episcopalchurch.org>, jskipper@episcopalchurch.org <jskipper@episcopalchurch.org>, joe@fcnl.org <joe@fcnl.org>, mdennis@maryknoll.org <mdennis@maryknoll.org>, Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>, dave@paxchristiusa.org <dave@paxchristiusa.org>, jeanstokan@hotmail.com <jeanstokan@hotmail.com>, ivory@ctr.pcusa.org <ivory@ctr.pcusa.org>, chobgood@nationalcitycc.org <chobgood@nationalcitycc.org>, rcavenaugh@uua.org <rcavenaugh@uua.org>, Powelll@ucc.org <Powelll@ucc.org>, stiefr@ucc.org <stiefr@ucc.org>, jwinkler@umc-gbcs.org <jwinkler@umc-gbcs.org>, Hanson, Jaydee <jhanson@umc-gbcs.org>, ageyer@cathedral.org <ageyer@cathedral.org>, dshank@sojo.net <dshank@sojo.net>, Tony Kireopoulos <tkireopoulos@nccusa.org>, bobkinsey@earthlink.net <bobkinsey@earthlink.net>, Bob Moore <cfpa@peacecoalition.org>, ssidorak@aol.com <ssidorak@aol.com>, edarnold@mindspring.com <edarnold@mindspring.com>, jim@bpfna.org <jim@bpfna.org>, Rev. John Holt <rissc@dowtech.com>, rsider@speakeasy.net <rsider@speakeasy.net>, Glen Gersmehl <lpf@ecunet.org>, LenandJudy@syracusenet.net <LenandJudy@syracusenet.net>, Jacqueline Lynn <epfnational@ameritech.net>, seth.kaperdale@juno.com <seth.kaper-dale@juno.com>, david@nhchurches.org <david@nhchurches.org>

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

July 17, 2003

To: Heather Foote

Fax: 202 232-3197

No. of pages: 2

Dear Heather:

We cordially invite you to participate in an Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament scheduled for Wednesday, December 3, 2003. It will take place from 10:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. The purpose is to develop legislative, education, and grassroots organizing strategies on nuclear weapons issues for 2004.

The Consultation help the faith community:

- \* Respond more effectively to regressive nuclear weapons policies of the Bush Administration that risk global nuclear proliferation and possible use of nuclear weapons.
- \* Renew our insistence that nuclear disarmament is a moral issue.
- \* Strengthen our advocacy of practical steps leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons.
- \* Set the stage for working more closely together on these issues.

The Consultation is being organized by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a Washington-based coalition of religious organizations. Invitations are going to heads of national offices working on this issue and nuclear disarmament specialists on their staff. We will also have participants who are involved in grassroots organizing, such as representatives of religious peace fellowships and persons from state ecumenical and interfaith organizations.

The morning session will feature presentations on key policy issues, including:

- (a) proposals for new nuclear weapons (mini-nukes, bunker buster),
- (b) opportunities for greater U.S.-Russian nuclear disarmament (de-alerting, deeper cuts in strategic weapons), and
- (c) need for expansion of the nuclear threat reduction program to keep nuclear weapons and fissile material out of the hands of terrorists.

We are inviting a U.S. senator as luncheon speaker. The afternoon will be devoted to development of strategies for legislative advocacy, dealing with the 2004 election campaign, education, and state and local organizing. We hope that those in attendance will make a commitment to work together on the strategies that are developed.

We will provide more detailed information in the fall. Meanwhile please put this event on your personal calendar and also on your organization's calendar.

We would appreciate know whether you might attend the December 3 Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament. If you have any questions, please contact any of the signers listed below.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
(301) 896-0013 hhallman@mupwj.org

Rich Killmer, Program Director  
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy  
(202) 885-8684 rkillmer@wesleysem.edu.org

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
(202) 547-6000, ext. 146 dculp@fcnl.org

###

You may reply to:

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

### **Persons invited to December 3 Consultation who did not come**

Curtis Ramsey-Lucas <ograbc@aol.com>, Mary Lord <peace@afsc.org>, Bal Pinquel <bpinguel@afsc.org>, Heather Foote <hfoote@afsc.org>, Jim Lowder <jim@bpfna.org>, Phil Jones <pjones\_gb@brethren.org>, Anna Bradley <abradley@nationalcitycc.org>, Bill Ferguson <nmchog@hotmail.com>, Stan DeBoe <sdeboe@cmsm.org>, Martha Gardner <mgardner@episcopalchurch.org>, Jerre Skipper <jskipper@episcopalchurch.org>, Ron Sider <rsider@speakeasy.net>, Jacqueline Lynn <epfnational@ameritech.net>, Mohamed Majid Ali <hagmagid@aol.com>, Marie Lucey <mlucey@lcwr.org>, Glen Gersmehl <lpf@ecunet.org>, Marie Dennis <mdennis@maryknoll.org>, Anne Curtis <networklobby.org>, Sara Lisherness <slisherness@unidial.com>, Duane Shank <dshank@sojo.net>, Rob Keithan <rcavenaugh@uua.org>, Loey Powell <Powelll@ucc.org>, Ron Stief <stiefr@ucc.org>, John Boostra <boonstra@thewac.org>, Nancy Jo Kemper <njk@kycouncilofchurches.org>, JGerson@afsc.org <JGerson@afsc.org>, Rev. John Holt <rissc@dowtech.com>, rsider@speakeasy.net <rsider@speakeasy.net>, LenandJudy@syracusenet.net <LenandJudy@syracusenet.net>, Tom Ewell , <tewell@mainecouncilofchurches.org>



Dear Rich,

I've thought a lot more about the final session at our December Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament. I want to backtrack from what I tentatively agreed to in our conversation yesterday.

The session on Mobilizing the Religious Community should focus primarily on gaining commitment for specific activities we will work together on in 2004. It shouldn't be seen as just another strategy session. That afternoon we will have already considered joint strategies for dealing with the president and Congress, for engaging in grassroots organization and being involved in the election campaign. These in effect are strategies to mobilize the faith community to work together for nuclear disarmament. The final 50 minutes should be spent in tying down the commitment to implement these strategies. That's not a lot of time for this purpose.

It is important to hold top people for this final session. That's why I would like to lead off with a panel consisting of Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Jerry Powers, David Saperstein or Barbara Weinstein, and a Muslim representative if present. They are too high level to ask them to be respondents to a prepared paper.

We would be saying to them, "This morning we considered highly important nuclear issues that the faith community is concerned about: the retrogressive policies of the Bush Administration, the desire to develop new nuclear weapons and renew testing, the lack of action for de-alerting and really deep cuts in strategic weapons, insufficient attention and resources devoted to nuclear threat reduction. This afternoon we explored strategies on how the faith community can deal with the president and Congress on these issues. We discussed how to work together in grassroots organizing. We considered options for those who want to get involved in the 2004 election. If these things are to happen, nuclear disarmament must be placed on a higher priority for action within the faith community. What is necessary for this to happen within your community (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim)?"

This would open the discussion to ways to heighten the priority (which you have said is essential). It would lead into the final 20 to 30 minutes during which people would make specific commitments to do things.

If you would like a further conversation about this, I'll be home for much of Thursday but only until 9:30 a.m. on Friday. Or you could try to reach me Saturday when I'll be in and out. Before I leave for Russia on Tuesday afternoon I would like to contact these persons.

Shalom,  
Howard

A Personal Invitation. Please do not forward or circulate.

Dear

We cordially invite you to participate in an Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament scheduled for Wednesday, December 3, 2003. It will take place from 10:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. The purpose is to develop legislative, executive-related, and grassroots-organizing strategies on nuclear weapons issues for 2004.

The Consultation will help the faith community:

- \* Respond more effectively to regressive nuclear weapons policies of the Bush Administration that risk global nuclear proliferation and possible use of nuclear weapons.
- \* Renew our insistence that nuclear disarmament is a moral issue.
- \* Strengthen our advocacy of practical steps leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons.
- \* Set the stage for working more closely together on these issues.

The Consultation is being organized by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a Washington-based coalition of religious organizations. Invitations are going to heads of national offices working on this issue and nuclear disarmament specialists on their staff. We will also have participants who are involved in grassroots organizing, such as representatives of religious peace fellowships and persons from state ecumenical and interfaith organizations.

The morning session will feature presentations on key policy issues, including:

- (a) nuclear weapons strategies of the Bush Administration,
- (b) proposals for new nuclear weapons (mini-nukes, bunker buster), and
- (c) reducing nuclear danger through de-alerting, dismantlement of strategic weapons, and safeguarding warheads and fissile material.

We are inviting a U.S. senator as luncheon speaker. The afternoon will be devoted to development of strategies for dealing with the president and Congress, grassroots organizing, and the 2004 election campaign. At the end of the day we hope that those in attendance will make a commitment to work together on the strategies that are developed.

We will provide more detailed information in the fall. Meanwhile please put this event on your calendar.

Let us know whether you might attend the December 3 Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament. If you have any questions, please contact any of the signers listed below.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
(301) 896-0013    [hhallman@mupwj.org](mailto:hhallman@mupwj.org)

Rich Killmer, Program Director  
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy

(202) 885-8684 rkillmer@wesleysem.edu.org

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
(202) 547-6000, ext. 146 dculp@fcnl.org

###

You may reply to:

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

A Personal Invitation. Please do not forward or circulate.

Dear

We cordially invite you to participate in an Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament scheduled for Wednesday, December 3, 2003. It will take place from 10:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. The purpose is to develop legislative, executive-related, and grassroots-organizing strategies on nuclear weapons issues for 2004.

The Consultation will help the faith community:

- \* Respond more effectively to regressive nuclear weapons policies of the Bush Administration that risk global nuclear proliferation and possible use of nuclear weapons.
- \* Renew our insistence that nuclear disarmament is a moral issue.
- \* Strengthen our advocacy of practical steps leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons.
- \* Set the stage for working more closely together on these issues.

The Consultation is being organized by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a Washington-based coalition of religious organizations. Invitations are going to heads of national offices working on this issue and nuclear disarmament specialists on their staff. We will also have participants who are involved in grassroots organizing, such as representatives of religious peace fellowships and persons from state ecumenical and interfaith organizations.

The morning session will feature presentations on key policy issues, including:

- (a) nuclear weapons strategies of the Bush Administration,
- (b) proposals for new nuclear weapons (mini-nukes, bunker buster), and
- (c) reducing nuclear danger through de-alerting, dismantlement of strategic weapons, and safeguarding warheads and fissile material.

We are inviting a U.S. senator as luncheon speaker. The afternoon will be devoted to development of strategies for dealing with the president and Congress, grassroots organizing, and the 2004 election campaign. At the end of the day we hope that those in attendance will make a commitment to work together on the strategies that are developed.

We will provide more detailed information later this month. Meanwhile please put this event on your calendar.

Let us know whether you might attend the December 3 Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament. If you have any questions, please contact any of the signers listed below.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
(301) 896-0013    [hhallman@mupwj.org](mailto:hhallman@mupwj.org)

Rich Killmer, Program Director  
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy

(202) 885-8684 rkillmer@wesleysem.edu.org

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
(202) 547-6000, ext. 146 dculp@fcnl.org

###

You may reply to:

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

A Personal Invitation. Please do not forward or circulate.

Dear

We cordially invite you to participate in an Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament scheduled for Wednesday, December 3, 2003. It will take place from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. The purpose is to develop legislative, executive-related, and grassroots-organizing strategies on nuclear weapons issues for 2004.

The Consultation will help the faith community:

- \* Respond more effectively to regressive nuclear weapons policies of the Bush Administration that risk global nuclear proliferation and possible use of nuclear weapons.
- \* Renew our insistence that nuclear disarmament is a moral issue.
- \* Strengthen our advocacy of practical steps leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons.
- \* Set the stage for working more closely together on these issues.

The Consultation is being organized by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a Washington-based coalition of religious organizations. Invitations are going to heads of national offices working on this issue and nuclear disarmament specialists on their staff. We will also have participants who are involved in grassroots organizing, such as representatives of religious peace fellowships and persons from state ecumenical and interfaith organizations.

As the attached schedule indicates, the morning session will feature presentations on key policy issues, including:

- (a) nuclear weapons strategies of the Bush Administration,
- (b) proposals for new nuclear weapons (mini-nukes, bunker buster), and
- (c) reducing nuclear danger through de-alerting, dismantlement of strategic weapons, and safeguarding warheads and fissile material.

We are inviting a U.S. senator as luncheon speaker. The afternoon will be devoted to development of strategies for dealing with the president and Congress, grassroots organizing, and the 2004 election campaign. At the end of the day we hope that those in attendance will make a commitment to work together on the strategies that are developed.

Let us know whether you might attend the December 3 Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament. If you have any questions, please contact any of the signers listed below.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
(301) 896-0013 hhallman@mupwj.org

Rich Killmer, Program Director  
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy  
(202) 885-8684 rkillmer@wesleysem.edu.org

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
(202) 547-6000, ext. 146 dculp@fcnl.org

###

You may reply to:

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

# A PROPOSAL TO THE PLOUGHSHARES FUND

## SUMMARY PAGE

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Phone: 301 896-0013  
Website: www.mupwj.org

Contact person: Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
E-mail: hhallman@mupwj.org

Project title: Interfaith Action for Nuclear Disarmament

Amount requested: \$50,000 for two years

Total project budget: \$100,000 for two years

Organizational budget for other activities: \$10,200 annually

Summary description of organization.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a national association of laity and clergy, organized in 1987 to work for nuclear disarmament and other peace and justice concerns. (1) Within Methodism we engage in grassroots mobilization and seek to influence denominational policy. (2) Working in an interfaith mode, (a) we provide leadership for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a U.S. coalition of denominational offices and religious peace fellowships, (b) we participate in global religious coalitions, and (c) we link these activities with civil sector peace organizations. This grant proposal involves our interfaith activities.

Summary description of project.

The purpose of this project is to enhance the catalytic leadership that Methodists United for Peace with Justice carries out through its chair, Howard W. Hallman, in support of interfaith activities for nuclear disarmament. One aspect will occur through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament that Hallman serves as chair. Activities will include coordination, grassroots mobilization, a list-serve, a website, strategic planning, and participation in Ecumenical Advocacy Days. A second aspect will be promotion of prophetic global leadership by religious organizations directed at getting nuclear weapons states and other possessors to renounce all uses of nuclear weapons and to eliminate their nuclear arsenals. Activities will include a global appeal and delegation visits to top officials of possessor states.



# FULL PROPOSAL

## Description of Organization

Methodists United for Peace with Justice organized in 1987 as a national association of laity and clergy. Stimulation for organizing was the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Since then the quest for global nuclear disarmament has been our major focus. We work within Methodism, in interfaith activities, and in association with civil sector organizations.

For our network **within Methodism** we publish a quarterly bulletin, *Peace Leaf*, and send out *Peace/Justice Alerts*. We network with peace with justice coordinators in United Methodist conferences around the country. We are involved in efforts to overcome two centuries of racial separation within Methodism. These activities are described more fully on our website, [www.mupwj.org](http://www.mupwj.org). They are financed by membership contributions and small grants

In seeking nuclear disarmament we are **coalition oriented** and work closely with other religious organizations and with civil sector organizations. In 1997 our chair, Howard Hallman, fostered interfaith action in support of Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. In the summer of that year he organized and served as chair of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which mobilized the faith community to support Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. In 2000 this interfaith coalition evolved into the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which Hallman chairs, to work for a variety of nuclear disarmament objectives. This current project is intended to support and strengthen his continued leadership of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

We also work **globally** with religious organizations in other countries and with international religious organizations. This was manifested in 1998 when Hallman, as a co-chair of the Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000, produced a statement signed by international religious leaders that was directed to the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting. This current project will build upon that experience.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a nonprofit corporation, established under laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. The corporation has status as a 501(c)(4) organization under the Internal Revenue Code. We have established the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, which the Internal Revenue Service has recognized as a 501(c)(3) organization and a public foundation under section 509(a)(1). We are submitting IRS letters by U.S mail.

## Description of Project

### Objectives

The **first objective** of this project is to **provide catalytic leadership for cooperative interfaith action in the United States** (a) to oppose current retrogression on nuclear policies

and (b) to strengthen national and grassroots support for specific steps that lead toward nuclear disarmament.

The **second objective** is to **promote prophetic global leadership by religious organizations** directed at getting nuclear weapon states and other possessors to renounce all uses of nuclear weapons and to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

## Methods

### Objective One: Interfaith Mobilization

**Background.** Many religious denominations have policy positions in favor of nuclear disarmament. They express their views to public officials. They provide educational material to congregations around the country. They encourage grassroots activists to contact their elected officials on specific issues. These efforts are stronger when they work in coalition with other religious organizations and with civil sector organizations. To make this possible Howard Hallman, working from a base as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, provided leadership for the formation of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in 2000. He continues to serve as chair. This project is intended to support and enhance his catalytic leadership to encourage and facilitate religious organizations working together in face of regressive policies on nuclear weapons of the present Administration.

**The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament** is an informal coalition of denominational offices, peace fellowships, and other religious associations. By choice it has no charter or by-laws. Hallman serves as chair by consensus rather than formal election. There are no other officers. The Interfaith Committee meets monthly in a conference room in the Methodist Building, just across from the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C.

**Participants.** Although there is no formal membership, the following organizations have an active relationship with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, shown by signing letters to public officials and participating in other coalition activities.

Alliance of Baptists  
American Baptist Churches, National Ministries  
American Friends Service Committee  
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America  
Church of the Brethren General Board  
Church Women United  
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men  
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship  
Disciples Peace Fellowship  
Episcopal Church, USA  
Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America  
Evangelicals for Social Action  
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Marianist, New York Province, Office of Justice and Peace  
Mennonite Central Committee  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
F. Francis Murphy Justice and Peace Initiative  
Muslim Peace Fellowship  
National Council of Churches  
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby  
Pax Christi USA  
Presbyterian Church, USA  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities  
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas  
Sister of St. Joseph of Peace  
Sojourners  
Unitarian Universalist Association  
United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries  
United Methodist Council of Bishops  
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society  
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops  
World Peacemakers

**Operational mode.** These organizations work on a variety issues of domestic and foreign policy. Most of them have offices in Washington engaged in public policy advocacy. They also have networks for grassroots outreach and have systems for providing information and action alerts. Dealing with multiple issues, they lack expertise on all of them. They find it difficult to keep up with many strands of legislation and executive policy. Therefore, the interfaith community has developed working groups and committees to take the lead on different issues.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament serves this role on matters related to nuclear weapons and their elimination. As such it functions as a **cooperative endeavor**. Different organizations step up to leadership roles on different issues. The lead organization provides timely information on legislative and executive decision-making. It offers background information and shares action alerts.

**Shared responsibility.** Currently within the faith community David Culp of the Friends Committee on National Legislation is providing leadership to oppose attempts to develop new nuclear weapons, such as bunker busters and mini-nukes. Rich Killmer of the Churches' Center for Public Policy provides connections with the Urgent Call to Reduce Nuclear Danger. Catherine Gordon of the Presbyterian Washington Office helps with linkages to the network of official denominational units. From the civic sector Brian Finlay of the Nuclear Threat Reduction Program keeps the Interfaith Committee informed on this issue and recommends timely action. In the past when de-alerting was a major issue we had an active relationship with Back from the Brink. Hallman is maintaining ties with organizations in the civil sector community which are still working for de-alerting and for deeper cuts in strategic nuclear weapons. This project will sustain and strengthen these cooperative relationships.

**Grassroots mobilization.** Religious organizations draw on these sources of information for grassroots outreach. For example, during the past several months David Culp has identified key congressional districts and states where grassroots action is needed to influence swing votes on new nukes issues. Each organization then chooses whether to communicate with its grassroots constituents in those locations.

Earlier during the CTBT ratification campaign the interfaith community was better organized to coordinate grassroots activities in key states. This was made possible by having a person responsible for grassroots coordination, a role fulfilled by Marie Rietmann from the staff of 20/20 Vision. To fill this void the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is exploring whether Rich Killmer could take on this task as an extension of the grassroots work he is doing with the Urgent Call to Reduce Nuclear Danger.

**List-serve.** To facilitate communication the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament operates a list-serve for 40+ participating organizations. Howard Hallman serves as moderator. We use the list serve for meeting announcements, circulation of drafts of sign-on letters, and sharing information. Regularly David Culp shares FCNL action alerts through the list serve. 20/20 Vision uses the list-serve to recruit co-sponsors from religious community for postcard mailings. On occasion Hallman forwards action alerts and sign-on letters from the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability on issues related to nuclear weapon production. He also forwards special analyses coming from the Council for a Livable World, the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, and other civil sector organizations on such matters as missile defense and arms control treaties. In this project we will broaden participation in the list-serve by more denominational offices and religious peace fellowships. We will encompass a broader range of topics related to nuclear disarmament.

**Website.** During the past year the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament created a website, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). It is co-sponsored by 12 denominational offices. Howard Hallman serves as moderator. The website has two functions: (1) provide a repository for statements and reports on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, international bodies, and civil sector organizations; and (2) serve as a forum for presentation and discussion of ideas on how to achieve zero nuclear weapons.

As an extension of its focus on nuclear disarmament issues, the website was used during the past year for providing linkage to statements by religious organizations opposing military action against Iraq and favoring alternative methods to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero3-disarmingiraq.html>.)

In this project we will expand the section of website devoted to presentation of scenarios on how to get to zero nuclear weapons. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero4.htm>.) We will promote greater dialogue on these proposed scenarios. We will use the website as a tool for coalition building with civil sector organizations.

**Strategic planning.** To prepare for a renewed effort to halt new nuclear weapons and to push harder for nuclear disarmament in 2004, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is planning an Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament for December 3, 2003. This will involve not only staff actively working on nuclear disarmament issues but also heads of Washington offices, staff from denominational headquarters who make decisions on

organizational priorities, representatives of religious peace fellowships, and persons from state religious coalitions working for nuclear disarmament. Howard Hallman, David Culp, and Rich Kilmer are serving as the steering committee for the consultation.

The one-day Consultation will feature discussion of key issues, such as opposition to new nuclear weapons (mini-nukes, bunker buster), need for greater U.S.-Russian nuclear disarmament (de-alerting, deeper cuts), and support for the Cooperative Nuclear Threat Reduction Program. We will ask a U.S. senator to challenge us in a luncheon speech. The afternoon will be devoted to development of legislative, non-partisan election campaign, education, and grassroots strategies for 2004. Leading up to the Consultation, participants in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will produce background papers for each type of strategy. This is another cooperative endeavor that is tied together by Hallman as chair.

**Interfaith advocacy.** In response to a proposal from the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, nuclear disarmament will be a major track in Ecumenical Advocacy Days for Global Peace with Justice, scheduled for March 5-8, 2004 (see [www.AdvocacyDays.org](http://www.AdvocacyDays.org)). Saturday, March 6 will be spent in workshops on substance of the issue, Sunday, March 7 will provide training for advocacy, March 8 will feature lobby visits on Capitol Hill. This will provide an opportunity to bring grassroots advocates to Washington as part of a broader interfaith effort. Altogether there will be ten hours of training on nuclear disarmament, plus time spent on lobby visits.

This is another cooperative venture with responsibility shared with Friends Committee on National Legislation, Presbyterian Washington Office, and Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy. Other Washington interfaith staff working for nuclear disarmament will participate along with persons from state and local religious coalitions. The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament facilitates this process and provides linkage with other organizations in the ecumenical community.

**Role of the chair.** In functioning as a cooperative endeavor the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament tends to be non-hierarchical in character. Different organizations take the lead for different tasks. However, there is a need for someone to keep the coalition on track, to facilitate communication, to coordinate when appropriate, to provide initiative leadership when necessary, but not to boss. This role is fulfilled by the chair. For Howard Hallman, the current chair, nuclear disarmament is the primary issue he is working on. He maintains relationships with civil sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. As the next section explains he also has connections with global religious networks.

A grant to Methodists United for Peace with Justice will support Hallman's catalytic leadership role at a time when the challenge to achieve nuclear disarmament is becoming greater and more important. This will strengthen the work of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in the tasks enumerated above, including coordination, grassroots mobilization, list-serve, website, strategic planning, and Ecumenical Advocacy Days. It will also enhance the work of other grantees of the Ploughshares Fund, which take advantage of linkages with this interfaith network and also contribute to its effectiveness.

## Objective Two: Global Initiative

**Background.** In 1998 the Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, presented a statement entitled "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition" to the **NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva.** (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptactnow>.) The statement was co-signed by 42 religious leaders from 12 countries. It was initiated and drafted by Howard Hallman, serving as co-chair of the Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000. Other co-chairs were Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA and Ibrahim Ramey of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels also hosted a reception for PrepCom delegates that Hallman arranged.

Also for the 1998 PrepCom meeting Hallman developed an NGO statement entitled "A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons", which was presented to the delegates by Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptspiritual>.)

In 2000 Hallman participated in **A Consultation of Churches on Nuclear Policy** in Brussels with a particular focus on NATO. This involved persons from the World Council of Churches, Conference of European Churches, Canadian Council of Churches, National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, and Pax Christi International. This led to delegation visits to top officials of NATO states to encourage them and NATO as a whole "to conform to the obligations undertaken in the Non-Proliferation Treaty."

In a like manner **religious delegations called upon top officials** in a number of nations in the fall of 2002 and winter of 2003 to advocate dealing with Iraq without going to war. Although we weren't part of these delegation visits, we note the utility of this method for advocating nuclear disarmament.

**Global Appeal.** Building upon his international contacts in the faith community and upon observation of the experience with delegation visits, Howard Hallman has initiated a two step process to press for global nuclear disarmament. This is the second part of this project for which we are requesting financial assistance.

The first step is "**An Interfaith Appeal for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.**" A work in progress, the third draft is attached. It calls upon all possessors of nuclear weapons "to unequivocally renounce the use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance" and "to eliminate their nuclear arsenals" through appropriate steps. This goes beyond "no first use" to "no use".

Currently we are seeking **initial signers from the World Council of Churches, Pax Christi International, Conference of European Churches, National Council of Churches (USA), Canadian Council of Churches, and World Conference on Religion and Peace.** The latter will be particularly valuable in outreach to faith groups beyond the Christian community as we invite signatures by religious leaders in various countries around the globe.

At this writing Dr. Robert Edgar, general secretary of the National Council of Churches, has assigned Dr. Antonios Kireopoulos, associate general secretary for international affairs, to

work on this project. As former staff for the World Conference on Religion and Peace, Dr. Kireopoulos, will provide connections with that interfaith organization. Paul Lansu, executive secretary of Pax Christi International, has endorsed this initiative and wants to have meeting to discuss it on August 31 in New York, the day after a forum the previous day on "Pre-emptive Peace" that his organization is sponsoring. His president, Msgr. Michel Sabbah, Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, will be available then.

To bring in the other organizations, Hallman is communicating with Salpy Eskidjian, program executive of the World Council of Churches, with whom he worked at the 1998 NPT PrepCom. He is contacting Rev. Rüdiger Noll, secretary for church and society, Conference of European Churches, and Ernest Regehr, director of Project Ploughshares, Canadian Council of Churches, both of whom he knows from the 2000 Brussels Consultation of Churches on Nuclear Policy.

Recognizing that the **Holy See** rarely signs joint statements, we will encourage the Holy See's representative to the United Nations to make a parallel statement in its annual presentation to the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. (For previous statements see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#holysee>.) To seek help for this effort, Hallman is in touch with Canadian Senator Doug Roche, who represented the Holy See at the 1998 NPT PrepCom. Beyond seeking parallel action by the Holy See, there will be many Catholic signers of the Interfaith Appeal, gained through Pax Christi International and Pax Christi USA.

At its November 2003 meeting the **U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops** will observe the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the papal encyclical, *Peace on Earth*, and the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, that dealt with the nuclear crisis. That same month the **General Assembly, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.** holds its annual meeting, offering another opportunity to speak out for nuclear disarmament.

We also intend to urge **Pugwash, IPPNW, and women's organizations** to develop international statements by scientists, physicians, and women calling for renunciation of nuclear weapons and prompt action for their elimination. This builds upon contacts we have made in requesting scenarios for how to get zero nuclear weapons for posting on [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Working in parallel in this manner pulls in other networks but avoids an extremely difficult, time-consuming attempt to get agreement on a multi-sector statement.

The second and most important step in this global initiative is to **form international delegations of religious leaders to call upon the heads of nations possessing nuclear weapons**, or their representatives, to press the case for renunciation of nuclear weapons and to demand action for their elimination. This is the central focus of this global endeavor and differentiates this project from those that merely release public statements and hope for results.

Beyond international delegations we will **encourage religious coalitions within specific nations** to call on their governments to renounce nuclear weapons. In the United States this will involve the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and the participating denominations and faith bodies.

The Interfaith Appeal for Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons is in its early stage. The formation of delegations lies in the future. Financial assistance to Methodists United for Peace with Justice to support the work of Howard Hallman will enable this initiative to advance.

## **Audience**

Using its own resources, **Methodists United for Peace with Justice** (a) reaches out to local peace advocates and congregations within the United Methodist Church, (b) seeks to influence the United Methodist General Conference, the quadrennial policy-making body, and (c) relates to leadership of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and Christian Methodist Episcopal Church in efforts to overcome two centuries of racial separation.

This project relates to our interfaith activities. For the part dealing with the **Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**, the direct audience will be (a) staff of denominations, faith groups, and religious peace fellowship who work on nuclear disarmament issues and (b) other leaders of these bodies. Not wishing to duplicate grassroots outreach of these organizations, we perceive their grassroots networks to be an indirect audience that is served more effectively because of coalition activities we encourage.

For the part of the project dealing with **the global appeal**, the audience will be officials of international religious organizations and religious bodies within different nations. They in turn will reach out to their own members.

A secondary audience consists of officials of civil sector organizations with whom we will be working to build broader coalition activities.

## **Evaluation**

A. The success of the project related to **interfaith work in the United States** will be measured by the following benchmarks:

- 1) Holding the Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament in December with 40 to 50 participants and coming up with agreement on coherent legislative, education, and grassroots strategies for 2004.
- 2) Participation in the Ecumenical Advocacy Days for Global Peace with Justice in March 2004 and drawing in at least 60 participants from state and local religious coalitions.
- 3) Selection of target states and congressional districts for mobilizing grassroots action during the next session of Congress.
- 4) Organization of grassroots interfaith cooperation in these target areas.
- 5) Drawing ten more national religious organizations into the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.
- 6) Expansion of the How to Get to Zero page of [www.zero-nukes](http://www.zero-nukes) by adding at least 25 new scenarios from recognized civil sector experts.



It should be noted that Howard Hallman will be personally responsible for achieving the last two objectives, the first four rely upon our ability to provide catalytic leadership that results in action by numerous coalition partners.

B. The success of the part of the project related to **the global appeal** will be measured by these benchmarks:

- 1) Issuance of "An Interfaith Appeal for Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons" that is signed by important international and national religious leaders of major faiths and from every continent.
- 2) Parallel statements from the Catholic hierarchy and from major civil sector organizations.
- 3) Interfaith delegations calling on top leaders of states possessing nuclear weapons.
- 4) Follow up visits by delegations from religious organizations within these states.
- 5) Subsequent efforts to influence public opinion and public policies in these states.
- 6) Indications of changes in public policy in one or more of these states.

### **Past Accomplishments**

In previous project narrative we have described some of our accomplishments. Here we pull this information together in summary form.

Although support for **our work within Methodism** is not part of this project proposal, it is what gives us our basic legitimacy. At the policy level we are responsible for getting the United Methodist General Conference to adopt strong policy statements on nuclear abolition, the latest being an 2000 resolution entitled " Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence". (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#sayingno>). We publish a quarterly bulletin, *Peace Leaf*, which goes by U.S. mail and e-mail to Methodists around the country. (See <http://www.mupwj.org/peaceleaf.htm>.) We use the official list serve of peace with justice coordinators from United Methodist conferences around the country at least once a week to send up-to-date information about legislative issues and other information related to nuclear disarmament. We are also engaged in working with leaders of predominantly African American Methodist denominations to overcome historic racial separation.

In matters related to this project proposal, Howard Hallman brought the **Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament** into existence and functions as chair. Some of its sign-on letters are found at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#interfaithcommittee>. This entire website -- [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) -- is a project of the Interfaith Committee with Hallman as moderator. The committee's list-serve with 40+ organizational participants serves as a vehicle for information exchange, drafting sign-on letters, meeting announcements, shared legislative alerts.

Related to the global appeal part of this project, Hallman was responsible for producing **two statements developed for the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting**: (1) "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", a statement offered by Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International (<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptactnow>) and (2) " A Spiritual, Ethical,

and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons", a statement offered as part of NGO presentations (<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptspiritual>).

## **Personnel of Methodists United for Peace with Justice**

### **Board of Directors**

Chair: Howard W. Hallman, *Bethesda, Maryland*  
Vice Chair: Rev. Phil Wilson, *Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*  
Secretary: Charlotte Hipkins, *Massilon, Ohio*  
Treasurer: Phillip H. Miller, *Annandale, Virginia*  
Editor, Peace Leaf: Rev. James Hipkins, *Massilon, Ohio*

Camille Anders, *Tucker, Georgia*  
Rev. Joy E. Arthur, *Midland, Michigan*  
Rev. Bruce K. Edwards, *Morrison, Missouri*  
Joyce Georgieff, *Santa Ana, California*  
Sherman W. Harris, *Potomac, Maryland*  
James C. Hudson, *Alexandria, Virginia*  
Rev. John M. Mecartney, *Chelsea, Michigan*  
Rev. Shuyler Rhodes, *San Francisco, California*  
Donald C. Whitmore, *Auburn, Washington*

### **National Advisory Committee**

Richard Deats, *Nyack, New York*  
Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar, *New York, New York*  
Dr. Alan Geyer, *Bethesda, Maryland*  
Brenda Hardt, *Brenham, Texas*  
Bishop Felton Edwin May, *Washington, D.C.*  
Rev. Dean Snyder, *Washington, D.C.*  
Bishop Joseph Sprague, *Chicago, Illinois*  
Bishop Timothy W. Whitaker, *Lakeland, Florida*  
Bishop C. Dale White, *Newport, Rhode Island*  
Carol Windrum, *Omaha, Nebraska*  
Rev. Dr. J. Philip Wogaman, *Washington, D.C.*

### **Key Staff**

This project will be carried out by **Howard W. Hallman** in his roles as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice and chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

### **Education**

Born in Pittsburg, Kansas, Hallman graduated from the University of Kansas in 1950 with a B.A. (honors in political science). For his master of arts degree at KU (1951), he wrote a

thesis entitled *A Study of Gandhi's Techniques of Non-violence as Means of Affecting Political Change*.

## **Professional Career**

Hallman began his professional career working for the Bureau of Government Research, University of Kansas. He then spent 13 years engaged in housing and community improvement programs in Philadelphia and New Haven. He was associated with the War on Poverty in the 1960s. From 1969 to 1983 he headed the Civic Action Institute, which conducted research, training, and technical assistance on employment training programs, local government decentralization, citizen participation, and neighborhood self-help activities.

In 1973 Hallman was elected to the National Academy of Public Administration. In 1976 he was the principal founder of Neighborhoods, USA, a national association of neighborhood leaders and local officials, now in its 27<sup>th</sup> year. In 1980 he was a founding member and first treasurer of the National Neighborhood Coalition. He has conducted studies and made presentations in Sweden, Canada, Puerto Rico, Yugoslavia, Israel, Japan, and Turkey. He is author of more than 250 publications including nine books, such as *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis* and *Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life*.

## **Peace Activities**

Hallman has been a peace activist since his college days. He was a conscientious objector during the Korean War and performed alternative civilian service. He was chair of the Philadelphia chapter, Fellowship of Reconciliation for two years in the 1950s. He actively opposed the Vietnam War. He has also been continuously involved in civil rights activities.

In 1984 Hallman felt a call to work for nuclear disarmament. In 1986 he obtained many signers for a "Citizens' Declaration for Worldwide Nuclear Disarmament". He was unpaid coordinator of the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign in Montgomery County, Maryland (1986-89). In 1987 he was a founding member of Methodists United for Peace with Justice and has subsequently served as issues chair, treasurer, executive director, and now chair. From 1996 to 1998 Hallman was co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, affiliated with Abolition 2000. In the United States he has served as chair successively of an informal group of religious organizations supporting ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (1997), the Interfaith Group for the CTBT (1997-99), and now the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

## **Interfaith**

Hallman has been active in local churches throughout his life, usually serving on the social action committee. At the University of Kansas he was vice-president of the Student Religious Council, served as chair of Religious Emphasis Week, and was awarded the William Allen White Interfaith Fellowship Award. He also chaired the campus Civil Rights Coordinating Council. In Philadelphia he was a member of the Board of Directors, Community Service Department, Philadelphia Council of Churches. In New Haven he was on the board of the Wider City Parish (an inner city ministry). He served as chair of the Interfaith Forum on Peace and Justice of Montgomery County, Maryland (1987-1990). He was member of the Commission on

Social and Economic Justice, Interfaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington (1999-2001). He has worked to promote cooperation among denominations in the Methodist family. His wife is an ordained United Methodist minister.

For recreation Hallman plays senior softball and viola in chamber music groups.

## **Financial Information**

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a voluntary organization. Our work within Methodism is handled entirely by volunteers from the Board of the Director, including the chair in effect as part-time staff, the treasurer, the editor of *Peace Leaf*, and a board member working on Pan-Methodist connections. This work is financed by membership contributions and activity fees. In 2002 our expenditures for this segment totaled \$2,700.

Occasionally we receive small grants for the chair's interfaith activities. In 2002 for creation of the website, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org), for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we received a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, \$2,000 from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller Family, and \$700 from denominational offices for a total of \$7,700.

Currently we are seeking funds to provide fuller support for and expand our interfaith activities for nuclear disarmament. For this purpose we have adopted an annual budget of \$52,400, as shown on the next page. In this proposal we request the Ploughshares Fund for a grant of \$25,000 for each of two years, or a total of \$50,000. We have a request pending with the Rockefeller Family. We intend to apply to the Town Creek Foundation prior to its September 15 deadline. We are seeking other foundation support. We expect to obtain \$2,400 from denominational offices as contributions to maintain the website of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org).

**Budget**  
**Methodists United for Peace with Justice**

**Activities within Methodism**

Personnel -- mostly voluntary	
Chair	
Treasurer	
Editor, Peace Leaf	
Board members	
Web consultant for www.mupwj.org	\$1,200
Operations	
Administration	1,200
Communications (phone, internet, postage)	1,800
Printing, photocopy	600
Supplies	1,200
Peace Leaf	3,200
Travel	<u>1,000</u>
Annual total	\$10,200

**Interfaith Activities for Nuclear Disarmament**

Personnel	
Hallman (part time) 12 months @ \$3,000/mo.	\$36,000
Fringe benefits 15% of salary	<u>5,400</u>
	41,400
Web consultant for www.zero-nukes.org	2,400
Communications (phone, internet, postage)	3,000
Printing, photocopy	2,400
Supplies	600
Travel	<u>2,600</u>
One year total	\$52,400
Two year budget	\$104,800

Request to Ploughshares Fund:  
\$25,000/year for a two year total of \$50,000

July 2003

Dear

Thanks for your inquiry about the Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled for December 3, 2003. This meeting is primarily for representatives of 30 national organizations that have been involved in the work of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair. By error my invitation to one of this group was forwarded to a larger e-list. Regretfully we cannot accommodate a larger number because of the discussion format and space available.

However, an excellent opportunity for wider participation will occur on March 5-8, 2000 in Washington, D.C. during Ecumenical Advocacy Days for Global Peace with Justice. On Saturday, March 6 and Sunday, March 7 the Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament is sponsoring 10 hours in sessions on nuclear disarmament, including a period of preparation for lobbying visits on Capitol Hill on Monday, March 8. Initial information on this event is available at <http://www.advocacydays.org/index.html>. It will be updated as plans develop.

We will keep your name and e-address on file and send you additional information on Ecumenical Advocacy Days when our plans are further along.

Shalom,  
Howard Hallman

Dear Maureen:

I'm glad that you have agreed to be a presenter at the December 3 Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament. At the attached program schedule indicates, your topic -- Influencing the President and Executive Branch -- is the first section of the afternoon session, starting at 1:35 p.m.

We are asking you to provide an outline of alternative approaches that faith groups can use in trying to influence the President and Executive Branch officials. You might offer your preferences from the perspective of your experience in the White House, but your coverage should be broader.

In a day that will emphasize conciseness of expression, we are looking for a three to five presentation. Following your presentation we will give two pre-selected respondents an opportunity to make brief comments (two to three minutes). Then we will open the session to other participants.

It would be helpful to have in advance an outline of your presentation so that we can send it to participants ahead of time. You could even prepare a longer paper that you will have time to present if you want to.

Next Monday, November 10 at the 2:00 p.m. meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament we will be previewing strategy options that presenters will offer in the afternoon session related to the President, Congress, grassroots, and election campaign. If you have time, please join us in Room 2 of the United Methodist Building. If you can't come but have time to provide an initial draft of your outline, please send it to me.

I'm glad that you have joined our community. I look forward to working with you.

Shalom,  
Howard

“WHERE IN THE WORLD ARE WE GOING? THE PRETENSION OF  
PREEMPTION”

Lecture by the Rev. Dr. Stephen J. Sidorak, Jr. (DELIVERY VERSION)  
Executive Director, Christian Conference of Connecticut  
Chautauqua Institution  
July 24, 2003

My beloved 22 year-old son, Stephen, introduced me to “The Daily Show with Jon Stewart” which airs nightly at eleven EST on the television network Comedy Central. On the day of Baghdad’s liberation, “. . . Mr. Stewart told his viewers that “if you are incapable of feeling at least a tiny amount of joy at watching ordinary Iraqis celebrate this, you are lost to the ideological left.” Then he added: “If you are incapable of feeling badly that we even had to use force in the first place, you are ideologically lost to the right.” (He beseeched) “both of these groups to leave the room now.”” For some strange reason, I feel the same request might be in order this afternoon—for I will be discussing the intellectual and practical foundations for our war on Iraq—and thereby undoubtedly raising some ideological eyebrows. But maybe you will hear me out and stay in the “room.”

I hope today to help you understand the homework the ecumenical and interreligious communities must do in order to engage the “principalities and powers” responsibly. You will become acquainted with a number of books and their authors, a short list of titles that could be considered required reading on the subject matter of this lecture. Further, I will familiarize you with chapter and verse of official U.S. government documents pertaining to national security policy in an attempt to scare the hell out of you, wake you up to reality and equip you for a ministry of peacemaking. There will be three headings under which I will address the pretension of preemption; policy, weaponry and implications, particularly for people of faith.

I will refrain from providing any formal apologetics *vis a vis* the proper role of the Christian Church in public life until the very end of this presentation. The burden of this paper lies elsewhere. Still, at the outset, let me remind you of what Gandhi argued: “Those who say religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means.” Soon, there will be some of you who will *think* that I have stopped “preaching” religion and started “meddling” in politics. This may also make you want to leave the “room.” Instead, let me simply implore you to consider the fact that the separation of Church and State does not mean a divorce between religion and politics. Rightly understood, there should always be an inseparability of *discipleship* and *citizenship*. The Christian Church has an enduring role to unmask boldly the pretensions of the state, especially if these pretensions begin to take on idolatrous proportions. Therefore, the moral concerns of the Church cannot be separated from the security policies. Ecumenical vigilance by the Church inhibits political hubris by the State.

“One nation arms because it fears another; the other arms more because this armament alarms it; each subsidizes a third and a fourth to aid it. Two fight; all fight; none knows how to stop; a planet is stained red in a solidarity of hate and horror.” With these words written out of the terrifying experience of wars in the twentieth century,



Walter Rauschenbusch in, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, outlined the “vicious spiral of violence”

(Jonathan Schell) that continues to plague international life early in the twenty-first century. “Two fight; all fight; none knows how to stop...” We could set a new record for violence in a moment of time if ever are unleashed the weapons of mass destruction contained in the arsenals of many nations, if not yet in the possession of any terrorist groups. We seem destined to keep upping the ante of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons while constantly lowering the policy threshold for their use.

Thus, the question to ask this afternoon is that first asked by the Roman philosopher and historian Cicero, whose life, incidentally, roughly coincided (106-43 B.C.E.) with the decline of the Roman Empire, namely: “Where in the world are we going?” The answer to that question today is **we are going to war**. Even as we end one war, we are preparing for the next. Unlike no other time in any of our lifetimes, we are anxiously living through a period when “wars and rumors of wars” run rampant. The Commander in Chief betrayed as much in the unguarded answer he gave to a question posed by a reporter during the run-up to the war on Iraq: “Are we ready for war?” the reporter asked. To which President Bush responded: “With which nation?” It is as if the United States is just spoiling for its next fight. Alas, it may be as Plato lamented: “Only the dead have seen the end of war.”

The answer to Cicero’s question is clear. The world is going to war or is *already* at war because of the global war on terrorism now underway, a war, we are told “unlike any other” and apparently of “uncertain duration,” a war that covers a multitude of sins. So, let us try to understand a little bit better this afternoon “where in the world we are going.” Hegel reminded us history is what goes on behind our backs. Let us take a background look, so to speak.

The deadly combination of policy and weaponry, of new national security policy and the ongoing development of weapons systems that “shock and awe,” leads one to the conclusion that what is going on behind our backs does not bode well for the human future. Lewis Lapham, in his book, *Theater of War*, described coming to terms with the fact that he belonged “to an endangered species, never more than 30 minutes away from an appointment with extinction.” Doris Kearns Goodwin, in her book, *Wait Till Next Year*, noted: “Our generation was the first to live with the knowledge that, in a single instant, everyone and everything we knew—our family, our friends, our block, our world—could be brought to an end.” Just last year, in a June issue of *Newsweek*, George Will acknowledged, “the world may be closer to nuclear war than it was at any time during the Cold War—even October 1962.” In his newly published book, *Our Final Hour*, the Astronomer Royal of the United Kingdom, Sir Martin Rees, maintains “humanity is more at risk than at any earlier phase in its history,” and adds: “I think the odds are no better than fifty-fifty that our present civilisation on Earth will survive to the end of the present century.” If your eschatological anxiety level is rising, then you pass the reality test! Bertrand Russell believed: “Brief and powerless is man’s life; on him and all his race the slow sure doom falls pitiless and dark.” I am more hopeful.

First, let us take a look at officially declared policy. In September of 2002, the Bush administration publicly released a document entitled “*The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*” followed in December of 2002 by another document entitled “*National Security Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction.*”

When coupled with the latest, periodic “*Nuclear Posture Review*” completed previously in December of 2001, which contemplates U.S. initiation of nuclear conflict in a variety of what it calls “contingencies” with seven, count them—North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, China and Russia—seven prospective countries, one can conclude the United States has declared as official policy a doctrine of **preemption**, that is, **a readiness to resort to war without first being attacked**. It is as if Uncle Sam is keeping a “hit list” in his back pocket. Lawrence Kaplan and William Kristol were unequivocal when they brandished this estimation of our military agenda in their co-authored book, *The War Over Iraq*. “The mission begins in Baghdad, but it does not end there.” Or, as one of our nation’s capitol bumper stickers is reported to read: “Real Men March on Tehran.”

*Previously* a requirement for any armed response by our nation, *historically* an imperative of international law and *traditionally* the cornerstone criterion of the just war tradition, the old notion of not throwing the first punch, if you will, has been supplanted by this new policy of preemption, a radical departure from prior, official U.S. policy. The Bush administration argues that starting a war is justified because of the *likelihood* of a future attack. In the Commander in Chief’s own words: “America will act against...threats before they are fully formed,” with the ghosts of September 11, 2001 doubtless haunting the decision. To say that such a position is problematical on a variety of levels would be a breathtaking understatement, not the least on a moral level alone. Reinhold Niebuhr reminded us: “(W)e have been so deluded by our innocency (the idea of “America as the darling of divine providence”) that we are ill prepared to deal with the temptations of power which now assail us.” Michael Howard, in his book *The Invention of Peace*, expanded on this theme when he cautioned that “driven by moral fervour” a nation would “not overly concern itself with prudential considerations of power.” And in his book, *American Empire*, Andrew Bacevich averred: “For those fancying that a star-bangled fist ought to enforce the rules of a globalized world, the moral complications lying in wait appeared formidable. Yet at the political center of things, these concerns barely registered.”

The absence of moral deliberation about national security policy is at once inexcusable and intolerable. This paper represents but the beginning of a moral critique of our new policy. For it is my conviction that **the policy of preemption and the pretension** of it is a moral scandal worthy of the suffix “gate” being attached to it. It represents “conduct unbecoming” a great nation like ours and thus to speak of “**preemption-gate**” is to call the policy what it is, namely, a moral scandal. For the United States has come to resemble the country described by the prophet Isaiah, “a nation tall and smooth...a people feared near and far, a nation mighty and conquering....” (Isaiah 18:2b, NRSV)

The United States has declared as its official national security strategy a policy of apocalyptic potential, with Armageddon dimensions, well nigh messianic in scope. Even *The National Review* cannot contain its misgivings about preemption, inasmuch as one of its headlines read: “You can’t spell ‘messianic’ without mess.” *The New York Times* editorialized the new national security strategy “sounds more like a pronouncement that the Roman Empire or Napoleon might have produced.” We appear prepared, to paraphrase one writer, to follow Rome down the road to imperial perdition. Of the new “*National Security Strategy*,” Robert Bellah wrote that it is “the most explicit blueprint in history for world domination” and “nothing if not a description of empire.” Max Boot,

himself something an advocate for American empire, humorously recalls that Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, when asked by the network al-Jazeera “whether the United States was “empire building,”...reacted as if he’d been asked whether he wears women’s underwear. “We don’t seek empires,” Rumsfeld replied huffily. “We’re not imperialistic. We never have been.”” Apparently, the rest of the world believes otherwise, viewing the United States as “champions of hegemony,” in Joseph Nye’s terms, with a foreign policy that is “all accelerator and no brakes.” I believe with Confucius that “in politics everything should be called by its proper name.” It sure looks like the world around we are “empire-building,” and using both building blocks of it—policy and weaponry. Karl Meyer, in his book *The Dust of Empire*, speaks of our “go-it-alone arrogance” and writes “while Americans may not see themselves as an imperial people, they are so perceived across the globe.” Unless we have become utterly Machiavellian, believing that “to be feared is much safer than to be loved” and that *The Prince*, “if he has good weapons...will never lack for good friends,” we must re-examine where in the world we are going. We find ourselves in a world the Psalmist assayed, forgetting the ephemeral quality of it. “The nations have sunk in the pit that they made; in the net that they hid has their own foot been caught.” (Psalm 9:15, NRSV) Please pardon this long digression on empire but also understand that it helps put into better perspective the subject matter of this paper and sets the context for it.

The current administration believes its new national security strategy is consistent with international law, although it would be exceedingly difficult to reconcile the doctrine of preemption with Article 51 of the U.N. Charter which authorizes the use of force only in response to “armed attack,” not *likely* “armed attack.” To be sure, the “right of self defense” is recognized under international law, but not the “willingness to attack nations unilaterally even in the absence of clear provocation,” as Robert Wright summarizes the problem. **The multilateral implications of unilateral adoption of a policy of preemption have not yet been thought through.** While there is apparently precedent in international law for “anticipatory self-defense,” no consensus has been reached regarding the consequences of a world wherein *any* nation can arrogate unto itself the right to *shoot first and ask questions later*. This gave pause to Kenneth Pollack, who advanced a hard-line argument for war against Iraq in his book, *The Threatening Storm*. “In taking action against Iraq we should not set a precedent that would allow other nations to make a similar claim enabling them to take preemptive action against countries they might not like.” But what are we left with if not a world wherein nations left to their own devices are free to devise their own double standards? The Co-Chair of the bipartisan Commission on National Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the so-called Hart-Rudman Commission, former Colorado Senator Gary Hart asks a series of probing questions about a policy that **self-righteously claims for itself what it steadfastly denies to others.** “Whom do we invade and with whom do we negotiate? And if we can adopt this preemptive policy, why cannot other nations? If we can engage in preventive wars, why cannot India or Pakistan or a rather large number of other antagonists do the same thing? Wipe out your enemy now on the grounds that he may *someday* represent a threat to you.” as Hart summarizes the matter. Then he makes this recommendation. “Before we take the next step, wherever that may be (Syria? Iran? North Korea?), perhaps we should stop and take stock.” Indeed, **one crucial question to ask would be, what are**

**the moral ramifications of such a fundamental shift way from deterring conflict to starting war?**

It is no small moral matter how this unprecedented shift in policy from deterrence and containment to a doctrine of preemption or so-called preventive war could possibly be compatible with the strict ethical criteria imposed by the just war tradition. **The just war requires a moral presumption against military preemption.** The Bush Doctrine, as it has been dubbed, with its sweeping military reach and geopolitical grandiosity, represents not only a repudiation of the ethical constraints that inform the just war theory, but the governing principles which have guided U.S. defense policy since the inception of the nation, with the noteworthy exception of the wars that won the old West waged against the Native American peoples. **We are simply not a nation typically given to striking first—until now.** In the words of the Commander in Chief: “After our nation was attacked on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, America made a decision: We will not wait for our enemies to strike before we act against them.” The President reiterated this disturbing policy of nearly exclusive reliance on military preemption on the flight deck aboard the aircraft carrier USS Abraham Lincoln, where he brusquely declared: “...we will continue to hunt down the enemy before he can strike.” As the man who has the ear of the vice president, Victor Davis Hanson, intoned unctuously in his book, *An Autumn of War*: “Thank God we do not have to fight anyone like ourselves.”

**There is a presumptuousness in the policy of preemption,** a militarized demeanor that lends itself to *swaggering before* hostilities commence and *gloating after* they are finished. Granted, he was relieved of his duties after only a few weeks on the job, but the outburst of retired Army Lieutenant General Jay M. Garner upon conclusion of armed conflict in Iraq, probably reflects the attitudes of many in the current administration when he petulantly gave this advice and counsel: “Damn fellas, we ought to be beating our chests every morning. We ought to look in the mirror and get proud and suck in our bellies and stick out our chests and say, ‘Damn, we’re Americans,’ and smile.” Such incorrigible behavior is obviously oblivious to the backlash it often creates, the phenomenon our CIA calls “blowback,” the blatantly foreseeable but unintended consequences of official policy. As Chalmers Johnson advises us in his book, *Blowback*: “Even an empire cannot control the long-term effects of its policies. That is the essence of blowback.”

This new doctrine of preemption resembles more a “faith-based initiative” than a national security strategy firmly grounded in *realpolitik*. It abruptly abandons the doctrine of deterrence and blithely supersedes the policy of containment, twin concepts that served this nation well against a superpower no less, the former Soviet Union, throughout the long, tense nuclear standoff of the Cold War. The President, in his June 1, 2002 Graduation Speech at West Point, while acknowledging that deterrence and containment, in some cases “still apply,” was basically dismissive of both, saying of the former that it “means nothing” and of the latter that it is “not possible.” Surely, deterrence and containment, proven strategies of national security, cannot be cavalierly discarded for a policy legally suspect and morally repugnant, notwithstanding the numerous ethical issues attendant to deterrence and containment hitherto addressed by church leaders and others. **The policies of the present administration provide compelling proof of the tragic hubris that invariably tempts a veritable superpower, as well as damning evidence of the inveterate tendency to invite the very thing we**

**seek to avert, illustrating perfectly the old adage that in politics what begins in fear often ends in folly.** We should heed these words on “military genius” written by history’s greatest military strategist. “War,” Clausewitz wrote, “is the realm of uncertainty; three quarters of the factors on which action in war is based are wrapped in a fog of greater or lesser uncertainty.” I prefer a national security policy appreciative of what Clausewitz first called the “fog” of war, with all the questions it raises, to one that purports to have all the answers about war. The “friction in war,” defined by Clausewitz as the “difficulties” that “accumulate,” makes waging war anything but an easy undertaking. Because war is fraught with “friction,” Clausewitz was, in Bernard Brodie’s words, “averse to the compounding of maxims and axioms and to the people engaged in it.” In short, Clausewitz would most likely have been taken aback by the new national security strategy of the United States and most certainly distressed by the dogmatic pedantry of its promoters. **The increasing militarization of American foreign policy has become alarming, its growing bellicosity unmistakable, its doctrinaire intransigence troubling.** The author of the book *Empire*: Niall Ferguson, also an advocate of it, impresses upon us the revolutionary nature of the new national security policy. “The radical aspect of the doctrine is not the theory but the practice. When Mr. Bush says he is prepared to fight terror in ‘every corner of the world,’ he really can. And he really does.” Raymond Aron, in his book, *On War*, issued this reminder. “The strong are always inclined to abuse their strength. The more obvious their superiority, the more suspect they become.” For a timely illustration of this tendency, simply consider the taunting of the Iraqi resistance a few weeks ago by the Commander in Chief. “Bring ‘em on,” President Bush remarked, sounding more a middle linebacker adept at trash talk than a head of state of a great nation.

With this backdrop on policy, let us now look at weaponry, the second point of this lecture. The stunning blend of payload and precision plus the closely coordinated land, sea and air command and control of our new weapons systems affords the United States the capability to deliver massive violence right on target from virtually anywhere in the world, indeed engendering in anyone near the bull’s-eye “shock and awe.” However, we fail miserably morally, if we refuse to face the graphic facts of the sheer lethality our weapons systems can deliver upon enemy populations and the punishing damage they can inflict on the infrastructure of our foes. We need to remember how “we sanitize the cataclysmic impact of high-powered munitions upon human flesh,” as Joe Klein wrote in his *Newsweek*. And we could recall the moral judgment rendered sadly by John Bennett on the usual exercise of U.S. military might and our technological capacity to project it worldwide—“everything is permitted at a distance.”

The overall goal of the new national security strategy of the U.S., enunciated in a document released in May of 2002 entitled “*Joint Vision 2020*,” is to achieve what has been termed “full spectrum dominance,” that is, the creation of armed forces “persuasive in peace, decisive in war, preeminent in any form of conflict.” The weapons employed in the war on Iraq, their devastating destructive capabilities and the sheer havoc they can wreak by killing and destroying efficiently, offers demonstrable proof that the mission of “full spectrum dominance,” “the ability to rapidly project power worldwide,” has been successfully accomplished, certainly giving pause to any possible enemy. To be sure, the historically unprecedented military power of the United States, unrivaled by any other nation presently or any imaginable alliance of nations imminently, and its astonishing

global reach, its capacity “to defeat any adversary and control any situation across the full range of military operations,” in *Joint Vision 2020* terminology, is ample testimony to what Albert Einstein previously concluded: “It is appallingly clear that our technology has surpassed our humanity.” The Co-Chair of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, Former Georgia Senator Sam Nunn, underscored this concern when he asked: “Are our weapons driving our policy?”

The precise intention of U.S. policy is the elimination of any competition in armaments altogether. The “*Nuclear Posture Review*” states that a purpose of U.S. policy is to “discourage other countries from competing militarily” which is also trumpeted in the new “*National Security Strategy*” document where it is written: “We must build and maintain our defenses beyond challenge.” Our strategic goal is nothing if not extravagant. “Our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build-up in hopes of surpassing, or equaling, the power of the United States.” Others nations dare not even think of joining the competition, of entering this arms race. Our pledge is to **out-develop, out-deploy, out-spend and, ultimately, outrun** all the competition in terms of weapons. At the same time, we will evidently overlook the whole panoply of problems that plague the world due to the uncontrolled proliferation of weapons of mass destruction while we heedlessly build up our own arsenal of them. We will remain complicit in a global crisis largely of our own making and continue to be hypocritical about our responsibility for it. Woe unto those who would practice “WMD apartheid,” a “recipe for proliferation” and a prescription for disaster. Robert Bellah’s comment on our military superiority is worth noting: “The U.S. has enormous power, more than any nation has ever had before—probably more than it is good for any nation to have.” Similarly, Robert Kagan, in his celebrated essay “Of Paradise and Power,” draws a distinction between strong and weaker powers in the world with this cautionary note: “Those with great military power are more likely to consider force a useful tool of international relations than those who have less military power. The stronger may, in fact, rely on force more than they should.” **We rely primarily on military power at our own peril.**

When the new national security policy of the U.S. is considered in conjunction with the nascent Ballistic Missile Defense System, the “Star Wars” concept, which necessitated unilateral abrogation by the United States of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Russia, **and** in connection with the *breathless* search for a *breakthrough* weapon, including *nuclear* weapons once deemed “unthinkable” but now described as “usable,” a sneaking suspicion soon overtakes one. It begins to dawn on one that the U.S. has become entirely bent on acquiring the capability to wage war, even *nuclear* war, with impunity—spared any devastating, retaliatory nuclear strike. Our new “*National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction*” makes this patently clear. The United States “reserves the right to respond with overwhelming force—including through resort to all our options—to the use of WMD against the United States, our forces abroad, and friends and allies,” “**all our options**” being the operative euphemism for nuclear weapons. And how truly demented this mad scramble on our part to develop and deploy weapons of mass destruction on the one hand, and to weaponize space by arming the heavens in the vain hope of defending ourselves against these very kinds of weapons on the other, must look to the rest of world, or appear in the sight of God. Hear again the prophet Isaiah and his warning: “Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help; and stay

on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord!" (Isaiah 31:1, KJV) I recall the rebuke written by T. S. Eliot about humanity's propensity to attempt to solve its security quandaries by recourse to quick-fix, high-tech solutions. "They constantly try to escape/From the darkness outside and within/By dreaming of systems so perfect that no one will need/to be good." There will be no *deus ex machina* to the moral problems war perennially presents, no narrowly technological resolution to the spiritual issues war always raises. We can concur with Thomas Mann: "War is a coward's escape from the problems of peace."

**A policy of preemption and the weapons to implement it verges on the usurpation of a prerogative more divine than human, a trap set for those whose spiritual pride, moral blindness and unbridled ambition leads them to believe that they are doing the will of God when they prosecute the nation's wars.** The chief architect of the doctrine of containment, George Kennan, spoke presciently in 1949. "(A) democratic society cannot plan a preventive war. Democracy leaves no room for conspiracy in the great matters of state. But even if it were possible for democracy to lay its course deliberately toward war, I would question whether that would be the right answer....(W)e are condemned, I think, to define our objectives here in terms of what can be accomplished by measures short of war....I for one am deeply thankful that Providence has placed that particular limitation on us." Ten years later, in the May 1959 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*, Kennan underscored his concern. "... (N)ot even the greatest conviction of righteousness in our purposes absolves us from the obligation of decency in method. If we allow ourselves to copy our adversary's methods as a means of combating him, we may have lost the battle before we start...." **Our inordinate confidence in the rightness of our cause can lead us into the temptation that the policy of preemption represents—that we can do no wrong and that there is no alternative to war.** The upshot of such a policy, typified by failure in diplomacy, was poignantly depicted by Chris Hedges in his book, *War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning*. "Once we sign on for war's crusade, once we see ourselves on the side of the angels, once we embrace a theological or ideological belief system that defines itself as the embodiment of goodness and light, it is only a matter of how we will carry out murder."

In his book, *The Psychology of War*, Lawrence LeShan contends "the fog of war"...actually begins *before* the war is joined," and notes how war is "always executed far more efficiently than are any efforts to prevent war," the perfect case study now being the feeble efforts and botched diplomacy during the recent "rush to war" on Iraq, as if the United States really wanted to have its way with Iraq all along. Our leaders implemented a foreign policy largely disdainful of international reservations, wholly devoid of diplomatic imagination, and seemingly ignorant of any nonviolent alternative to war, intent on teaching Iraq a thing or two and any other nations that would care to take notice, including particularly North Korea and Iran. Early on, the Congress abdicated its Constitutional responsibility by quickly acquiescing to the administration's political stampede toward armed conflict, leaving a disturbing vacuum instead of a loyal opposition. I recall the creator of the comic strip *Boondocks*, Aaron McGruder, wryly observing: "If Bush could link the Democrats to al Qaeda, then they would vote to bomb themselves!"

All the while, the United Nations was alternately cajoled to endorse blindly U.S. policy or reviled when it flatly refused to do so, with the U.N. subsequently earning U.S. opprobrium and accusations of its irrelevance because the U.N. did not succumb to do U.S. bidding. Meanwhile, the United States has squandered most of the worldwide sympathy expressed and international goodwill extended immediately following the 9-11 terrorist attacks, perhaps fulfilling the prophecy made of the aftermath on the war on Iraq by Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak: “Instead of having one bin Laden, we will have 100 bin Ladens.” We need not despair if we feel our own perception of the problem does not appear to be widely shared. Reassuringly, Patrick Tyler claimed in *The New York Times* column he authored, “*A New Power in the Streets*,” “...(T)here may still be two superpowers on the planet: the United States and world public opinion.” **Irrespective of our opinion of the United Nations, we ought to remember the irreparable harm that might befall the nation that expresses mostly contempt for it and the bedlam that could be created without it.** We should recall Winston Churchill’s words: “The U.N. was set up not to get us to Heaven but only to save us from Hell.”

If we have grave moral doubts about the direction of national security policy, we are not alone. Indeed, as Robert McAfee Brown maintained during the Vietnam War: “...(O)ther nations detect (moral) bankruptcy in a foreign policy which can offer only military answers to political questions. They see us rejecting diplomacy in favor of force.” Nothing much may have changed over time with respect to the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, except its dramatic militarization, its “might makes right” mindlessness, its “crusading ideological approach,” as Hans Morgenthau, in his book, *Politics Among Nations*, described it. We can rest assured that there are others around who sense we may be “blundering into disaster,” to borrow a book title from Robert McNamara. **We could quite readily drift toward our own undoing and suffer the “blowback” of a policy that employs the armed forces of the United States in a wanton manner.** As “Old Man Eloquent,” the sixth President of the United States, John Quincy Adams once said of American foreign policy: “But she goes not abroad, in search of monsters to destroy....She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit....”

Let me turn your attention briefly now to the public role of the Christian Church. What took decades to build in the 1960’s and 1970’s, that is, formidable opposition to the war in Vietnam, and what took many, many years to cultivate, to wit, widespread support for civil rights, took only a matter of months this time around, namely, a remarkable ecumenical and interreligious convergence around the notion that we did not need to go to war to get what the whole world, or the better part of it, wanted—a peaceful settlement to the dangerous situation in Iraq. I take heart from universal Christian peacemaking initiatives and the momentum they attained preceding the war on Iraq. Nevertheless, far too many clergy and laity were “missing in action” as peacemakers. We can only speculate as to why they were absent from the debate and merely conjecture as to their reluctance to resist the resort to war. Far too many Christians never finished, some may not have even started, doing their national security homework, reading about what is going on—*in their name*. Worse, there were many others who were generally supportive of the war, despite their own vexing reservations about the administration’s changing rationale for it, the glaring lack of a smoking gun linking Iraq to the events of 9-11, or



conclusive evidence of Iraqi possession of weapons of mass destruction, as well as their own theological qualms about reconciling war with a Christian conscience.

Halford Luccock once remarked: “One of the striking differences between a large section of the church today and the Christian fellowship pictured in the New Testament is that the New Testament Church was *fighting something*” while “(s)o many of our churches do not know that there is any fight going on.” Luccock acknowledged what we know to be the truth: “...the church’s lips are sealed even in the presence of glaring wrong.”

The churches and their leaders, clergy and laity alike, must recover their prophetic voice and speak out against “glaring wrong” when they recognize it. I have tried today to make the case for the “glaring wrong” of our nation’s security policy and weapons systems and to get you thinking about “where in the world are we going?”

Be certain that those who espouse this insidious policy of preemption are fully aware of its divisive nature. As Deputy Secretary of Defense and prime mover of the preemption policy, Paul Wolfowitz said: “(W)e have to be willing to press controversial policies, even those that may challenge traditional norms and customs—because so much is at stake.” **Realize that a vigorous national debate on national security policy is the order of the day and that the churches should be a party to it.** Otherwise, the debate will be won by the likes of those such as Michael Ledeen, Resident Scholar in the Freedom Chair at the American Enterprise Institute, who contends: “Every ten years or so, the United States needs to pick up some crappy little country and throw it against the wall, just to show the world we mean business” or by someone such as Anne Coulter, the syndicated columnist, who, in discussing America’s enemies, in all seriousness recommends: “We should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity.” Our Commander in Chief once confessed: “I don’t see many shades of gray in this world.” But any great debate always sees “shades of gray.” **Our anxiety over terrorism has led to extremism in policy.** A Middle Eastern resident helps us appreciate the perception of others when he says of our nation: “It’s not you that we are afraid of. It is your fear that frightens us.” **The religious community must join this debate.**

Remember how backwards we’ve got everything now. In 1946, Bernard Brodie adumbrated the terms of the debate in this manner. “Thus far the chief purpose of our military establishment has been to win wars. From now on its chief purpose must be to avert them.” How in the world did we go so wrong? And what can the churches do to make things right again? **The policy of preemption represents the exact opposite of why our military exists—if we are a morally serious people.**

Be mindful, as you ask yourself the question, “where in the world are we going?” of Arnold Toynbee’s conclusions in *A Study of History* about empire and militarism—how the Greeks and the Romans “overran the world in their day, and that they too believed for a time that they were not as other men are”—how the excesses of militarism bring destruction on a nation because there is “the suicidalness” of it, of how empires collapse under the weight of their own armaments, and that “the Graeco-Roman account is our best source of potential information about what may be in store for us.” Albert Camus, who did not consider himself a Christian, nevertheless wrote eloquently about Christians. “What the world expects of Christians is that Christians should speak out, loud and clear, and that they should voice their condemnation in such a way that never a

doubt, never the slightest doubt, could rise in the heart of the simplest man. That they should get away from abstraction and confront the blood-stained face history has taken on today. The grouping we need is a grouping of (people) resolved to speak out clearly and to pay up personally.”

You now know my own view. Our arrogance of power, in the sight of God, must be seen as an abomination, a telltale sign that we are approaching what Dr. King called “spiritual death.” Human beings are fallible creatures, their judgment can become clouded, and their decisions turn disastrous. “(S)ince all have sinned and fall short...” (Romans 3:23, NRSV) In his book, *Christianity and History*, Herbert Butterfield warned: “The hardest strokes of heaven fall in history upon those who imagine that they control things in a sovereign manner, as though they were kings of the earth, playing Providence not only for themselves but for the far future—reaching out into the future with the wrong kind of far-sightedness, and gambling on a lot of risky calculations in which there must never be a single mistake.” Shakespeare spoke of our all too human penchant for folly. “...but man, proud man,/Drest in a little brief authority/Most ignorant of what he’s most assured.../Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven/As to make the angels weep.”

I believe it is imperative for church leaders to provide an alternative vision of “the things that make for peace”—and justice. **We dare not try to get even with evil people lest we only end up looking more like them.** As David Bromwich, editor of the book *On Empire, Liberty and Reform* by Edmund Burke, emphasized: “The fate of many nations depends on our ability to declare no more enemies than we have and to create no more enemies than we must.” We should never, Saint Augustine admonished us, fight evil as if it were something that arose entirely outside of ourselves. There is indeed an “axis of evil” but it is hardly Iraq, Iran and North Korea. A far more likely trio, as William Sloane Coffin submitted, would be “environmental degradation, pandemic poverty and a world awash with weapons.” Awakening to the existence of this “axis of evil” assumes the requisite determination to end it. Thus, of religious leaders a new energy will be demanded, “an eagerness for the fray” will be required, to the end a rebirth of ecumenical activism and interreligious engagement will emerge in America’s public life that joins moral courage to political will, convinced with Kierkegaard, that a person of faith makes her or his way through this warring, unjust world always “polemically poised.”

There is a battle going on for the hearts and minds of *every* American and the Church must join it, battling for the heart and mind of *each* Christian. There cannot be a Church triumphant unless there is first a Church militant. **We cannot possibly be servants of God if we remain slaves to pharaoh.**

Thank you very much.

Dear Colleagues,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet at 2:00 p.m., Monday, November 10 in Room 2, United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

We will talk about (1) current legislation, (2) the December 3 Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament, (3) Ecumenical Advocacy Days 2004, and (4) a global appeal on nuclear disarmament.

Attached is the program for the December 3 Consultation. We are getting a good response from our invitation to participate. At our November 10 meeting we will talk about the flow of the Consultation and the outcome we are trying to achieve. We will have a preview of action strategies to be considered on December 3 related to the President, Congress, grassroots, and the election campaign.

Also attached is a proposed outline for the Nuclear Disarmament Track of Ecumenical Advocacy Days 2004 that Rich Killmer and I have developed for your consideration. Among other things we offer a pair of options for the second half of the opening plenary: a debate or a power point overview of issues.

I'll write to you about the global appeal in a couple of days.

If you can't come to the November 10 meeting and have comments to offer on these matters, please let me know or reply to all.

If you can't handle Word attachments, tell me and I'll paste the two documents onto an e-mail message.

Shalom,  
Howard

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a nonprofit corporation, established under laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. The corporation has status as a 501(c)(4) organization under the Internal Revenue Code. We have established the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, which the Internal Revenue Service has recognized as a 501(c)(3) organization and a public foundation under section 509(a)(1). We are submitting IRS letters by U.S mail.

September 10, 2003

Ms. Christine B. Shelton, Executive Director  
Town Creek Foundation  
121 N. West Street  
Easton, MD 21601

Dear Ms. Shelton:

When I inquired in April whether you might consider a grant request from Methodists United for Peace with Justice for our interfaith work for nuclear disarmament, you discouraged me from submitting a full proposal. Nevertheless, I have decided to submit a proposal for your current round of grant making for two reasons.

First, I have been working for nuclear disarmament for twenty years. I'm not easily discouraged, even against improbable odds. Second, there are new developments that you might want to consider.

That's why we are submitting a request for a grant of \$25,000 in support and enhance our catalytic leadership role in bringing together the faith community for cooperative action for nuclear disarmament. This occurs (1) through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, and (2) through a new global, interfaith initiative calling for states possessing nuclear weapons to unequivocally renounce all use and move toward elimination of their nuclear arsenal.

I'm glad that you are supporting FCNL and the Churches' Center NR/DI campaign. I work closely with David Culp and Rich Killmer. I know they are doing great work. Indeed, we are partners in several endeavors. What they do is strengthened and broadened by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament because it enables them to function within a wider coalition.

Under my leadership the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is gearing up for a renewed push for nuclear disarmament in 2004. We have scheduled a major Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament for December 3 to bring together leadership of denominational offices and religious peace fellowships. The purpose is to develop strategies for 2004 and to gain commitments for follow-through. This is described in the grant proposal. Secondly, we are sponsoring a nuclear disarmament track in Ecumenical Advocacy Days 2004 that will bring grassroots activists to

Ms. Christine B. Shelton  
September 10, 2003  
Page two.

Washington, D.C. next March. Individual offices, including those you fund, cannot undertake such efforts by themselves. The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament makes it possible.

The second component of our proposal deals with "An Interfaith Appeal for Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons." This Appeal affirms that nuclear weapons are immoral, that possessor states should renounce all use of nuclear weapons and expeditiously eliminate their nuclear arsenals. Building upon my previous international work, I am developing this appeal in cooperation with staff from the World Council of Churches, Pax Christi International, World Conference of Religions for Peace (which reaches diverse faiths), National Council of Churches (USA), Canadian Council of Churches, Conference of European Churches, and Churches Together in Britain and Ireland. With this beginning we will reach out to get signatures from religious leaders of many faiths throughout the world. This will be followed by religious leaders calling upon heads of states possessing nuclear weapons (or their representatives) to press the demand for renunciation and elimination of nuclear weapons.

We are the catalyst for both components. Town Creek support for our leadership role would have a multiplier effect by helping to mobilize broad interfaith action for nuclear disarmament.

What we intend to do is described in detail in our application. If you need further information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

# A Proposal to the Town Creek Foundation from Methodists United for Peace with Justice

## Our Organization, Goals and Objectives

Methodists United for Peace with Justice organized in 1987 as a national association of laity and clergy. Stimulation for organizing was the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Since then the quest for global nuclear disarmament has been our major focus. Our work combines a **prophetic vision** for the long-term goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and **focused advocacy** of short-term and intermediate steps toward this goal.

We began our efforts **within Methodism** where we work with national and regional church bodies in the United States, publish a quarterly bulletin, *Peace Leaf*, and send out *Peace/Justice Alerts* (see [www.mupwj.org](http://www.mupwj.org)). We are **coalition oriented** and work closely with other religious organizations and with civil sector organizations. Since the mid-1990s we have taken a **leadership role** in religious coalition activities for nuclear disarmament. This is now expressed through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which is chaired by our chair, Howard W. Hallman. We also work **globally** with religious organizations in other countries and with international religious organizations. This proposal deals with our coalition and global activities.

## Our Financial Status

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a voluntary organization. Our work within Methodism is handled entirely by volunteers from the Board of Directors. This includes the chair in effect as part-time staff, the treasurer, the editor of *Peace Leaf*, and a board member working on Pan-Methodist connections. This work is financed by membership contributions and activity fees. In 2002 our expenditures for this segment totaled \$2,700.

Occasionally we receive small grants for the chair's interfaith activities. In 2002 for creation of the website, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org), for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we received a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, \$2,000 from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller Family, and \$700 from denominational offices for a total of \$7,700.

## Need for Support

Mostly through voluntary efforts we have developed a major leadership role in interfaith action for nuclear disarmament. This is expressed in the two components for which we are seeking financial support: (1) expanding the work of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and (2) mobilizing world religious leaders in a demand for global elimination of nuclear weapons. Grant funds are needed to support these two interfaith activities. Our work within Methodism will continue to be financed by our own resources, including volunteers.

## Project Goals

This project has two goals, one pragmatic with a close-term focus and the other more prophetic with a longer-range perspective:

- 1) **To provide catalytic leadership for cooperative interfaith action in the United States** (a) to oppose current retrogression on nuclear weapon policies and (b) to strengthen national and grassroots support for specific steps that lead toward nuclear disarmament.
- 2) **To promote prophetic global leadership by religious leaders and religious organizations** directed at getting nuclear weapon states and other possessors to renounce all uses of nuclear weapons and to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

## Strategies

### Goal One: Interfaith Mobilization (pragmatic)

The first part of this project is designed to support and enhance the catalytic leadership role that our chair, Howard Hallman, provides for the **Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**. This is a Washington-based coalition that has evolved from an informal group that Hallman put together in 1997 to foster interfaith action in support of Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. This grew into the Interfaith Group for the CTBT that he chaired from 1997 to 1999 to mobilize the faith community in support of Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

This was transformed in 2000 into the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament as a coalition of denominational offices, peace fellowships, and other religious associations. By choice it has no charter or by-laws. Hallman serves as chair by consensus rather than formal election. There are no other officers. The Interfaith Committee meets monthly in a conference room in the United Methodist Building, just across from the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C. Although there is no formal membership, 39 organizations (listed in Appendix A) have an active relationship with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, shown by signing letters to public officials and participating in other coalition activities. (For a sample of letters see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#interfaithcommittee>.)

**Cooperative action.** The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament functions as a cooperative endeavor to enable religious organizations to work together on matters related to nuclear weapons and their elimination. Particular focus is upon current legislation and pending executive decisions. Different organizations step up to leadership roles on different issues. The lead organization provides timely information on legislative and executive decision-making. It offers background information and shares action alerts.

Currently in this mode of **shared responsibility** within the faith community, David Culp of the Friends Committee on National Legislation is providing leadership to oppose attempts to develop new nuclear weapons, such as bunker busters and mini-nukes. Rich Killmer of the Churches' Center for Public Policy provides connections with the Urgent Call to Reduce Nuclear Danger. Catherine Gordon of the Presbyterian Washington Office helps with linkages to the network of official denominational units. From the civic sector Brian Finlay of the Nuclear Threat Reduction Program keeps the Interfaith Committee informed on this issue and



recommends timely action. In the past when de-alerting was a major issue we had an active relationship with Back from the Brink. Hallman is maintaining ties with organizations in the civil sector community which are still working for de-alerting and for deeper cuts in strategic nuclear weapons. This project will sustain and strengthen these cooperative relationships.

**Grassroots mobilization.** This mode of cooperation enables religious organizations to share information on current issues for grassroots outreach. For example, during the past several months David Culp has identified key congressional districts and states where grassroots action is needed to influence swing votes on new nukes issues. Each organization then chooses whether to communicate with its grassroots constituents in those locations.

Earlier during the CTBT ratification campaign the interfaith community was better organized to coordinate grassroots activities in key states. This was made possible by having a person responsible for grassroots coordination, a role fulfilled by Marie Rietmann from the staff of 20/20 Vision. To fill this void the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is exploring whether Rich Killmer could take on this task as an extension of the grassroots work he is doing with the Urgent Call to Reduce Nuclear Danger.

**List-serve.** To facilitate communication the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament operates a list-serve for representatives of 40+ organizations. Howard Hallman serves as moderator. We use the list serve for meeting announcements, circulation of drafts of sign-on letters, and sharing information. Regularly David Culp shares FCNL action alerts through the list serve. 20/20 Vision uses the list-serve to recruit co-sponsors from religious community for postcard mailings. On occasion Hallman forwards action alerts and sign-on letters from the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability on issues related to nuclear weapon production. He also forwards special analyses coming from the Council for a Livable World, the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, and other civil sector organizations on such matters as missile defense and arms control treaties. Currently we are using the list-serve in designing a December 3 Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament and the nuclear disarmament track for Ecumenical Advocacy Days 2004 (see below). In this project we will broaden participation in the list-serve by more denominational offices and religious peace fellowships. We will encompass a broader range of topics related to nuclear disarmament.

**Website.** During the past year the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament created a website, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). It is co-sponsored by 12 denominational offices. Howard Hallman serves as moderator. The website has two functions: (1) provide a repository for statements and reports on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, international bodies, and civil sector organizations; and (2) serve as a forum for presentation and discussion of ideas on how to achieve zero nuclear weapons.

As an extension of its focus on nuclear disarmament issues, the website was used during the past year for providing linkage to statements by religious organizations opposing military action against Iraq and favoring alternative methods to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero3-disarmingiraq.html>.)

In this project we will expand the section of website devoted to presentation of scenarios on how to get to zero nuclear weapons. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero4.htm>.)

We will promote greater dialogue on these proposed scenarios. We will use the website as a tool for coalition building with civil sector organizations.

**Strategic planning.** To prepare for a renewed effort to halt new nuclear weapons and to push harder for nuclear disarmament in 2004, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is planning an Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament for December 3, 2003. This will involve not only staff actively working on nuclear disarmament issues but also heads of Washington offices, staff from denominational headquarters who make decisions on organizational priorities, representatives of religious peace fellowships, and persons from state religious coalitions working for nuclear disarmament. The Consultation schedule is shown in Appendix B.

**Interfaith advocacy.** In response to a proposal from the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, nuclear disarmament will be a major track in Ecumenical Advocacy Days for Global Peace with Justice, scheduled for March 5-8, 2004 (see [www.AdvocacyDays.org](http://www.AdvocacyDays.org)). Saturday, March 6 will be spent in workshops on substance of the issue, Sunday, March 7 will provide training for advocacy, March 8 will feature lobby visits on Capitol Hill. This will provide an opportunity to bring grassroots advocates to Washington as part of a broader interfaith effort. Altogether there will be ten hours of training on nuclear disarmament, plus time spent on lobby visits.

**Role of the chair.** In functioning as a cooperative endeavor the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament tends to be non-hierarchical in character. Different organizations take the lead for different tasks. However, there is a need for someone to keep the coalition on track, to facilitate communication, to coordinate when appropriate, to provide initiative leadership when necessary, but not to boss. This role is fulfilled by the chair. For Howard Hallman, the current chair, nuclear disarmament is the primary issue he is working on. He maintains relationships with civil sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. As the next section explains he also has connections with global religious networks.

## **Goal Two: Global Initiative (prophetic)**

**Background.** In 1998 the Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, presented a statement entitled "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition" to the **NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva**. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptactnow>.) The statement was co-signed by 42 religious leaders from 12 countries. It was initiated and drafted by Howard Hallman, serving as co-chair of the Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000. Other co-chairs were Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA and Ibrahim Ramey of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels also hosted a reception for PrepCom delegates that Hallman arranged.

Also for the 1998 PrepCom meeting Hallman developed an NGO statement entitled "A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons", which was presented to the delegates by Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptspiritual>.)

In 2000 Hallman participated in **A Consultation of Churches on Nuclear Policy** in Brussels with a particular focus on NATO. This involved persons from the World Council of Churches, Conference of European Churches, Canadian Council of Churches, National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, and Pax Christi International. This led to delegation visits to top officials of NATO states to encourage them and NATO as a whole "to conform to the obligations undertaken in the Non-Proliferation Treaty."

In a like manner **religious delegations called upon top officials** in a number of nations in the fall of 2002 and winter of 2003 to advocate dealing with Iraq without going to war. Although we weren't part of these delegation visits, we note the utility of this method for advocating nuclear disarmament.

**Global Appeal.** Building upon his international contacts in the faith community and upon observation of the experience with delegation visits, Howard Hallman has initiated a two step process to press for global nuclear disarmament. This is the second part of the project for which we are requesting financial assistance.

The first step is "**An Interfaith Appeal for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.**" A work in progress, the fifth draft is presented in Appendix C. It calls upon all possessors of nuclear weapons "to unequivocally renounce the use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance" and "to eliminate their nuclear arsenals" through appropriate steps. This goes beyond "no first use" to "no use".

Initially we are seeking endorsement from the World Council of Churches, Pax Christi International, Conference of European Churches, Churches Together in Britain and Ireland, National Council of Churches (USA), Canadian Council of Churches, and World Conference on Religion and Peace. The latter will be particularly valuable in outreach to faith groups beyond the Christian community as we invite signatures by religious leaders in various countries around the globe.

Recognizing that the **Holy See** rarely signs joint statements, we are encouraging the Holy See's representative to the United Nations to make a parallel statement in its annual presentation to the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. (For previous statements see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#holysee>.) For this purpose Pax Christi International is approaching the Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace. Canadian Senator Doug Roche, who represented the Holy See at the 1998 NPT PrepCom, has agreed to talk with the Vatican representative to the United Nations. Beyond seeking parallel action by the Holy See, there will be many Catholic signers of the Interfaith Appeal, gained through Pax Christi International and Pax Christi USA.

At its November 2003 meeting the **U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops** will observe the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the papal encyclical, *Peace on Earth*, and the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, that dealt with the nuclear crisis. That same month the **General Assembly, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.** holds its annual meeting, offering another opportunity to speak out for nuclear disarmament. We hope that these two meetings will help build momentum for increased attention to nuclear disarmament by the faith community.

We also intend to urge **Pugwash, IPPNW, and women's organizations** to develop international statements by scientists, physicians, and women calling for renunciation of nuclear weapons and prompt action for their elimination. This builds upon contacts we have made in requesting scenarios for how to get zero nuclear weapons for posting on [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Working in parallel in this manner pulls in other networks but avoids an extremely difficult, time-consuming attempt to get agreement on a multi-sector statement.

The second and most important step in this global initiative is to **form international delegations of religious leaders to call upon the heads of nations possessing nuclear weapons**, or their representatives, to press the case for renunciation of nuclear weapons and to demand action for their elimination. This is the central focus of this global endeavor and differentiates this project from those that merely release public statements and hope for results.

Beyond international delegations we will **encourage religious coalitions within specific nations** to call on their governments to renounce nuclear weapons. In the United States this will involve the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and the participating denominations and faith bodies.

An Interfaith Appeal for Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons is in its early stage. The formation of delegations lies in the future. Financial assistance to Methodists United for Peace with Justice to support the work of Howard Hallman will enable this initiative to advance.

## **Action Plan and Timeline**

The timeline for the work of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is as follows:

Fall 2003	Continue to work on legislative issues before Congress
December 3, 2003	Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament
Jan-Oct 2004	Advocacy on nuclear disarmament issues before Congress
Jan-Nov 2004	Encourage local religious groups to raise nuclear disarmament issues in a non-partisan manner during the 2004 election campaign
March 5-8, 2004	Nuclear disarmament track during Ecumenical Advocacy Days
Nov or Dec 2004	Consultation to plan strategies for 2005

For "An Interfaith Appeal for Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons" we are feeling our way as we seek support from diverse international and national religious organizations. The approximate timeline is as follows:

Sept-Oct 2003	Gain initial signers
Oct-Nov	Obtain signatures of religious leaders from around the world
Nov or Dec	Public release of the Appeal
Jan-Mar 2004	Interfaith delegations call upon leaders of states possessing nuclear weapons

## **Outcomes Expected and Methods for Evaluation**

A. The success of the project related to **interfaith work in the United States** will be measured by the following benchmarks:

- 1) Holding the Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament in December with 40 to 50 participants and coming up with agreement on coherent strategies for advocacy in Washington and grassroots mobilization for 2004.
- 2) Participation in the Ecumenical Advocacy Days for Global Peace with Justice in March 2004 and drawing in at least 60 participants from state and local religious coalitions.
- 3) Selection of target states and congressional districts for mobilizing grassroots action during the next session of Congress.
- 4) Organization of grassroots interfaith cooperation in these target areas.
- 5) Drawing ten more national religious organizations into the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.
- 6) Expansion of the How to Get to Zero page of [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) by adding at least 25 new scenarios from recognized civil sector experts.

It should be noted that achieving the first four benchmarks will rely upon our ability to provide catalytic leadership that results in action by numerous coalition partners. Howard Hallman will be personally responsible for achieving the last two benchmarks..

B. The success of the part of the project related to **the global appeal** will be measured by these benchmarks:

- 1) Issuance of "An Interfaith Appeal for Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons" that is signed by important international and national religious leaders of major faiths and from every inhabited continent.
- 2) Parallel statements from the Catholic hierarchy and from major civil sector organizations.
- 3) Interfaith delegations calling on top leaders of states possessing nuclear weapons.
- 4) Follow up visits by delegations from religious organizations within these states.
- 5) Subsequent efforts to influence public opinion and public policies in these states.
- 6) Indications of changes in public policy in one or more of these states.

## **Appendix A**

### **Religious Organizations Participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**

Alliance of Baptists  
American Baptist Churches, National Ministries  
American Friends Service Committee  
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America  
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)  
Church of the Brethren General Board  
Church Women United  
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men  
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship  
Disciples Peace Fellowship  
Episcopal Church, USA  
Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America  
Evangelicals for Social Action  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Leadership Conference of Women Religious  
Marianist, New York Province, Office of Justice and Peace  
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns  
Mennonite Central Committee  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
F. Francis Murphy Justice and Peace Initiative  
Muslim Peace Fellowship  
National Council of Churches  
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby  
Pax Christi USA  
Presbyterian Church, USA  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities  
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas  
Sister of St. Joseph of Peace  
Sojourners  
Unitarian Universalist Association  
United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries  
United Methodist Council of Bishops  
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society  
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops  
World Peacemakers

**Appendix B**  
**Interfaith Consultation for Nuclear Disarmament**  
**December 3, 2003**  
**United Methodist Building, Washington, D.C.**

**Gathering**

9:30 a.m. Sign-in, continental breakfast  
9:55 In your seats

**Setting the Stage**

10:00 Welcome

*Invocation*

Outline of day

10:10 Theological Themes

Presenter -- Barbara Green, Churches Center for Theology and Public Policy

**Key Issues**

10:30 Nuclear weapons doctrine of Bush Administration

Presenter -- Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists

11:00 Proposals for new nuclear weapons (including testing)

Presenter -- David Culp, Friends Committee on National Legislation

11:30 Reducing nuclear dangers (de-alerting, deep cuts, nuclear threat reduction)

Presenter -- Laura Holgate, Nuclear Threat Initiative

12:00 noon *Blessing for lunch*

Break

12:15 p.m. **Luncheon**

Speaker: "A Political Perspective" Senator Carl Levin invited

**ACTION STRATEGIES**

**Focusing on Decision Makers**

1:30 President and Executive Branch

2:00 Congress

2:30 Break

**Building the Base for Action**

2:40 Grassroots Organizing

3:10 2004 Election Campaign

3:30 Break

**Mobilizing the Religious Community**

3:40 Increasing Priority for Nuclear Disarmament

4:10 Making Commitments

*Benediction*

4:30 Adjourn

**Appendix C**  
**An Interfaith Appeal for the**  
**Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons**  
**Fifth Draft: Not for Circulation**

Weapons of mass destruction -- nuclear, chemical, and biological -- pose a grave danger for planet Earth and its inhabitants. These are weapons that kill indiscriminately and produce lasting effects. Here we address nuclear weapons, the most destructive of the triad.

**We the undersigned believe that nuclear weapons are inherently immoral.** If used, nuclear weapons would inevitably kill thousands, possibly millions, of innocent people. They would cause devastating harm to the environment near and far. Multiple use would endanger the existence of life on Earth. Even so-called "mini-nukes" would have disastrous effects. Threatened use of nuclear weapons in the name of deterrence is morally wrong because it holds innocent people hostage for political and military purposes.

**Therefore, as a matter of conscience we call for the global elimination of nuclear weapons.**

**Respected military leaders have indicated that nuclear weapons are not practical instruments for warfare.** They point out that the destructive power is too vast for appropriate military purposes. They too are concerned about ancillary effects that harm innocent people and the environment. They recognize the adverse political consequences in the use of nuclear weapons. For these reasons these military leaders favor the elimination of nuclear weapons.

**Continued possession of nuclear weapons by a few privileged nations gives them legitimacy and encourages other nations and terrorist organizations to acquire them.** Emerging U.S. policy to develop new kinds of nuclear weapons and to envision new roles seriously increases this danger. It is imperative for the nuclear weapon states to honor their obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970 and achieve complete nuclear disarmament. Non-signatory states possessing nuclear weapons should likewise eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

Because nuclear weapons are immoral and ultimately impractical, **we call upon all who have nuclear weapons to unequivocally renounce the use of their nuclear arsenals against any adversary at any time under any circumstance.**

To go with renunciation of use, **we call upon the possessor nations to move immediately to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals** through such steps as:

- Quickly remove all existing nuclear weapons from alert status.
  - Cease all further research, testing, development, and production of new nuclear weapons.
- Dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles.
- Make all nuclear components and fissile material unusable as nuclear weapons.

**We call upon all who have ambitions to develop or acquire nuclear weapons to cease this quest.**



**We call upon the international community to carry out an enhanced nuclear non-proliferation program to prevent any nation or organization from developing or acquiring nuclear weapons.**

## **Recommendations to Possessors of Nuclear Weapons**

To carry out the principles of our Appeal, we offer specific recommendations to states possessing nuclear weapons and to would-be possessors.

We call upon the **United States** and **Russia**, which led the way in the nuclear arms race, to lead the way in the elimination of nuclear weapons. With their huge arsenals each judges the other capable of attacking with a mighty force. Each therefore retains a huge nuclear arsenal on high alert, thus continuing the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). The way out of this bind is through mutual adoption of a no-use policy followed by prompt de-alerting of all deployed nuclear weapons and complete dismantlement of their nuclear arsenals. This total task should be completed no later than 2012, the time frame established by the Moscow Treaty of 2002. In the meantime we call upon the United States and Russia to cease all research, development, testing, and production of new nuclear weapons.

We call upon the **United Kingdom, France, and China** to follow the example of South Africa, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus and unilaterally dismantle their nuclear weapons. We believe that their nuclear arsenals have no legitimate utility and indeed provide targets for pre-emptive attack. Therefore, nuclear disarmament would increase rather than diminish their national security.

We call upon **India** and **Pakistan** to mutually adopt a no-use policy for their nuclear weapons, to eliminate the ones they possess along with production facilities, and to lead the way to a South Asia nuclear weapon free zone.

We call upon **Israel** to eliminate its nuclear arsenal, achieving this objective along with a just peace with the Palestinians and with the creation of a Middle East weapons of mass destruction free zone.

We call upon **North Korea** and **Iran** to follow the example of Brazil, Argentina, South Korea, and Taiwan and cease all efforts to produce nuclear weapons and accept international safeguards.

We call upon **NATO** to cease its commitment to nuclear weapons. We ask the **United Kingdom, Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Turkey** to withdraw their consent for having U.S. nuclear weapons based upon their soil. We favor the creation of a European nuclear weapon free zone.

Signed by religious leaders from around the globe.

## Background Material

The following references provide background material for the " Interfaith Appeal for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons".

**1. Religious statements.** A compilation of previous religious statements on eliminating nuclear weapons is available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>.

**2. Military leaders views.** Ideas of military leaders are offered in a "Statement by International Generals and Admirals" (1996) at <http://www.gsinsitute.org/archives/000014.shtml>. Other statements by military leaders are available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/militaryleaders.html>.

**3. A joint statement** of religious and military leaders (2000) is found at <http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>.

**4. Civilian leaders views.** A steady stream of scientists, public officials, and other civilian leaders have advocated nuclear disarmament. They include

"Statement by International Civilian Leaders" (1998)

<http://www.gsinsitute.org/archives/000015.shtml>

" Statement By International Mayors, Nuclear Weapons: Threat to Cities" (2001)

<http://www.gsinsitute.org/archives/000021.shtml>

" Final Statement of the Third Global Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates" (2002)

<http://www.gsinsitute.org/archives/000141.shtml>

Reports and Statements by Scientists on Nuclear Weapons

<http://www.pugwash.org/reports/nw/nwlist.htm>

**5. Nuclear weapons convention.** One way to achieve global nuclear disarmament would be through a Nuclear Weapons Convention, analogous to conventions on biological and chemical weapons. A proposal for a "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Testing, Production, Stockpiling, Transfer, Use and Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons and on Their Elimination " is available at <http://www.lcnp.org/mnwc/convention.htm>

**6. Sequential Steps.** Another approach would be to embark upon a series of steps that would lead to elimination of nuclear weapons. During the past ten years several international bodies have pursued this approach. They include:

Canberra Commission, 1996

<http://www.gsinsitute.org/archives/000007.shtml>

New Agenda Coalition, 1998

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#newagendacoalition>

Tokyo Forum, 1999

<http://www.nuclearfiles.org/redocuments/1999/990725facingnucleardangers.html>

2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#npt>

**7. Bunker-buster nuclear weapons.** Scientific analysis of the effects of bunker-buster nuclear weapons is available from the Union of Concerned Scientists at [http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_security/nuclear\\_weapons/page.cfm?pageID=1170](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_security/nuclear_weapons/page.cfm?pageID=1170).

# Fiscal and Administrative Information

## Budget

### Methodists United for Peace with Justice

#### Activities within Methodism (2003)

##### Personnel -- mostly voluntary

Voluntary work of chair, treasurer, editor of *Peace Leaf*,  
other board members

Web consultant for [www.mupwj.org](http://www.mupwj.org) \$1,200

##### Operations

Administration 1,200

Communications (phone, internet, postage) 1,800

Printing, photocopy 600

Supplies 1,200

Peace Leaf 3,200

Travel 1,000

Annual total \$10,200

#### Interfaith Activities for Nuclear Disarmament (Project Proposal)

##### Personnel

Hallman (part time) 12 months @ \$3,000/mo. \$36,000

Fringe benefits 15% of salary 5,400

41,400

Web consultant for [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) 2,400

Communications (phone, internet, postage) 3,000

Printing, photocopy 2,400

Supplies 600

Travel 2,600

One year total \$52,400

#### Request to Town Creek Foundation: \$25,000

Grant would go to Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) entity.  
IRS letters attached.s

#### Explanation of Budget

Salary: Howard Hallman will work 60% of his time on this project @\$3,000/month

Web consultant: Marie Kayser (see [www.twotonedeyes.com](http://www.twotonedeyes.com))

Project travel: One trip to Europe in connection with "An Interfaith Appeal". Travel to New York City and other locales in the United States.

## **Fiscal Information**

The 2002 financial report of Methodists United for Peace with Justice is attached.

### **Grants received in 2002** (all for creation of [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) website)

United Methodist General Board of Church and Society	\$5,000
Anonymous member of Rockefeller Family	2,000
Denominational offices	<u>700</u>
	\$7,700

### **Grants received to date in 2003**

Denominational offices	\$1,000
------------------------	---------

### **Pending grant requests**

Ploughshares Fund for two-year grant for interfaith activities	\$50,000
--	----------

## **Organizational Capacity**

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a nonprofit corporation, established in 1987 under laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. The corporation has status as a 501(c)(4) organization under the Internal Revenue Code. We have established the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, which the Internal Revenue Service has recognized as a 501(c)(3) organization and a public foundation under section 509(a)(1). IRS letters are attached.

As a mostly voluntary organization we have very low overhead. The chair works from his home at minimal cost to Methodists United for Peace with Justice (phone, Internet services, postage, supplies). Likewise the treasurer and editor of *Peace Leaf* work from their homes. We receive our mail at Foundry United Methodist Church, 1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, D.C. and hold our annual board meeting there. Board members pay their own travel expenses. Some stay with local hosts when attending board meetings.

Although support for our work within Methodism is not part of this project proposal, it is what gives us our basic legitimacy. We publish a quarterly bulletin, *Peace Leaf*, which goes by U.S. mail and e-mail to Methodists around the country (recent issues are attached and are found at <http://www.mupwj.org/peaceleaf.htm>). We use the official list-serve of peace with justice coordinators from United Methodist conferences around the country to send up-to-date information about legislative issues and other information related to nuclear disarmament. At the policy level we are responsible for getting the quadrennial United Methodist General Conference to adopt strong policy statements on nuclear abolition, the latest being an 2000 resolution entitled "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" that calls for states possessing nuclear weapons to "renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons" and take steps for their elimination. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#sayingno>).

As our name "Methodists United" indicates, we seek to help overcome historic racial separation within Methodism by encouraging activities that deal with common concerns. Within the past year we have begun working on children's issues with four Pan-Methodist denominations: African Methodist Episcopal Church, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church,

Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, and United Methodist Church. Currently we are helping develop a plan to bring laity and clergy from these four denominations in Maryland and Virginia to Washington for a Wednesday-in-Washington under the auspices of the Children's Defense Fund. We are hoping that relationships established in this endeavor will enable us to encourage the predominantly African-American Methodist denominations to become more active on nuclear disarmament issues.

Our interfaith work for nuclear disarmament and our involvement with civic sector organizations on this issue is detailed in our grant proposal.

### **Board of Directors**

Chair: Howard W. Hallman, *Bethesda, Maryland*  
Vice Chair: Rev. Phil Wilson, *Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*  
Secretary: Charlotte Hipkins, *Massilon, Ohio*  
Treasurer: Phillip H. Miller, *Annandale, Virginia*  
Editor, Peace Leaf: Rev. James Hipkins, *Massilon, Ohio*

Camille Anders, *Tucker, Georgia*  
Rev. Joy E. Arthur, *Midland, Michigan*  
Rev. Bruce K. Edwards, *Morrison, Missouri*  
Joyce Georgieff, *Santa Ana, California*  
Sherman W. Harris, *Potomac, Maryland*  
James C. Hudson, *Alexandria, Virginia*  
Rev. John M. Mecartney, *Chelsea, Michigan*  
Rev. Shuyler Rhodes, *San Francisco, California*  
Donald C. Whitmore, *Auburn, Washington*

### **National Advisory Committee**

Richard Deats, *Nyack, New York*  
Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar, *New York, New York*  
Dr. Alan Geyer, *Bethesda, Maryland*  
Brenda Hardt, *Brenham, Texas*  
Bishop Felton Edwin May, *Washington, D.C.*  
Rev. Dean Snyder, *Washington, D.C.*  
Bishop Joseph Sprague, *Chicago, Illinois*  
Bishop Timothy W. Whitaker, *Lakeland, Florida*  
Bishop C. Dale White, *Newport, Rhode Island*  
Carol Windrum, *Omaha, Nebraska*  
Rev. Dr. J. Philip Wogaman, *Washington, D.C.*

## **Key Staff**

This project will be carried out by **Howard W. Hallman** in his roles as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice and chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

## **Education**

Born in Pittsburg, Kansas, Hallman graduated from the University of Kansas in 1950 with a B.A. (honors in political science). For his master of arts degree at KU (1951), he wrote a thesis entitled *A Study of Gandhi's Techniques of Non-violence as Means of Affecting Political Change*.

## **Professional Career**

Hallman began his professional career working for the Bureau of Government Research, University of Kansas. He then spent 13 years engaged in housing and community improvement programs in Philadelphia and New Haven. He was associated with the War on Poverty in the 1960s. From 1969 to 1983 he headed the Civic Action Institute, which conducted research, training, and technical assistance on employment training programs, local government decentralization, citizen participation, and neighborhood self-help activities.

In 1973 Hallman was elected to the National Academy of Public Administration. In 1976 he was the principal founder of Neighborhoods, USA, a national association of neighborhood leaders and local officials, now in its 27<sup>th</sup> year. In 1980 he was a founding member and first treasurer of the National Neighborhood Coalition. He has conducted studies and made presentations in Sweden, Canada, Puerto Rico, Yugoslavia, Israel, Japan, and Turkey. He is author of more than 250 publications including nine books, such as *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis* and *Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life*.

## **Peace Activities**

Hallman has been a peace activist since his college days. He was a conscientious objector during the Korean War and performed alternative civilian service. He was chair of the Philadelphia chapter, Fellowship of Reconciliation for two years in the 1950s. He actively opposed the Vietnam War. He has also been continuously involved in civil rights activities.

In 1984 Hallman felt a call to work for nuclear disarmament. In 1986 he obtained many signers for a "Citizens' Declaration for Worldwide Nuclear Disarmament". He was unpaid coordinator of the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign in Montgomery County, Maryland (1986-89). In 1987 he was a founding member of Methodists United for Peace with Justice and has subsequently served as issues chair, treasurer, executive director, and now chair. From 1996 to 1998 Hallman was co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, affiliated with Abolition 2000. In the United States he has served as chair successively of an informal group of religious organizations supporting ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (1997), the Interfaith Group for the CTBT (1997-99), and now the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

## **Interfaith**

Hallman has been active in local churches throughout his life, usually serving on the social action committee. At the University of Kansas he was vice-president of the Student Religious Council, served as chair of Religious Emphasis Week, and was awarded the William Allen White Interfaith Fellowship Award. He also chaired the campus Civil Rights Coordinating Council. In Philadelphia he was a member of the Board of Directors, Community Service Department, Philadelphia Council of Churches. In New Haven he was on the board of the Wider City Parish (an inner city ministry). He served as chair of the Interfaith Forum on Peace and Justice of Montgomery County, Maryland (1987-1990). He was member of the Commission on Social and Economic Justice, Interfaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington (1999-2001). He has worked to promote cooperation among denominations in the Methodist family. His wife is an ordained United Methodist minister.

For recreation Hallman plays senior softball and viola in chamber music groups.