

*If governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed,
as stated in the U.S. Declaration of Independence, then to what
degree am I, as a citizen, morally, legally and spiritually
responsible for the acts, and plans to act, of my government?*



*Hiroshima -- August 1945
Baghdad -- 2004 ???*

A Renunciation of Nuclear Weapons One Citizen At A Time

Documents in support of United States citizens
renouncing the use of nuclear weapons on their behalf

a reference guide in support of study, reflection, prayer and protest

Compiled and edited by Dennis Rivers with the cooperation of the
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and the Peacemaker Community
Santa Barbara, California -- March 30, 2002

this document is available free of charge on the web at www.nonukes.org

Dedicated to the children of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, August 1945.

May we learn something from your suffering
about our own capacity to *not see* what is before us,
something we desperately need to understand about ourselves.
And thus may you, even in death,
be eternal protectors of life.

And with great appreciation to these “friends of all life”
for their courage, deep insight and luminous teaching by example

Joanna Macy, Gene Knudsen Hoffman, Paloma Pavel, the late Walter Capps,
Mayumi Oda, Ramon Panikkar, David Krieger, David Hartsough and Kazuaki Tanahashi

A Renunciation of Nuclear Weapons
One Citizen At A Time

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction. By Dennis Rivers	1
A brief citizen's declaration regarding the use of nuclear weapons	3
Declaration of a United States Citizen Concerning the Use of Nuclear Weapons by the United States (full-page version)	4
Sample Paragraphs for Cover Letter to Elected Officials	6
Suggested Next Steps: Where to send copies of your declaration and groups you can support that are working on the nuclear weapons issue	7
Religious Organizations and Leaders on Nuclear Weapons and Abolition (from www.nuclearfiles.org)	8
Statement of Rabbi David Saperstein, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, On Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament	12
75 U.S. Catholic Bishops Condemn Policy of Nuclear Deterrence (from www.nuclearfiles.org)	13
A Buddhist Perspective on Nuclear War and the Possibility of Peace -- Excerpt from <i>A Human Approach to World Peace</i> by His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama	18
Revealed Nuclear Policies Are a Sign of Bad Faith To Rest of the World. A press release from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation -- March 2002	19
Shaping the Future. By David Krieger, President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation	20
Faking Nuclear Restraint: A Technical Analysis of The Bush Administration's Secret Plan For Strengthening U.S. Nuclear Forces -- <i>Natural Resources Defense Council</i> -- February 2002	21
Four Key Issues: A background briefing on the politics of nuclear disarmament. By John M. LaForge -- 1998	23
World Civilian Leaders' Statement For the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons -- 1998	28
Beyond Nuclear Madness: An Air Force General Speaks Out Against Nuclear Weapons. By Gen. Lee Butler, USAF (Ret.)	33
A Statement Supporting the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons, Signed by Sixty Retired Generals and Admirals from Seventeen Countries -- 1996	35
Six Arguments for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons --compiled by the Staff of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation -- 1999	38
Why Remember Hiroshima? By Dennis Rivers -- 1997	41

The genetic damage we create today by making, testing, and possibly using nuclear weapons will be the tragic legacy we leave for thousands of future human generations. We can't "un-ring the bell" of genetic damage. That is one important reason why we should turn away from nuclear weapons today.

Harland Goldwater, MD
Santa Barbara, California

Introduction: A Renunciation of Nuclear Weapons, One Citizen At a Time

by Dennis Rivers -- March 2002

Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel, one of the most inspiring and beloved Jewish teachers of the twentieth century, was also a regular participant in protests against racial segregation and the war in Vietnam. Asked once about the slim chances of actually influencing the course of events, he replied that when we protest, we do so not only to achieve certain results, but also to save our own souls. This collection of documents evolved out of my efforts to face my own responsibilities in regard to the nuclear weapons of my country, the United States, and to save my own heart from numbness and denial. For these weapons, in effect, belong to me. They have been created to defend me, and they have been created with my tax dollars and the assumption of my consent. My silence on this matter gradually becomes my consent to be "defended" in this way. I have decided to issue my own citizen's renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances. This may seem like an extreme position. Here are the considerations that have driven me to it.

I have been jolted into renewed protest in recent weeks by President Bush's announcement that the United States intends to use nuclear weapons not only to deter nuclear attacks, but to deter and respond to any attack or even threat of attack. This represents an enormous widening of the scope of possible nuclear wars, regardless of the much-announced current plans to reduce the total number of nuclear bombs held by the United States and Russia. Official pronouncements that this has been U.S. policy for some time do not lessen the danger of a dangerous path.

One major problem with threatening to use nuclear weapons is that we have to be very ready to carry out the threat. That means we lose any moral credibility in trying to control the spread of nuclear weapons, or to persuade our opponents to negotiate rather than escalate. Unfortunately, when people make threats, they actually instruct and invite those threatened to make the same threats back. For half a century the United States has been asserting its will in

world politics backed up by the threat of nuclear weapons. Now, every maniac on the planet wants to get his hands on one. I can't help thinking to myself, as an American: what lesson about power did we think we were teaching the world all those years?

And President Bush, like his predecessors of both parties, still does not seem to understand this process. That people watch what we do. By threatening to use nuclear weapons in a wider and wider range of circumstances, he is telling everyone how useful they are. More countries will make them, and they will get easier and easier to steal. (How confident are you that Pakistan can safeguard its nuclear weapons?) Eventually someone who hates us will get one and use it on us. Or we will end up living in a computerized security state in order to try to avoid that fate. Or we will have to carry out our threat and then have to cope with new waves of hatred against us. We have no way of knowing what our threats will provoke.

A balance of terror, or the threat of retaliation, can never bring us security. As the recent attacks on America demonstrate so tragically, overwhelming force will not keep us safe in a world where more than a billion people are angry, hungry and hopeless. If we want to be safe, it seems to me, we need to invest our resources in making a world in which peace is possible, a world that offers a better life for everyone. Instead, we are being invited to invest more and more heavily in the machinery of destruction. Since 1940 the United States has spent approximately six trillion dollars on nuclear weapons. (That is about \$1,000 for every man, woman and child now living on planet Earth!) And this investment is a seductive, addictive and self-aggravating process. First there were the tremendously expensive nuclear weapons themselves, then there were the tremendously expensive missiles to deliver them, and now we are told we need to invest in expensive new missiles to shoot down other nations' missiles. Meanwhile, when we spend new hundreds of billions on military hardware, we do not spend those billions on schools and hospitals around the world. The global gap between the rich and

the poor grows worse, resentment against America grows, we become more endangered and more in need, according to our experts, of new bombs and missiles. Some nations come to oppose us, like Iran or Libya, and I think because we imagine we could obliterate them with nuclear weapons if we chose, we do not really work very hard at healing the divisions in the world. Now, like gamblers who can't stand to face the money they have lost, our political leaders can't stand to face that our six trillion dollars spent on nuclear weapons has bought us only a world full of hatred, fear, poverty and violence.

I have come to believe that our own misplaced faith in weapons, our blindness to human needs, and our contemptuous dismissal of those whose guns are not as big as our guns, will be our undoing, more than any foreign enemy. This is one of many the reasons why I have decided to say no to the use of nuclear weapons on my behalf under any circumstances. Nuclear weapons are worsening the problems they were supposed to solve.

There are other serious problems with the mere possession of nuclear weapons, even before anybody uses them. One of them is that a person's character is defined not just by deeds after the fact, but largely by what a person is willing to do, plans to do, and will refrain from doing. If I am willing to infect a city with smallpox, or release nerve gas in a subway, and I plan to do so, I am morally depraved as a person, even if I have not yet gotten around to actually performing those actions. With a heavy heart I must confess that I have become convinced the same holds true for our planning to use nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons make it impossible to protect civilians from injury and death, as required by the Nuremberg Principles and any normal person's sense of restraint. Nuclear weapon explosions release massive amounts of radioactive poisons, which rain down on thousands of square miles of the surrounding land, cities, towns and people. Our readiness to use them is thus, God help us, our readiness to commit mass murder and poisoning. What is left of our character after that? This is another of the many reasons why I have decided to say no to the use of nuclear weapons on my behalf under any circumstances.

The moral issue just described points to the public side of character. There is also the subjective side of life. How do I feel about being alive? How do I feel about being me? How do I feel about people planning to commit mass murder on my behalf? If I have qualms of conscience, I am sure that I can blot them out of awareness with sufficient quantities of drugs, alcohol and/or violent entertainment. Or perhaps just get very buried in my work, buried enough that I don't feel much about the world around me. The question is, what is left of my life after I do that?

So, what is an ordinary citizen to do? Nuclear weapons programs began in secrecy and continue to this day to be shrouded in secrecy and far from citizen influence. And yet, as citizens in a democracy, we have an open-ended responsibility for all that is done in our names. It occurred to me that one beginning step I could take to fulfill that responsibility would be to very publicly withdraw my consent from this process, and to do this in a way that is consistent with the seriousness of the issue. Hence the documents on the following pages, and suggestions for signing them and sending them to your elected representatives. (Please feel free to compose your own statement.) I may not individually be able to stop the United States from its nuclear folly, but I can at least stand up and tell public officials not to invoke my name as a justification for it. Yes, I am trying to save my own soul, trying to hang on to some personal integrity as a citizen of a country that publicly denounces weapons of mass destruction while secretly planning to use them in expanding ways. Perhaps if many people take this personal responsibility for what is being done in their name, the soul of our world might be saved.

I know one thing for sure. If I die in a mass murder attack on the United States, I do not want additional mass murders committed in my name. Someone, somewhere must say *stop, turn, turn toward life, turn away from the instruments of death*. I invite you to study, reflect, pray and join me in making such a statement.

A Citizen's Renunciation of Nuclear Weapons

Mindful of the extreme dangers and costs that nuclear weapons bring both to the world and to those who rely on them, and mindful of America's practical, moral and spiritual need to serve life rather than build instruments of death,

I, _____,
a citizen of the United States of America,

renounce, withdraw my citizen's consent for, and oppose any design, production, testing, planning for use, or use of nuclear weapons by the United States, against any nation, group, persons or person, at any time, and under any circumstances. I declare to my elected representatives and to all agencies of the United States government that if I die in an act of mass murder against the United States, I do not want further acts of mass murder committed in my name. I make this declaration in my own name and in the name of

_____.

Signed this _____ day of _____, in the year _____:

resident of

_____ City

_____ State and Zip Code

and witnessed by:

Declaration of _____,

**A Citizen of the United States of America, Concerning
the Design, Production, Testing, Planning for Use, and Use of Nuclear Weapons**

made in accordance with my conscience, Article I of the Bill of Rights,
U.S. Constitution, and Nuremberg Principle VII

Having become deeply convinced that...

the continued planning for the use of nuclear weapons, and threatening to use nuclear weapons, by the United States, instructs all nations and all persons that nuclear weapons, and weapons of mass destruction in general, are legitimate and desirable means to achieve military and political ends. This increases the probability that the United States will eventually be attacked with nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction.

the enormous cost of nuclear weapons and missile programs diverts resources away from possible economic, medical and educational development assistance around the world. This increases world poverty, increases world resentment against the United States, and increases the probability of both wars and terrorist attacks against the United States, and against myself as a citizen of the United States.

the production of uranium and plutonium for nuclear weapons creates extremely long-lived radioactive poisons that threaten the genetic integrity of my life, of human life and of all life on Earth, and will burden future generations for hundreds of thousands of years with illnesses, birth defects and the need to safeguard nuclear wastes.

the possession of nuclear weapons exerts a distorting influence on the thinking of public officials and diplomats, causing them to imagine that complex problems in the relationships of nations can be solved with large explosions, inculcating in them a false sense of invulnerability, and turning them away from the patient labor needed to create a more peaceful and a more livable world.

the injurious effects of nuclear weapons, including radioactive fallout and the resulting sicknesses and genetic damage, cannot be controlled or contained. This makes injuring and killing civilians an inevitable consequence of using nuclear weapons, and reveals nuclear explosive devices to be weapons of mass murder rather than of war.

because the nuclear weapons programs of the United States are carried out in the name of, on behalf of, with the financial support of, and with the consent of, the citizens of the United States, each citizen bears personal, moral and legal responsibility for the actions and plans of the United States government (Nuremberg Principle VII), and has a moral duty to publicly oppose nuclear weapons, and to inform public officials of this opposition.

continued on next page

I, therefore, make the following declarations:

I renounce, withdraw my citizen's consent for, and oppose any design, production, testing, planning for use, or use of nuclear weapons by the United States, against any nation, group, persons or person, at any time, and under any circumstances. I declare to all branches and agencies of the United States government that if I die in an act of mass murder against the United States, I do not want further acts of mass murder committed in my name.

I instruct my elected representatives, namely, the President of the United States, the two United States Senators from the State of _____, and the Representative in the House of Representatives from the _____ District of _____, in their duty to represent me, to take the following actions:

1. To take all necessary steps to halt the design, production, testing, deployment and planning for use of nuclear weapons, and to recall and dismantle all such weapons now deployed.
2. To make every possible effort to move the conduct of United States foreign policy away from its current basis in fear, threat, military coercion and strategic deception, and toward honesty, dialogue, cooperation for mutual benefit, and a better life for all people around the world; and to encourage this shift in other nations.
3. To redirect the economic resources now being devoted to nuclear arms, missiles and missile defenses to economic, health and educational development both in the United States and around the world.

I appeal to every citizen of the United States of America, and to every person in every country, to renounce the use of nuclear weapons on his or her behalf under any circumstances, and to cease any activity connected with the design, production, testing, deployment, and planning for use, of nuclear weapons.

I commit myself to help build a world in which peace is possible, a world in which people work together toward meeting (and creatively reconciling) their basic needs for food, shelter, education, medical services, personal freedom, cultural autonomy and ecological survival.

Please retain this document. I intend these instructions and appeals to remain in force for the rest of my life, and to be binding upon the successive holders of the elective offices named above. I make this declaration in my own name and in the name of:

Signed this _____ day of _____, in the year _____.

_____, and witnessed by:
resident of _____
City _____
State and Zipcode _____

Sample Paragraphs for Cover Letters to Elected Officials
(select one or more, edit as desired)

Dear Mr. President, / Dear Senator _____, / Dear Representative _____,

This letter and the attached declaration express my deep concern about America's continuing reliance on nuclear weapons as instruments of both diplomacy and war.

I have come to believe that nuclear weapons, for a variety of reasons, can never be anything but instruments of the mass murder of civilians and the radioactive poisoning of entire districts and all their inhabitants. "Planning to use" nuclear weapons is therefore planning to commit mass murder, and this planning activity itself is a war crime under the Nuremberg Principles invoked by the United States at the end of World War Two.

For many years, nuclear weapons advocates have excused the illegality and immorality of nuclear weapons by saying that we would only use them in retaliation for a nuclear attack, and thus they might never be used again. While this was always a weak argument on moral grounds -- one is never morally justified in killing non-combatants -- at least it was some sort of argument. You have recently announced that the United States will now threaten the use of nuclear weapons "to deter any attack" on the United States, not only the threat of nuclear attack. This means America must now be ready to actually use nuclear weapons on a moment's notice in a wide variety of circumstances, a development I find extremely disturbing.

This new stance forces us to look again at the essential immorality of nuclear weapons: if we commit mass murder and poisonings in order to defend America, we will not have defended America, we will have lost America, because we will have turned ourselves into a nation of mass murderers and poisoners. I have reached the unhappy conclusion that threatening to use nuclear weapons is no different, morally, than threatening to use smallpox virus or poison gas on another country's children. These are all indiscriminant weapons. History may forgive us for using nuclear weapons the first time, in August 1945. But knowing what we know now about the effects of nuclear weapons, I doubt that history would forgive us for using them again.

As a voting citizen of the United States of America, I bear a direct and open-ended responsibility for the actions of the United States government. Thus I am bound by my own conscience and the Nuremberg Principles to do whatever I can to prevent nuclear weapons from being used again. As a believer in both God and humanity, I feel deeply bound to protect my brother and sister humans around the world, and the web of life that sustains them. My very serious concerns about the morality, legality, ecology, sanity and even military value of nuclear weapons have driven me to make the attached public disavowal of nuclear weapon use under any circumstances.

As the recent attacks on America demonstrate so tragically, overwhelming force will not keep us safe in a world where a billion people are angry, hungry and hopeless. Only a world that offers a better life for everyone will be a world in which Americans can be safe. I appeal to you to help create that world, rather than a world of ever-more-lethal arms races.

Please retain this letter and the attached declaration as a record of my deep and continuing objection to America's reliance on nuclear weapons.

Sincerely,

A U.S. Citizens' Renunciation of Nuclear Weapons: Some Suggested Next Steps

1. **Public signing.** The intention of the Citizens' Renunciation is to publicly withdraw one's consent from the planned use of nuclear weapons, and to do so in a way that is consistent with the moral seriousness of the issues involved. We suggest that you have a signing and witnessing ceremony, and invite the important people in your life and in your community to bear witness to your declaration. Invite them to study the issue and join you in your protest. If you would like to express your concerns in a different way, please feel free to write a declaration of your own that includes a direct request to public officials to end the U.S. reliance on nuclear weapons and the threat of nuclear weapons use. The most important point here is for each of us to "be the change we want to see" [Gandhi], to embody the thoughtfulness and concern we want public officials to bring to these issues.
2. **Send copies** of your declaration (short form or long form) to the following public officials and to all your local newspapers, radio stations (news director) and TV stations (news director). Include a cover letter explaining why you have taken this step. (See sample paragraphs on preceding page.) Wherever possible, make an appointment with public officials, deliver the document personally, and express your concerns about U.S. reliance on nuclear weapons.
 - The President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500
 - Your two Senators in the United States Senate. You can usually find their addresses in the front part of your telephone book under U.S. Government, or on the web (visit www.congress.org).
 - Your Representative in United States House of Representatives. You can usually find their addresses in the front part of your telephone book under U.S. Government, or on the web (visit www.congress.org).
3. **Please register online.** Register your protest online by visiting www.nonukes.org/declaration.htm. Your representatives in government will be

presented with a list of people in their state or district who have signed the Citizen's Renunciation of Nuclear Weapons.

4. **Symbolic acts of conscience.** If you are a parent, aunt or uncle, you may want to include a copy with your will as part of your legacy to future generations of your family. Nuclear illnesses and mountains of nuclear waste will travel down the generations after us. It may be comforting to people in the future to know that at least some people in this generation opposed nuclear weapons and the poisoning they bring. If you wish, you may have your declaration recorded at your County Clerk or Recorder's office as an enduring expression of your instructions to your representatives. Have your declaration framed and display it prominently. Discuss this action you are taking with your minister, rabbi, imam and/or best friends, give them copies of your declaration, and explain to them that you are taking this action on behalf of all life, theirs included.
5. **Support one or more of the following groups** that are working on nuclear issues, or form an independent study, advocacy and support group in your community:
 - Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
(www.wagingpeace.org)
 - Nuclear Control Institute (www.nci.org)
 - Greenpeace (www.greenpeace.org)
 - The Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative (www.nrdi.org)
 - The Institute for Cooperation in Space
(www.peaceinspace.com)
 - The American Friends Service Committee
(www.afsc.org/pindx/nucweap.htm)
 - The Fellowship of Reconciliation.
(www.forusa.org/Programs/disarm.html)
6. **Make copies of this resource guide** and present the topic of citizen renunciation of nuclear weapons design, planning, use, etc., to religious congregations and civic organizations in your community. Educate your local newscasters and reporters about the problem of nuclear weapons by sending them copies of this guide. This resource guide is available free of charge on the web (as an Adobe Acrobat PDF file) at www.nonukes.org/declaration.htm

Religious Organizations and Leaders on Nuclear Weapons and Abolition

from www.nuclearfiles.org

1998

"Let it not be said that the promotion of a culture of peace, the rooting out of the causes of violence, the abolition of nuclear weapons, are unreachable goals. The world has rid itself of the evils of legalized slavery, legalized colonialism and legalized apartheid. These were eliminated as the result of rising global awareness and political determination. So, also, the growing momentum to delegitimize and eliminate nuclear weapons must now be accompanied by political action by all States. Humanity deserves no less from us."

-- Archbishop Renato Martino, Apostolic Nuncio, Permanent Observer of the Holy See to the United Nations, Statement to the First Committee of the 53rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, October 19, 1998.

"This Conference resolves to call upon our respective governments and through our governments, the United Nations and other instruments:

- a. to urge all nations to agree by treaty to stop the production, testing, stock-piling and usage of nuclear weapons; and
- b. to press for an international mandate for all member states to prohibit nuclear warfare."

-- Resolution I.11 from the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops, August 1998

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

-- 75 U.S. Catholic Bishops, The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence: An Evaluation by Pax Christi Bishops in the United States, June 1998

"The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere...Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would

be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons."

-- Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President, Pax Christi International and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary, World Council of Churches, Statement to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee, March, 1998

"...the current declared nuclear nations must continue vigorously in good faith toward total nuclear disarmament. As United Methodists, we confess the sin of allowing the development, testing and use of these weapons to create, as the United Methodist bishops have called them, 'demonic war-making and hunger-making systems.' It is immoral to use God-given resources for human activities that are murderous and destructive and have caused the poverty and deaths of millions of people."

-- Reverend Thom White Wolf Fassett, Board of Church and Society, United Methodists, February 26, 1998

"The time has come for Canada to take a strong, principled stand against the continued possession of nuclear weapons by any state, affirming abolition as the central goal of Canadian nuclear weapons policy and adding Canada's voice to the call to immediately begin negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention."

-- Canadian Church Leaders Seek end to Nuclear Weaponry, February 18, 1998 (Letter to Prime Minister Chretien signed by 18 religious leaders)

1997

"If biological weapons, chemical weapons and now land-mines can be done away with, so too can nuclear weapons. No weapon so threatens the longed-for peace of the 21st century as the nuclear. Let not the immensity of this task dissuade us from the efforts needed to free humanity from such a scourge...since nuclear weapons can destroy all life on the planet, they imperil all that humanity has ever stood for and indeed humanity itself."

-- Archbishop Renato Martino, Holy See's Permanent Observer at the UN, "Nuclear Weapons Cannot be Justified and Deserve Condemnation: Grave Consequences Lie Ahead if the World is Ruled by the Militarism of Nuclear Arms," October, 1997

"A person cannot return to this tortuously profaned yet most sacred city without having done all that we can do to rid our nations and the world of nuclear weapons and of the ideologies, ambitions, economic, political, ideological and social structures that create,

maintain, profit from, and prepare to use nuclear weapons against human beings and against Nature."
-- Joseph Gerson, Ph.D., Regional Program Coordinator, American Friends Service Committee in New England, World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, Hiroshima & Nagasaki, August 1997. [The Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and their inhabitants were destroyed with nuclear weapons by the United States in August, 1945, near the end of World War II.]

"RESOLVED, That the 72nd General Convention of the Episcopal Church support the goal of total nuclear disarmament; and note with appreciation and pleasure the progress that has been made toward this goal; but inasmuch as the production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons continue, more must be done to achieve that nuclear disarmament, and be it further

"RESOLVED, That this General Convention urge the Government of the United States to exercise leadership among nations, especially the nuclear weapons states, by immediately initiating negotiations for an International Treaty on Comprehensive Nuclear Weapons Disarmament in all the aspects to include a deadline for the completion of nuclear disarmament ..."

-- Abolition of Nuclear Weapons Resolution from the General Convention of the Episcopal Church, 1997

1996

"Proliferating public knowledge of fission -- the process by which explosive power is created -- means that numerous nations and even terrorist groups are close to having the capacity to create nuclear bombs. Only an iron-clad commitment to total nuclear disarmament, which we do not have, will forestall such a horror."

-- John Rempel, Mennonite Central Committee Liaison to the United Nations and Minister of the Manhattan Mennonite Fellowship, New York, October 1996

"We reaffirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout the Earth and space. This can occur by achieving the following objectives:

1. Complete elimination of all nuclear weapons by all possessors;
2. Complete elimination of all delivery vehicles by all possessors;
3. Termination of all development, production, and testing of nuclear weapons by all nations and by all individuals and groups with nuclear ambition; and

4. Prevention of all nonpossessors from developing and otherwise acquiring nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles.

These objectives should be achieved as soon as possible through a combination of international treaties and reciprocal national initiatives, carried out with adequate verification.

"...We fervently believe that these recommendations will greatly enhance global security by eliminating the possibility of nuclear war. Furthermore, the resources of human talent, production capacity, and money released can become available to deal with urgent human problems around the globe. Nuclear abolition provides great hope for global peace and prosperity."

-- Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church, 1996

1995

"Nuclear weapons threaten life, liberty and security of persons. A world free of nuclear weapons is a human right for us and future generations.

"Nuclear weapons serve no justifiable military purpose and pose a threat to all forms of life. Reliance by governments on these weapons of indiscriminate mass destruction is immoral and must be ended. The responsibility for ending this reliance lies with all people on Earth, particularly the citizens of the nuclear weapons states.

"Article VI of the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), signed by some 178 states, calls for 'negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.'

"We support the goal of nuclear disarmament.

"We urge all governments, and especially nuclear weapons states, to initiate negotiations immediately for an International Treaty on Comprehensive Nuclear Disarmament.

"We pledge to seek the abolition of all nuclear weapons in the world, and to take actions toward realizing this goal."

-- Signed by Bruce Birchard, General Secretary, Friends General Conference; The Most Reverend Edmond L. Browing, Presiding Bishop, Episcopal Church, USA; The Most Reverend Thomas J. Gumbleton, Auxiliary Bishop, Detroit Catholic Archdiocese; Norval Hadley, Executive Director, Evangelical Friends Mission; John A. Lapp, Executive Director, Mennonite Central Committee; Johan Maurer, General Secretary, Friends United Meeting; The Reverend Donald E. Miller, General

Secretary, Church of the Brethren; The Most Reverend Walter F. Sullivan, Bishop, Richmond Catholic Diocese, President, Pax Christi USA; Bishop Melvin G., Talbert, Secretary, United Methodist Council of Bishops; President, National Council of Churches; The Reverend Dr. Daniel Weiss, General Secretary, American Baptist Churches; Bishop C. Dale White, United Methodist Church.

1995

"With the persistence of tensions and conflicts in various parts of the world, the international community never forgot what happened to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as a warning and an incentive to develop truly effective and peaceful means of settling tensions and disputes. Fifty years after the Second World War, the leaders of nations cannot become complacent but rather should renew their commitment to disarmament and to the banishment of all nuclear weapons."

-- Pope John Paul II, February 1995

"In considering the path to a global abolition of war, we must touch on the matter of weapons, including nuclear arms. Since this year marks the 50th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, I would like to take this opportunity to once again call for the elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the earnest prayer of humankind."

-- Daisaku Ikeda, President, Soka Gakkai International, "Creating a Century Without War Through Human Solidarity -- A Global Framework of Cooperation for Peace," January, 1995

"Since the advent of the nuclear age in 1945, humanity has lived in the shadow of death. Even the most limited nuclear war - a single bomb on a single city - would kill hundreds of thousands of people. In a major nuclear war, many millions would be killed by blast, heat, and radiation in the first hours and millions more would die from its effects in ensuing weeks. With the collapse of industry, trade, and agriculture, famine would engulf the rest of humanity; environmental destruction would be so great that the human race could become extinct. This is an epidemic for which there would be no cure - it must be prevented before it happens.

"The end of the Cold War and its ideologic conflict between nuclear superpowers has given us the chance to cast off its fearsome legacy and to end this threat to human survival. Yet there are still some 48,000 nuclear warheads in the world, and even if all existing arms control treaties are fully implemented, in 2003 there will remain 20,000 warheads - the equivalent of 200,000 Hiroshima bombs. Worse still,

today the number of nations possessing nuclear weapons has increased to at least eleven. As states maintain nuclear arsenals and bitter ethnic, religious or national rivalries persist, many more nations are certain to acquire nuclear arms in the years ahead. Moreover, even now vast resources are still expended on nuclear arms, while millions of people lack adequate food, housing or health care.

"We believe that it is intolerable to allow this danger to persist. Future generations may well judge us by one simple criterion: did we eliminate nuclear weapons when we had the chance, or did we leave our children hostage to this great peril? Let us act now so that we and our children may live.

"We commend President Clinton and our government for initiation of a moratorium on nuclear test explosions and the negotiation of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty now underway, and for the reduction of nuclear stockpiles. But much more is urgently needed now. We must commit ourselves to the goal of elimination of nuclear weapons themselves.

"Therefore -

"We urge all governments, and specifically our own government, to initiate negotiation of an international treaty on comprehensive nuclear disarmament. We urge them to complete these negotiations by the year 2000 so that we can enter the new millennium with a treaty in place committing all nations to non-proliferation and a firm timetable for the permanent abolition of all nuclear weapons.

"We appeal to President Clinton to commit our government to this undertaking. Further, we urge Senator Specter, Senator Santorum, and all our Representatives in Congress to support this effort by whatever means they find most appropriate."

-- Statement of Support for Non-Proliferation and the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons, initiated in 1995 by the World Federalist Association, 204 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh PA 15222, Rev 3/96. The following religious leaders in the Pittsburgh area have signed the above statement:

Bishop George Bashore, W. PA Conference,
United Methodist Church

Bishop Anthony G. Bosco Catholic Diocese of
Greenburg

Wallace Cayard, Clerk, Religious Society of
Friends of Pittsburgh

W. Darwin Collins, Regional Minister and
President, Christian Church, (Disciples of
Christ) in Pennsylvania

Rabbi Walter Jacob, Rodef Shalom
Congregation

Rev. Carolyn J. Jones, Executive Presbyter of

the Washington Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church
Rabbi Mark Mahler, Temple Emanuel, Mt. Lebanon
John Matta, Stated Clerk Pittsburgh Presbytery, Presbyterian Church USA
Bishop Donald J. McCoid, Southwest PA Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Arthur McDonal, Allegheny Unitarian Universalist Church
Rev. Paul Sawyer, Unitarian Universalist Church of North Hills
Dr. Paul Westcoat, Conference Minister of the Penn West Conference United
Bishop Donald Wuerl, Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh

Since its initiation in 1995, many additional members of the clergy have signed this Statement of Support.

1994

"Resolved. That the 71st General Convention of the Episcopal Church...urge the President of the United States and the U.S. negotiators in Geneva to take immediate international leadership in signing and implementing a comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in the coming year, and to pursue diplomatic initiatives for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons design, testing, and manufacture anywhere in the world."

-- Episcopal Church General Convention, 1994

1993

"Today there is no logical reason for the retention and further development of cataclysmic firepower. Nuclear reductions are not enough ... maintaining nuclear deterrence into the twenty-first century will not aid but impede peace. Nuclear deterrence prevents genuine disarmament. It maintains an unacceptable hegemony over non-nuclear nations. It fuels arms race build-ups around the world. It spans a militarism that is choking off development for the poorest half of the world's population. It is a fundamental obstacle in achieving a new age of global security. "

-- Archbishop Renato Martino, Holy See's Representative to the U.N., 1993

1990

"Since their exists in thermonuclear weapons a destructive power of vast proportions almost too frightful to contemplate, the Salvation Army recognizes that the world's problems cannot be solved by force, and that greed and pride, coupled

with the widespread desire for domination, poison the souls of men and sow the seeds of conflict.

The Salvation Army continues to be deeply concerned with the investment of huge financial resources to aid the escalating production of terrifying weapons of mass destruction, rather than the diversion of these funds to socioeconomic growth throughout the world. Disarmament, peace and development are inextricably linked."

-- Salvation Army, 1990

1986

"...we say a clear and unconditional No to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing ... We support the earliest possible negotiation of a phased but rapid reduction of nuclear arsenals ... to the eventual goal of a mutual and verifiable dismantling of all nuclear armaments."

-- United Methodist Council of Bishops, In Defense of Creation, 1986

1983

"As people, we must refuse to legitimate the idea of nuclear war. Such a refusal will require not only new ideas and new visions, but what the Gospel calls conversion of the heart...We believe it is necessary for the sake of prevention to build a barrier against the idea of nuclear war as a viable strategy for defense...Each proposed addition to our strategic system or change in strategic doctrine must be assessed in the light of whether it will render steps toward progressive disarmament more or less likely."

-- U.S. Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter on War and Peace, 1983

1965

"Any act aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and humanity. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation."

-- Roman Catholic Church,
Second Vatican Council, 1965

**“The world’s problems
cannot be solved
by force”**

Salvation Army, 1990

**Statement of Rabbi David Saperstein,
Director, Religious Action Center
of Reform Judaism,
On The Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament
Project's Release Of Its Joint Statement**

June 21, 2000

In the Bible it was commanded that before the Israelite army could engage in warfare, the priests needed to read to the assembled the rules of what was ethically permitted in warfare and what was prohibited. That interaction between religion and the military created the first ethical strictures of warfare — the foundation of what later became known as “just war theory.”

Today we religious and military leaders continue this tradition. We stand together in this House of God, informed by our values, learning from our respective expertise, aware of the horrible human cost of war and conflict, weary of the threat posed by nuclear proliferation — to call upon Congress, the President, the American military, and the American people to lead the way towards a process of nuclear reduction and disarmament.

I am here representing the Reform Jewish Movement with some 1.5 million Reform Jews and 1,700 Reform Rabbis in 900 congregations in North America. For we Jews know, perhaps better than most, the danger of linking destructive technology with man’s inhumanity to man.

As Samuel Pisar, the eloquent Holocaust survivor said in his extraordinary speech before the Israeli Knesset at the Second Gathering of Holocaust Survivors:

To us, the Holocaust is not only an indelible memory of horror; it is a permanent warning. For we have seen the end of creation. In the shadow of permanently flaming gas chambers, where Eichman’s reality eclipsed Dante’s vision of hell, we have witnessed a pilot project of the destruction of humanity, the death rattle of the entire species on the eve of the

atomic age, of thermonuclear proliferation — the final solution.

Here, with the authority of the numbers engraved on our arms, we cry out the commandments of six million innocent souls, children, of whom I used to be one: never again! From where, if not from us, will come the warning that a new combination of technology and brutality can transform the planet into a crematorium? From where, if not from the bloodiest killing ground of all time, will come the hope that coexistence between so called “hereditary enemies” is possible - between Germans and Frenchmen, Chinese and Japanese, Americans and Russians; above all, coexistence between Arabs and Jews?

Towards that end, at this crucial crossroads of history, we join to call on the world to recognize that threats of violence too often leads to violence; and threats of cataclysmic violence may well lead to cataclysmic violence; that nuclear proliferation benefits no one; that we can, we will, and we must find other ways to protect ourselves, our nations and our future: for it is not sufficient to have a temporary peace in our time, but, instead, we must leave a stable, trusting, cooperative and peaceful world to our children. That is the vision that must mobilize every church, synagogue, and mosque towards sustained efforts to raise the moral conscience of their members and our nation; it is the vision that should link every true soldier and every religious person together. It is certainly the vision that brings us here today.

**"If I am not for myself, who is for me, but if I am for my own self [only], what am I?
And if not now, when?"**

Hillel

75 U.S. Catholic Bishops Condemn Policy of Nuclear Deterrence

from www.nuclearfiles.org

June 1998

Erie, PA -- Nuclear deterrence as a national policy must be condemned as morally abhorrent because it's the excuse and justification for the continued possession and further development of nuclear weapons, say 75 U.S. Catholic bishops in a report issued today by Pax Christi USA, the national Catholic peace and justice organization. The report, "The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence: An Evaluation by Pax Christi Bishops in the United States," critiques current U.S. nuclear weapons policy in light of the Catholic Church's 1983 pastoral statement, "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response," which allowed for the morality of nuclear deterrence on the condition that it only be an interim measure tied to progressive disarmament. Further Catholic Church teaching has since called for a concrete policy of nuclear elimination. "With the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, we feel our statement is both timely and prophetic," says Walter F. Sullivan, Bishop of Richmond, Va. and president of Pax Christi USA. "We hope it will help generate further discussions both within the Catholic community and in the policy-making circles of our government."

The report recognizes the dramatic changes that have occurred since the end of the Cold War and offers a warning. "Because of the horrendous results if these weapons were to be used, and what we see as a greater likelihood of their use, we feel it is imperative to raise a clear, unambiguous voice in opposition to the continued reliance on nuclear deterrence," the report states. Coming in the wake of the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, the report calls for the United States and the other nuclear weapons states to enter into a process that will lead to a Nuclear Weapons Convention that would ban nuclear weapons the way that the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions have banned those weapons.

"What the Indian and Pakistani tests make clear is that the discriminatory nature of current nonproliferation efforts will not free the world of the threat posed by these weapons," says Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, Mich., and a leading expert on nuclear deterrence in the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. "The choice today is clear. Either all nations must give up the right to possess these weapons or all nations will claim that right. The events in India and Pakistan must be recognized as a sign of what is inevitable. We must act now to avoid a future where the nuclear

threat becomes the currency of international security."

Citing the \$60 billion Department of Energy program known as Stockpile Stewardship and Management, as well as current administration policies, the bishops conclude that the United States plans to rely on nuclear weapons indefinitely. "Such an investment in a program to upgrade the ability to design, develop, test, and maintain nuclear weapons signals quite clearly that the United States (and the other nuclear weapons states that are similarly developing these new design and testing capabilities) shows no intention of moving forward with 'progressive disarmament' and certainly no commitment to eliminating these weapons entirely," state the bishops.

The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence

An Evaluation by Pax Christi Bishops in the United States Issued on the 15th Anniversary of Challenge of Peace, God's Promise and Our Response

Dear Sisters and Brothers,

We, the undersigned Catholic bishops of the United States and members of Pax Christi USA, write to you on a matter of grave moral concern: the continued possession, development and plans for the use of nuclear weapons by our country. For the past fifteen years, and particularly in the context of the Cold War, we, the Catholic bishops of the United States, have reluctantly acknowledged the possibility that nuclear weapons could have some moral legitimacy, but only if the goal was nuclear disarmament. It is our present, prayerful judgment that this legitimacy is now lacking.

In 1983 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, in our Pastoral Letter *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, grappled with the unique moral challenge posed by nuclear weapons. Fifteen years ago we stated that, because of the massive and indiscriminate destruction that nuclear weapons would inflict, their use would not be morally justified.¹ We spoke in harmony with the conscience of the world in that judgment. We reaffirm that judgment now. Nuclear weapons must never be used, no matter what the provocation, no matter what the military objective.

Deterrence

Fifteen years ago we concurred with Pope John Paul II in acknowledging that, given the context of that time, possession of these weapons as a deterrent against the use of nuclear weapons by others could be morally acceptable, but acceptable only as an interim measure and only if deterrence were combined with clear steps toward progressive disarmament.

Ours was a strictly conditioned moral acceptance of nuclear deterrence. It depended on three criteria:

a) a reliance on deterrent strategies must be an interim policy only. As we stated then, "We cannot consider it adequate as a long-term basis for peace;"

b) the purpose of maintaining nuclear weapons in the interim was only "to prevent the use of nuclear weapons by others;" and

c) a reliance on deterrence must be used "not as an end in itself but as a step on the way toward a progressive disarmament."

In our 10th Anniversary Statement, *The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace*, we further specified that "progressive disarmament" must mean a commitment to the elimination of nuclear weapons, not simply as an ideal, but as a concrete policy goal

A New Moment

In 1998 the global context is significantly different from what it was a few years ago. Throughout the Cold War the nuclear arsenal was developed and maintained as the ultimate defense in an ideological conflict that pitted what were considered two historical forces against each other - capitalism in the West and communism in the East. The magnitude of that conflict was defined by the mutual exclusivity of each other's ideology. Nuclear weapons and the policy of Mutually Assured Destruction were accepted as the inescapable context of that particular struggle. Today the Soviet Union no longer exists. The United States is now aiding its democratic successor, the Russian Federation, in dismantling the very nuclear weapons that a short time ago were poised to destroy us. Yet, the Cold War weapons amassed throughout that struggle have survived the struggle itself and are today in search of new justifications and new missions to fulfill.

But, with the end of the Cold War came new hope. World opinion has coalesced around the concrete effort to outlaw nuclear weapons, as it has with biological and chemical weapons and most recently with anti-personnel landmines. As examples of this opinion we note the dramatic public statement of December 1996 in which 61 retired Generals and Admirals, many of whom held the highest level positions in the nuclear establishment of this country, said that these weapons are unnecessary, destabilizing and must be outlawed.^{vi} We also note the historic International Court of Justice opinion of July 1996 that, "The threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable to armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law." The Court went on to say, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

Additionally, the Holy See has become more explicit in its condemnation of nuclear weapons and has urged their abolition. We recognize this new moment and are in accord with the Holy See, which has stated, "If biological weapons, chemical weapons and now landmines can be done away with, so too can nuclear weapons. No weapon so threatens the longed-for peace of the 21st century as the nuclear [weapon]. Let not the immensity of this task dissuade us from the efforts needed to free humanity from such a scourge."

Unfortunately the monumental political changes that have occurred in the wake of the Cold War have not been accompanied by similar far reaching changes in the military planning for development and deployment of nuclear weapons. It is absolutely clear to us that the present US policy does not include a decisive commitment to progressive nuclear disarmament. Rather, nuclear weapons policy has been expanded in the post-Cold War period to include new missions well beyond their previous role as a deterrent to nuclear attack. The United States today maintains a commitment to use nuclear weapons first, including pre-emptive nuclear attacks on nations that do not possess nuclear weapons. "Flexible targeting strategies" are aimed at Third World nations, and a new commitment exists to use nuclear weapons either preemptively or in response to chemical and biological weapons or other threats to US national interests.^{ix} This expanded role of the US nuclear deterrent is unacceptable. !

A New Arms Race

In order to maintain the necessary credibility required by a continued reliance on nuclear deterrence, the United States is today embarking on an expansion of its nuclear weapons complex. The Department of Energy, in conjunction with the Department of Defense, has developed the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program, a vast and multi-faceted effort at modernizing the nuclear weapons complex to provide for the continued research, development and testing of nuclear weapons well into the next century. The program will eventually lead to creating computer-simulated nuclear weapons tests that will allow the United States to continue to test nuclear weapons in the event that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, (which will ban full-scale underground nuclear testing) enters into force. The cost of this Stockpile Stewardship program is currently estimated at \$60 billion over the next dozen years. Such an investment in a program to upgrade the ability to design, develop, test and maintain nuclear weapons signals quite clearly that the United States, (as well as the other nuclear weapons states that are similarly developing these new testing and design capabilities) shows no intention of moving forward

with "progressive disarmament" and certainly no commitment to eliminating these weapons entirely.

Instead of progressive nuclear disarmament, we are witnessing the institutionalization of nuclear deterrence. The recent Presidential Decision Directive on nuclear weapons policy, partially made known to the public in December 1997, makes this point clear. The Directive indicates that the United States will continue to rely on nuclear weapons as the cornerstone of the nation's strategic defense, that the role of these weapons has been increased to include deterring Third World non-nuclear weapons states and deterring chemical and biological weapons, as well as other undefined vital US interests abroad.^{xii} Does not this policy, coupled with the huge investments under the Stockpile Stewardship Program, represent a renewed commitment to nuclear deterrence that will affect generations to come? The Department of Energy's own timetable for the Stockpile Stewardship Program indicates that the United States will continue to develop, test and rely upon a nuclear deterrent through the year 2065. This is clearly not the interim policy to which we grudgingly gave our moral approval in 1983. Rather, it is the manifestation of the very reliance on nuclear weapons.

In *Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace* we addressed the growing concerns that nuclear weapons might be used against other than nuclear threats: "The United States should commit itself never to use nuclear weapons first, should unequivocally reject proposals to use nuclear weapons to deter non-nuclear threats, and should reinforce the fragile barrier against the use of these weapons."^{xv} Nuclear deterrence policy, as developed over the past decade, stands in clear contradiction to these goals.

Inherent Dangers

The policy of nuclear deterrence has always included the intention to use the weapons if deterrence should fail. Since the end of the Cold War this deterrent has been expanded to include any number of potential aggressors, proliferators and so-called "rogue nations." The inherent instability in a world unconstrained by the great-power standoff present throughout the Cold War leads us to conclude that the danger of deterrence failing has been increased. That danger can become manifest if but one so-called "rogue state" calls the deterrent bluff. In such a case the requirements of deterrence policy would be the actual use of nuclear weapons. This must not be allowed. Because of the horrendous results if these weapons should be used, and what we see as a greater likelihood of their use, we now feel it is imperative to raise a clear, unambiguous voice in opposition to the continued reliance on nuclear deterrence.

Moral Conclusions

Sadly, it is clear to us that our strict conditions for the moral acceptance of nuclear deterrence are not being met. Specifically, a) the policy of nuclear deterrence is being institutionalized. It is no longer considered an interim policy but rather has become the very "long-term basis for peace" that we rejected in 1983.

b) the role of nuclear deterrence has been expanded in the post Cold War era well beyond the narrow role of deterring the use of nuclear weapons by others. The role to be played now by nuclear weapons includes a whole range of contingencies on a global scale including countering biological and chemical weapons and the protection of vital national interests abroad.

c) although the United States and the republics that made up the former Soviet Union have in recent years eliminated some of their huge, superfluous stockpiles of nuclear weapons, our country, at least, has no intention, or policy position of eliminating these weapons entirely. Rather, the US intends to retain its nuclear deterrent into the indefinite future.

Gospel Call of Love

As bishops of the Church in the United States, it is incumbent on us to speak directly to the policies and actions of our nation. We speak now out of love not only for those who would suffer and die as victims of nuclear violence, but also for those who would bear the terrible responsibility of unleashing these horrendous weapons. We speak out of love for those suffering because of the medical effects in communities where these weapons are produced and are being tested. We speak out of love for those deprived of the barest necessities because of the huge amount of available resources committed to the continued development and ongoing maintenance of nuclear weapons. We recall the words of another Vatican message to the United Nations, that these weapons, "by their cost alone, kill the poor by causing them to starve."^{xvi} We speak out of love for both victims and the executioners, believing that "the whole law is fulfilled in one statement, namely, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'" (Gal. 5-14).

It is out of this love that we raise up our voices with those around the world in calling for an end to the reliance on nuclear deterrence and instead call upon the United States and the other nuclear weapons states to enter into a process leading to the complete elimination of these morally offensive weapons. Indeed, in taking his position we are answering the call of Pope John Paul II, whose Permanent Representative to the United Nations stated in October 1997:

"The work that this committee (1st Committee of the United Nations) has done in calling for negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention must be increased. Those nuclear

weapons states resisting such negotiations must be challenged, for in clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world. The gravest consequences for humankind lie ahead if the world is to be ruled by the militarism represented by nuclear weapons rather than the humanitarian law espoused by the International Court of Justice. "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Nonproliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition. "This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multi-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

We recognize the opposition that our message will meet. We are painfully aware that many of our policymakers sincerely believe that possessing nuclear weapons is vital for our national security. We are convinced though, that it is not. Instead, they make the world a more dangerous place. They provide a rationale for other nations to build a nuclear arsenal, thereby increasing the possibility that they will be used by someone.

Not only are they not vital for national security, but we believe they actually contribute to national insecurity. No nation can be truly secure until the community of nations is secure. We are mindful of Pope John Paul II's warning that "violence of whatever form cannot decide conflicts between individuals or between nations, because violence generates more violence."

On this, the 15th anniversary of The Challenge of Peace the time has come for concrete action for nuclear disarmament. On the eve of the Third Millennium may our world rid itself of these terrible weapons of mass destruction and the constant threat they pose. We cannot delay any longer. Nuclear deterrence as a national policy must be condemned as morally abhorrent because it is the excuse and justification for the continued possession and further development of these horrendous weapons. We urge all to join in taking up the challenge to begin the effort to eliminate nuclear weapons now, rather than relying on them indefinitely.

May the grace and peace of the risen Jesus Christ be with us all.

Anthony S. Apuron, OFM, Cap. , Archbishop of Agana, Guam
Victor Balke, Bishop of Crookston, MN
William D. Borders, Archbishop of Baltimore, MD (ret.)
Joseph M. Breitenbeck. Bishop of Grand Rapids, MI (ret.)
Charles A. Buswell, Bishop of Pueblo, CO (ret.)

Matthew H. Clark, Bishop of Rochester, NY
Thomas J. Connolly, Bishop of Baker, OR
Patrick R. Cooney, Bishop of Gaylord, MI
Thomas V. Daily, Bishop of Brooklyn, NY
James J. Daly, Auxiliary Bishop of Rockville Centre, NY (ret.)
Nicholas D'Antonio, OFM, Bishop of New Orleans, LA (ret.)
Joseph P. Delaney, Bishop of Fort Worth, TX
Norbert L. Dorsey, C.P., Bishop of Orlando, FL
Joseph A. Ferrario, Bishop of Honolulu, HI (ret.)
John J. Fitzpatrick, Bishop of Brownsville, TX (ret.)
Patrick F. Flores, Archbishop of San Antonio, TX
Joseph A. Fiorenza, Bishop of Galveston-Houston, TX
Raphael M. Fliss, Bishop of Superior, WI
Marion F. Forst, Bishop of Dodge City, KS (ret.)
Benedict C. Franzetta, Auxiliary Bishop of Youngstown, OH (ret.)
Raymond E. Goedert, Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago, IL
John R. Gorman, Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago, IL
F. Joseph Gossman Bishop of Raleigh, NC
Thomas J. Gumbleton, Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, MI
Richard C. Hanifen, Bishop of Colorado Springs, CO
Edward D. Head, Bishop of Buffalo, NY (ret.)
Joseph L. Howze, Bishop of Biloxi, MS
Howard J. Hubbard, Bishop of Albany, NY
William A. Hughes, Bishop of Covington, KY (ret.)
Raymond G. Hunthausen, Archbishop of Seattle, WA (ret.)
Joseph L. Imesch, Bishop of Joliet, IL
Michael J. Kaniecki, S.J., Bishop of Fairbanks, AK
Raymond A. Lucker, Bishop of New Ulm, MN
Dominic A. Marconi, Auxiliary Bishop of Newark, NJ
Joseph F. Maguire, Bishop of Springfield, MA (ret.)
Leroy T. Matthiesen, Bishop of Amarillo, TX (ret.)
Edward A. McCarthy, Archbishop of Miami, FL (ret.)
John E. McCarthy, Bishop of Austin, TX
Lawrence J. McNamara, Bishop of Grand Island, NE
John J. McRaith, Bishop of Owensboro, KY
Dale J. Melczek, Bishop of Gary, IN
Donald W. Montrose, Bishop of Stockton, CA
Robert M. Moskal, Bishop of St. Josaphat in Parma, OH
Michael J. Murphy, Bishop of Erie, PA (ret.)
P. Francis Murphy, Auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore, MD
William C. Newman, Auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore, MD
James D. Niedergeses, Bishop of Nashville, TN (ret.)
Edward. J. O'Donnell, Bishop of Lafayette, LA

Albert H. Ottenweller, Bishop of Steubenville, OH (ret.)
 Donald E. Pelotte, S.S.S., Bishop of Gallup, NM
 A. Edward Pevec, Auxiliary Bishop of Cleveland, OH
 Michael D. Pfeifer, O.M.I., Bishop of San Angelo, TX
 Kenneth J. Povish, Bishop of Lansing, MI (ret.)
 Francis A. Quinn, Bishop of Sacramento, CA (ret.)
 John R. Roach, Archbishop of St. Paul /Minneapolis, MN (ret.)
 Frank J. Rodimer, Bishop of Paterson, NJ
 Peter A. Rosazza, Auxiliary Bishop of Hartford, CT
 Joseph M. Sartoris, Auxiliary Bishop of Los Angeles, CA
 Walter J. Schoenherr, Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, MI (ret.)
 Roger L. Schwietz, OMI, Bishop of Duluth, MN
 Daniel E. Sheehan, Archbishop of Omaha, NE (ret.)
 Richard J. Sklba, Auxiliary Bishop of Milwaukee, WI
 John J. Snyder, Bishop of St. Augustine, FL
 George H. Speltz, Bishop of St. Cloud, MN (ret.)
 Kenneth D. Steiner, Auxiliary Bishop of Portland, OR
 Joseph M. Sullivan, Auxiliary Bishop of Brooklyn, NY
 Walter F. Sullivan, Bishop of Richmond, VA
 Arthur N. Tafoya, Bishop of Pueblo, CO
 Elliot G. Thomas, Bishop of St. Thomas, VI
 David B. Thompson, Bishop of Charleston, SC
 Kenneth E. Untener, Bishop of Saginaw, MI
 Loras J. Watters, Bishop of Winona, CA (ret.)
 Emil A. Wcela, Auxiliary Bishop of Rockville Centre, NY

- 9 British American Security Information Council, Nuclear Futures: Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and US Nuclear Strategy, March 1, 1998. p.10
- 10 President William J. Clinton, Letter of Transmittal of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the United States Senate, Sept. 22, 1997.
- 11 Western States Legal Foundation, A Faustian Bargain: Why "Stockpile Stewardship" is Incompatible with the Process of Nuclear Disarmament, March 1998.
- 12 Reported in the Washington Post, December 7, 1997, p. 1. 13 Information shared by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) Senior NIF Scientist, William J. Hogan with Pax Christi USA Delegation to LLNL, October 7, 1997.
- 14 British American Security Information Council, Nuclear Futures: Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and US Nuclear Strategy, March 1, 1998. p.9.
- 15 The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace, NCCB, 1993, p. 13.
- 16 Giovanni Cheli, Permanent Representative for the Holy See Observer Mission to the United Nations, United Nations 1st Special Session on Disarmament, 1976.
- 17 Archbishop Renato Martino, United Nations Permanent Observer of the Holy See, Statement to the United Nations' 1st Committee, Oct. 15, 1997.
- 18 Pope John Paul II, Address to Pax Christi International, May 29, 1995.

Notes to: The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence
 An Evaluation by Pax Christi Bishops in the United States
 Issued on the 15th Anniversary of Challenge of Peace,
 God's Promise and Our Response

- 1 The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response, NCCB, 1983, No. 150.
- 2 Ibid., Challenge of Peace, No. 186
- 3 Ibid., Challenge of Peace, No. 185 & 188 (1)
- 4 John Paul II, "Message to the United Nations Special Session On Disarmament, 1982," #8
- 5 The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace, NCCB, 1993, p. 13.
- 6 New York Times, December 6, 1996, Statement on Nuclear Weapons by 61 International Generals and Admirals.
- 7 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Illegality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, July 8, 1996.
- 8 Archbishop Renato Martino, United Nations Permanent Observer of the Holy See, Statement to the United Nations' 1st Committee, Oct. 15, 1997.

“Our lives begin to end
 the day we become silent
 about things that matter.”

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

A Buddhist Perspective on Nuclear War and the Possibility of Peace
Excerpt from *A Human Approach to World Peace*
by His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama
From www.fpmt.org/teachings/hhdlworldpeace.asp

By far the greatest single danger facing humankind – in fact, all living beings on our planet – is the threat of nuclear destruction. I need not elaborate on this danger, but I would like to appeal to all the leaders of the nuclear powers who literally hold the future of the world in their hands, to the scientists and technicians who continue to create these awesome weapons of destruction, and to all the people at large who are in a position to influence their leaders: I appeal to them to exercise their sanity and begin to work at dismantling and destroying all nuclear weapons. We know that in the event of a nuclear war there will be no victors because there will be no survivors! Is it not frightening just to contemplate such inhuman and heartless destruction? And, is it not logical that we should remove the cause for our own destruction when we know the cause and have both the time and the means to do so? Often we cannot overcome our problems because we either do not know the cause or, if we understand it, do not have the means to remove it. This is not the case with the nuclear threat.

Whether they belong to more evolved species like humans or to simpler ones such as animals, all beings primarily seek peace, comfort, and security. Life is as dear to the mute animal as it is to any human being; even the simplest insect strives for protection from dangers that threaten its life. Just as each one of us wants to live and does not wish to die, so it is with all other creatures in the universe, though their power to effect this is a different matter.

Broadly speaking there are two types of happiness and suffering, mental and physical, and of the two, I believe that *mental* suffering and happiness are the more acute. Hence, I stress the training of the mind to endure suffering and attain a more lasting state of happiness. However, I also have a more general and concrete idea of happiness: a combination of inner peace, economic development, and, above all, world peace. To achieve such goals I feel it is necessary to develop a sense of *universal responsibility*, a deep concern for all irrespective of creed, colour, sex, or nationality.

The premise behind this idea of universal responsibility is the simple fact that, in general terms, all others' desires are the same as mine. Every being wants happiness and does not want suffering. If we, as intelligent human beings, do not accept this fact, there will be more and more suffering on this planet. If we adopt a self-centred approach to life and constantly try to use others for our own self-interest, we may gain temporary benefits, but in the long run we will not succeed in achieving even personal happiness, and world peace will be completely out of the question.

Revealed Nuclear Policies Are a Sign of Bad Faith To Rest of the World

A press release from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
March 2002

On 9 March, reports surfaced in major US media that the US Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) [a classified document] released on 9 January [to selected members of congress] contains contingency plans for using nuclear weapons against seven states: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, North Korea, Russia and China. It also reportedly contains plans to develop and deploy new "earth-penetrating" nuclear weapons and to accelerate the time it would take to resume full-scale nuclear testing. Using nuclear weapons against other states or developing new nuclear weapons would directly violate US obligations to pursue the elimination of nuclear weapons under Article VI of the 1970 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

At the 2000 NPT Review Conference, the US, along with the other state parties to the treaty, committed themselves to an "unequivocal undertaking" to eliminate nuclear weapons and to a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies. Even if the US does not pursue the plans outlined in the NPR, as Secretary of State Colin Powell and other top military and government officials are claiming, the provocative rhetoric could unravel the non-proliferation regime.

"The fact that the US is developing contingency plans to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states will certainly be viewed as a sign of bad faith by most of the world and will do serious damage to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty," said David Krieger, President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation."

Weapons of mass destruction and missile proliferation do pose a legitimate threat not only to US security, but also to international security. However, unilateral US threats to use nuclear weapons, in conjunction with developing and

deploying missile defenses, as a means of countering these threats is likely to provoke rather than prevent proliferation. A much better option would be for the US to take the lead on negotiations for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation has issued an international appeal that has now been signed by over 100 prominent individuals, including 38 Nobel Laureates. The Appeal to End the Nuclear Weapons Threat to Humanity and All Life calls upon the US and other nuclear weapons states to take the following practical steps as a means to preserve the non-proliferation regime and achieve the complete elimination of nuclear weapons:

- * De-alert all nuclear weapons and de-couple all nuclear warheads from their delivery vehicles.
- * Reaffirm commitments to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- * Commence good faith negotiations to achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention requiring the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.
- * Declare policies of No First Use of nuclear weapons against other nuclear weapons states and policies of No Use against non-nuclear weapons states.
- * Reallocate resources from the tens of billions of dollars currently being spent for maintaining nuclear arsenals to improving human health, education and welfare throughout the world.

For more information please contact Carah Ong
Research and Publications Director,
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
www.wagingpeace.org
Tel: (805) 965-3443 Cell: (805) 453-0255
Fax: (805) 568-0466 Email: research@napf.org

Shaping the Future

By David Krieger

President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

From www.wagingpeace.org/articles/02.03/0228kriegershaping.htm

What kind of future do you want? The vision of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation is a world at peace, free of the threat of war and free of weapons of mass destruction. It is worth contemplating this vision. Is it a vision worth striving for? Is it an impossible dream or is it something that can be achieved?

Since no one can predict the future with certainty, those who say this vision is an impossible dream are helping to determine our reality and the future of our children and grandchildren. None of the pundits or intelligence agencies could foresee the fall of the Berlin Wall, the break-up of the Soviet Union, or the end of apartheid in South Africa. It was people who believed the future could be something more and better than the present that brought about these remarkable changes.

One thing is certain. The future will be shaped by what we do today. If we do nothing, we leave it to others to shape the future. If we continue to do what we have done in the past, the future is likely to resemble the past. When Nelson Mandela became president of South Africa, which itself was something impossible to predict, he had to make a decision on how the crimes of the apartheid period would be handled. Rather than harsh retribution, he chose amnesty for all who came before a Truth and Reconciliation Commission and admitted to their crimes. This choice helped shaped a new future for South Africa and perhaps for the world.

If we are to shape a new future for a safer and saner world we need to have bold visions of what that world could be. We need to dream great dreams, but we need to do more than this. We need to act to make our dreams a reality, even if those acts appear to be facing enormous obstacles.

It is hard to imagine an abuse of power that has ended of its own accord. Abuses end because people stand up to them and say No. The world changes because people can imagine

a better way to treat the earth and each other and say YES to change.

If we want a world without war, we need to be serious about finding alternative means to resolve disputes non-violently and to provide justice and uphold dignity for all people. This requires an institutional framework at the global level: a stronger United Nations, an effective International Court of Justice, and a new International Criminal Court to hold all leaders accountable for crimes under international law.

If we do not begin to redistribute resources so that everyone's basic needs can be met, the richer parts of the world will face a future of hostility and terrorism. The only way to prevent such a future is by turning tomorrow's enemies into today's friends. Creating a better future requires acting now for a more equitable present.

The future of life on the planet is endangered by weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons. We are committed to eliminating these weapons, but we won't succeed unless we are joined in this effort by far more people. That's where you come in. Be a force for a future free of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by being a force for change.

One of our supporters, Tony Ke, a high-powered Canadian web designer, recently created a new web site called End of Existence (www.endofexistence.org). I encourage you to visit it for an exciting new look at why we must abolish nuclear weapons before they abolish us. I also encourage you to join some of the world's great leaders in signing our Appeal to End the Nuclear Weapons Threat to Humanity at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/secure/signtheappeal.asp>.

Let's not let the future be shaped by our complacency and inaction. We have the power, the privilege and the responsibility to shape a better world, a world free of war and free of weapons of mass destruction. The Foundation works each day to achieve this vision. You can find out more about what we are doing and how you can play a part by exploring our web site: www.wagingpeace.org. We invite you to be part of the solution.

Faking Nuclear Restraint:

A Technical Analysis of the Bush Administration's Secret Plan For Strengthening U.S. Nuclear Forces

Excerpts from the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) press release of February 13, 2002

After a year in office the Bush administration has completed the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) mandated by Congress in the fall of 2000. The NPR establishes the broad outline of Pentagon planning for U.S. nuclear strategy, force levels and infrastructure for the next 10 years and beyond. It also endorses significant revisions to the nuclear war planning process to enhance its flexibility and responsiveness, which would allow the Pentagon to generate new nuclear attack plans and have them approved quickly in a crisis.

The administration has provided the public with a cursory view of the NPR, but the entire report remains secret. The NPR has received little attention from the news media and even less from analysts. This is unfortunate. The logic and assumptions underlying the administration's hostility to arms control, and its infatuation with nuclear weapons, deserve vigorous public scrutiny and debate. Not since the resurgence of the Cold War in Ronald Reagan's first term has there been such an emphasis on nuclear weapons in U.S. defense strategy. Behind the administration's rhetorical mask of post Cold War restraint lie expansive plans to revitalize U.S. nuclear forces, and all the elements that support them, within a so-called "New Triad" of capabilities that combine nuclear and conventional offensive strikes with missile defenses and nuclear weapons infrastructure.

NRDC has learned from a variety of sources more about the likely implications of this review for the evolution of the U.S. nuclear posture. Words and phrases in quotation marks are said to be from the NPR or the Department of Defense (DOD) special briefing on the NPR:

Nuclear Weapons Forever?

- The Bush administration assumes that nuclear weapons will be part of U.S. military forces at least for the next 50 years. Starting from this premise it is planning an extensive and expensive series of programs to sustain and

modernize the existing force and to begin studies for a new ICBM to be operational in 2020, a new SLBM and SSBN in 2030, and a new heavy bomber in 2040, as well as new warheads for all of them. Nuclear weapons will continue to play a "critical role" because they possess "unique properties" that provide "credible military options" for holding at risk "a wide range of target types" important to a potential adversary's threatened use of "weapons of mass destruction" or "large-scale conventional military force."

- The NPR uses terminology from the September 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review, which states the purpose of possessing nuclear weapons is fourfold: to "assure allies and friends," "dissuade competitors," "deter aggressors" and "defeat enemies."
- The Bush administration will not eliminate the relatively inflexible nuclear "counterforce" Major Attack Options that characterized the Cold War nuclear planning process, despite the administration's pronouncements about being in a post-Cold War world. Instead, the administration will scale the attack options to the size required to preempt opposing threats, and supplement them by an "adaptive planning" process that anticipates a range of nuclear contingencies and is flexible enough to respond quickly where and when a crisis occurs.

The Numbers Game

- The United States is "adjusting its immediate nuclear force requirements" for "operationally deployed forces" downward, from 8,000 warheads today to 3,800 in 2007, in recognition of the changed relationship with Russia, but "Russia's nuclear forces and programs remain a concern." Barring unforeseen adverse developments, the NPR's eventual "goal" is to reach the level of 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed weapons" in 2012.
- Over the next 10 years, the Bush administration's plans call for the United States to retain a total stockpile of intact nuclear weapons and weapon components that is roughly seven to nine times larger than the publicly stated goal of 1,700 to 2,200

"operationally deployed weapons." This is an accounting system worthy of Enron. The operationally deployed weapons are only the visible portion of a huge, hidden arsenal. To the "accountable" tally of 2,200 one must add the following:

- ~240 missile warheads on the two Trident submarines in overhaul at any given time;
 - + ~1,350 strategic missile and bomber warheads in the "responsive force";
 - + ~800 "nonstrategic" bombs assigned to US/NATO "dual-capable" aircraft;
 - + ~320 "nonstrategic" sea-launched cruise missile warheads in the "responsive force;"
 - + ~160 "spare" strategic and non-strategic warheads;
 - + ~4,900 intact warheads in the "inactive reserve" stockpile;
-
- = ~7,800 intact warheads;
- ~5,000 stored plutonium "primary" and HEU
 - + "secondary" components that could be reassembled into weapons

In other words, the Bush administration is actually planning to retain the potential to deploy not 1,700 to 2,200 nuclear weapons, but as many as 15,000.

The Nuclear Complex and Infrastructure

- The administration plans to revitalize U.S. nuclear infrastructure with the capacity to: upgrade existing systems, "surge" production of weapons, and develop and field "entirely new systems." All of this is designed to "discourage" other countries from "competing militarily with the United States."
- The administration believes that the current arsenal -- a subset of what was in place at the end of the Cold War -- is not what is needed for the future. That arsenal was developed and deployed mainly to deter the former Soviet Union and to carry out the "Single Integrated Operational Plan (SIOP)." In the administration's view, significantly modified and quite possibly new nuclear warheads will be required to accomplish new military missions, and thus the NPR calls for a revitalized nuclear weapon complex that could, if directed, design, develop, manufacture and certify new warheads.

The administration believes that the development of this arsenal must begin now because it will take much longer than a decade to complete. This arsenal would have the capability to target and destroy mobile and re-locatable targets and hard and deeply buried targets. ...

Spinning the Nuclear Posture Review While Violating U.S. Treaty Commitments

Administration officials have sought to cast the NPR as a watershed step in breaking with the Cold War past. As Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld stated in the publicly released foreword:

First and foremost, the Nuclear Posture Review puts the Cold War practices related to planning for strategic forces behind us.... As a result of this review, the U.S. will no longer plan, size or sustain its forces as Russia presented merely a smaller version of the threat posed by the former Soviet Union.

In fact, a fully informed analysis of the NPR suggests that far more has been retained than discarded from the Cold War's doctrine and practice regarding nuclear weapons, and the break is not nearly as clean as suggested.

Moreover, a strong case can be made that the nuclear weapons policies and programs laid out in the NPR effectively preclude further U.S. "good faith" participation in international negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Good faith participation in such negotiations, leading to the achievement of "effective measures" (such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty) "relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament," is a legal and political obligation of all parties under Article VI of the nearly universal nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) that entered into force in 1970. The Bush administration posture of avoiding further binding legal constraints on the U.S. nuclear arsenal, while pursuing the reinvigoration of the U.S. nuclear weapons production complex and the development of new nuclear weapons, will be viewed by many nations as a blatant breach of the "good faith" negotiating standard under the treaty, and tantamount to a U.S. "breakout" from the NPT. ...

For complete text of press release, please visit:
www.nrdc.org/media/pressreleases/020213a.asp

Four Key Issues: A background briefing on the politics of nuclear disarmament

By John M. LaForge (1998)

The clamor for nuclear disarmament is being raised by millions the world over not only by established peace and anti-nuclear organizations, but by NGOs, scientific panels, retired generals, eminent military and civilian officials, nuclear weapons designers, and international judges. With the influential weight of these new voices, the United States has an opportunity to reconsider official nuclear weapons policy and to achieve four important victories in route to the bomb's abolition: A pledge of "no first use"; a promise of no use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-armed states; a disclosure and accounting of secret military programs; a formal renunciation of the "usefulness" of the bomb. In the following pages I will present a brief review of each of these four issues.

Pledge "No First Use"

The United States' atomic bombings were the "first use" of nuclear weapons in more ways than one. In modern parlance, nuclear "first use" means the escalation from conventional bombing or the threat of it, to the initiation of nuclear warfare. The U.S. government was not only the first to use nuclear weapons in war but the first to escalate from conventional to nuclear bombardment. The Pentagon still uses the "first use" threat, as in the 1991 Persian Gulf bombing campaign, during which government officials, including Defense Secretary Dick Cheney and Secretary of State James Baker, "continued to publicly hint that the United States might retaliate with nuclear weapons." Following their lead, U.S. Representative Dan Burton (R-IN), syndicated columnist Cal Thomas, and others publicly advocated bombing Iraq with nuclear

weapons in the midst of the U.S.-led bombardment.

In April 1996, the Clinton administration's Herald Smith publicly threatened to use nuclear weapons against the African state of Libya—a member in good standing of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty—for allegedly building a weapons plant. When then Defense Secretary William Perry was questioned about Smith's threat, he only reiterated it, saying about using U.S. nuclear weapons against non-nuclear Libya, "...we would not forswear that possibility." (The nonproliferation treaty forbids any nuclear attack against states that are party to it.)

Last November [1997], the Clinton administration made public in Presidential Policy Directive 60 the "first-use" intentions of its nuclear warfare planners. The announcement was that U.S. H-bombs are aimed at Third World nations said by the Department of State to be administered by "rogue" governments. "The directive is notable for language that would allow the United States to launch nuclear weapons in response to the use of chemical or biological weapons..." The presidential announcement was accompanied by a statement by senior National Security Council staffer Robert Bell who said, "The [Directive] requires a wide range of nuclear retaliatory options, from a limited strike to a more general nuclear exchange." And "Clinton ordered that the military...reserve the right to use nuclear arms first, even before the detonation of an enemy warhead."

This newly announced first-strike policy flies in the face of the prestigious National Academy of Sciences (NAS), the nation's highest scientific advisory group, which recommended last June that the United States, "declare that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons in war or crisis." The Clinton administration seemed to directly dismiss the NAS's advice when, in April 1998, the U.S. Embassy in Moscow flatly refused to rule out the possible use of nuclear warheads against

Iraq, saying "...we do not rule out in advance any capability available to us."

Pledging "no first use" would save billions of dollars in research and development, as well as the cost of maintenance of systems designed to strike first: the MX, Trident I and II, Cruise and Minuteman III missiles, and the B-1 and Stealth bombers. Forswearing nuclear "first use" wouldn't be risky in geopolitical terms because the United States has no nuclear-armed enemies, and all the other nuclear-armed states (Britain, China, France, India, Israel, and Russia) are either allies, "most favored nations," clients, or military Don Quixoties.

Further, a "no first use" pledge would free U.S. presidents from threatening to go nuclear, officially unacknowledged terrorism they have practiced many times. Putting an end to these ultimate bomb threats would bring U.S. actions in line with its current rhetoric: President Clinton denounced "nuclear terrorism" on June 15, 1995, en route to the summit meeting in Halifax.

Significantly, the nuclear weapons states who have used their first strike "master card" believe they've succeeded with their dreadful risk-taking—the way an extortionist can get what he wants without ever pulling the trigger. Nuclear war planners want to keep this "ace" up their sleeve. Sadly, since official history has it that the U.S. Army Air Corps' atomic bombings of Japan were justified, there is a heavy stigma against formally renouncing another first use. To do so might seem to call into question the rationale of having crossed the line back then.

Promise No Nuclear Strikes

Using the bomb against non-nuclear Japan followed the mass destruction of Dresden and Hamburg in Germany and the indiscriminate fire bombings of Kobe, Osaka, Yokohama, and Tokyo in Japan. In August 1945, the power disparity between nuclear and "conventional" firestorms must have appeared small. However, the atom bomb's real punch—initially denied

and by nature delayed for many years—is now known to be cancer, leukemia, birth defects, and weakened immune system function for generation upon generation. Today's U.S. warheads are from 12 to 96 times the magnitude of the Hiroshima blast: from 150 kiloton (Kt) warheads on Cruise missiles, to the 1,200 Kt (1.2 megaton) B-83 bombs aboard the air force's heavy bombers.

The deadly power of modern H-bombs (more accurately "radiation bombs" [that kill people with an intense wave of neutrons and gamma rays]) gives the demand for a "non-nuclear immunity" pledge the advantage of being fair and rational. The so-called "rogue states" that the U.S. State Department claims want to join the Nuclear Club—Libya, North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Cuba—have a combined military budget of \$15.3 billion (Libya: \$1 billion; N. Korea \$6 billion; Iraq: \$3 billion; Iran: \$2 billion; Syria: \$3 billion; Cuba: \$0.3 billion). This is less than one-ninth of the Pentagon's annual \$300-plus billion (including NASA, Energy Department, and National Guard). The 1991 Persian Gulf bombardment and the decade-long bombings of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, proved to the non-nuclear states and all the world and should have proved to our own, that nuclear weapons are superfluous and totally unnecessary when the government chooses to destroy small countries.

The agreement on non-nuclear immunity made May 11, 1995 by the five declared Nuclear Club members will not quell legitimate charges of hypocrisy made against them. The pact is full of exceptions and is not binding. Only China has made an unequivocal pledge: "At no time and under no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons and (China) undertakes unconditionally not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones."

In spite of the possible taint of impropriety that may accrue to the atomic bombings of Japan, the United States should end its opposition to adopting China's unambiguous

language and promise never to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states.

Secret Military Programs

The building, testing, and unleashing of the bomb in 1945 was done in total secrecy by the Manhattan Project. The Project provided the unprecedented political insurance that was necessary for such extravagant spending on such a dubious program. It might never have “worked.” One consequence of the Project’s leap into hidden government spending—ironically, all done in the name of combating anti-democratic militarism—is that a militarized and anti-democratic process was institutionalized.

Witness the 4,000 secret radiation experiments conducted under the auspices of the U.S. military against more than 16,000 U.S. civilians: pregnant women, retarded children, prison inmates, cancer patients, the terminally ill, and stolen cadavers. Former Energy Secretary Hazel O’Leary confessed shock about the U.S. scientist’s actions. “I said, ‘Who were these people [conducting the experiments] and why did this happen?’ The only thing I could think of was Nazi Germany.” Official misconduct on such a scale could not have occurred without the nuclear establishment’s grant of complete secrecy.

If further proof were needed that such official secrecy breeds more wrong-doing than it prevents, we have hundreds of thousands of tons of military radioactive wastes that have been injected into deep wells, dumped into the water table, buried in shallow trenches, and thrown into the oceans (our nuclear submarines still routinely release “allowable” amounts of liquid and gaseous radioactive wastes into the oceans), that will threaten living things with cancer and reproductive abnormalities forever. The U.S. government’s cover-up of these ethical and environmental outrages was exposed in 20 front-page *New York Times* articles in 1989.

The classified Pentagon budget has now ballooned to about \$30 billion or more per year. The official secrecy this fund is afforded

protects programs and adventures that may not be legal, but, because they’re secret, cannot be challenged in Congress, the courts, or the press. Indeed, the secret budget continues to exist because the boondoggles that it keeps secret could not withstand public or Congressional oversight.

One example is the Navy’s Project ELF, which for years has been attacked in Congress as a “cold war relic.” The ELF transmitter sends one-way orders to submerged, nuclear-armed U.S. and British submarines around the world. This nuclear war “starter pistol” was saved from certain cancellation in April 1995 by a so-called “classified emergency reason” originating with the Navy. The nuclear war fighting function of ELF (along with its potentially harmful non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation), made it an easy target for deficit hawks, so its budget had earlier been cut. The Navy’s maneuver—by way of the “secret emergency” which is still unknown to the public—convinced a House-Senate conference committee to restore the funding. U.S. Senator Russ Feingold (D-WI), who has repeatedly sponsored legislation to terminate Project ELF, was unconvinced by what he called an “eleventh-hour trick,” saying, “The Navy explicitly told me there was no ‘classified’ reason for maintaining ELF.” Hundreds of these cold war dinosaurs are still being maintained inside secret programs that, if made public, would make laughing stocks of the military contractors—and the taxpayers.

Admit the Uselessness of the Bomb

Calling nuclear warheads “fundamentally useless,” the National Academy of Sciences, in the June 1997 report mentioned earlier, charged that current U.S. nuclear war fighting plans were “largely unchanged from the cold war era” when 30,000 H-bombs were targeted at the former USSR and China. This NAS rejection of the bomb is a far cry from current State Department policy and amounts to a startling condemnation of official U.S. history.

There has for 50 years been a debate about whether the destruction of Hiroshima and

Nagasaki was “necessary.” Although critical voices have generally been drowned by the soothing official paradox that “the Bomb saved lives,” negative answers are not hard to find. In 1945, Brig. Gen. Bonnie Feller wrote, “Neither the atomic bombing nor the entry of the Soviet Union into the war forced Japan’s unconditional surrender.” Historian Gar Alperovitz (*Atomic Diplomacy*, Penguin Books, 1985 and *The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb*, Random House, 1996) has said, “I think it can be proven that the bomb was not only unnecessary but known in advance not to be necessary.” President Dwight Eisenhower said it wasn’t necessary: “First, the Japanese were ready to surrender and it wasn’t necessary to hit them with that awful thing. Second, I hated to see our country be the first to use such a weapon.”

These charges, as contrary to the government story as they are, share a wrongheaded implication; namely, that nuclear warfare could conceivably be “necessary” or “excusable” under some circumstances. That most people in the United States still believe this to be true, is the result of decades of myth-making started by President Truman, who said, “The world will note that the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, a military base. That was because we wished this first attack to avoid, insofar as possible, the killing of civilians.”



Hiroshima -- August 1945

Taking President Truman at his word, the 140,000 civilians killed at Hiroshima are the minimum to be expected when exploding a small nuclear weapon on a “military base.” At

this rate today’s “small” (Cruise missile) warheads, which are 12 times the power of Truman’s bomb, might “avoid” killing any more, but would kill a minimum of 1.68 million civilians.

The ability to think of such acts as “necessary”—and to prepare and to threaten them—requires the adoption of a learned indifference that insulates the conscience of the executioner. Such a deep-seated denial is needed in order to excuse any mass destruction because, generally, the rightness of indiscriminate attacks is not debatable whether in Oklahoma City, Sarajevo, Rwanda, or Hiroshima. Furthermore, since the H-bomb can produce only uncontrollable, widespread, and long-term results, it follows that the rationalization of U.S. nuclear war planning has hardly changed since 1945. Consider how similar to President Truman’s words (above) are those of the U.S. State Department’s recent declaration to the International Court of Justice (the World Court) on the question of the legality of using nuclear weapons: “Nuclear weapons can be directed at a military target and can be used in a discriminate manner.”

This artful lie, the engine of the nuclear weapons establishment, amounts to the cynical and outlawed notion that good can come from the commission of mass destruction. The State Department’s claim cannot, no matter how often or skillfully repeated, make the effects of even one nuclear warhead limited, controllable, militarily practical or ethically justifiable.

In his October 3, 1996 speech to the State of the World Forum in San Francisco, Gen. George Lee Butler became the first U.S. Strategic Air Command (SAC) commander in history to condemn U.S. nuclear weapons and nuclear war policy, a policy he had molded and implemented, saying in part, “A renewed appreciation for the obscene power of a single nuclear weapon is taking a new hold on our consciousness...” He delivered the same statement to the National Press Club December 4, 1996. In a more recent essay, Gen. Butler has

said that President Clinton's nuclear war policy is based on the mistaken belief that "nuclear weapons retain an aura of utility." Gen. Butler argues that "Too many of us have failed to properly understand the risks and consequences of nuclear war. [Nuclear weapons'] effects transcend time and place, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation[s]." Butler concludes that, "The likely consequences of nuclear war have no politically, militarily or morally acceptable justification, and therefore the threat to use nuclear weapons is indefensible."

Conclusion

Even if the official history and rationalizations surrounding the 1945 atomic bombings are not rejected by a majority, these four conclusive steps—a pledge of "no first use," a promise of non-nuclear immunity, the abandonment of secret military budgets, and the renunciation of nuclear war's "usefulness" might be taken in view of what is indisputably known about nuclear weapons. Furthermore, crucial and compelling demands have been issued in recent months by dozens of authorities who now agree that nuclear abolition is necessary and possible. For example, last February at the National Press Club, 117 world leaders—among them former President Jimmy Carter, former President of the USSR Mikhail Gorbachev, former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, and former Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau—called upon nuclear weapons states to "declare unambiguously that their goal is ultimate abolition"; in April 1997 Dr. Hans Bethe, a Nobel Prize winner and the most senior of the living scientists who built the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs, wrote to President Clinton calling on him to withdraw the \$2.2 billion in funding set for nuclear weapons development; in December 1996, 62 retired generals and admirals from around the world published a declaration in major papers urging that "the following...must be undertaken now...long term international nuclear policy must be based on the declared principle of continuous,

complete and irrevocable elimination of nuclear weapons."

A practical mechanism and working blueprint for verifiable nuclear disarmament was proposed August 14, 1996 by the international Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. The commission was made up of 17 prominent experts from around the world including Gen. Butler, former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, and Nobel Peace Prize winner Joseph Rotblat. International legal authority for such a program was reaffirmed by the July 8, 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice (the World Court), which (besides outlawing the threatened use of nuclear weapons) declared that nuclear weapons states are under a binding obligation to proceed with the elimination of nuclear weapons under the terms of the 1970/1995 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

These are the obvious, decisive, and available reasons and means by which to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons. The goal can be reached only if those of us demanding it will amplify our voices and refuse to take no for an answer.

John M. LaForge is co-director of Nukewatch, a peace and environmental action group based in Wisconsin, and editor of its quarterly newsletter *The Pathfinder* (PO Box 649, Luck, WI 54853). His articles on nuclear power and weapons have appeared in *Z Magazine*, *The Progressive*, *Earth Island Journal*, and *Sociological Imagination*.

This article was first published as "Nuclear Politics - Nuclear Disarmament - Hiroshima's and Nagasaki's lessons still to be learned," in the July/August 1998 issue of *Z Magazine*. Reprinted with permission.

World Civilian Leaders' Statement For Nuclear Weapons Abolition February 2, 1998

*Read by (and with comments from) Alan Cranston,
Former U.S. Senator and Chair, State of the World
Forum, on February 2, 1998, at the National Press
Club, Washington, D.C.*

“First, I’ll read the statement by heads of state and civilian leaders worldwide, advocating that specific steps be taken now to reduce ongoing nuclear weapon dangers still facing us all after the end of the Cold War. These leaders, many of who led their nations during the Cold War, urge that the nuclear states declare unambiguously that their goal is ultimate abolition of nuclear weapons.

The statement is as follows:”

“The end of the Cold War has wrought a profound transformation of the international political and security arena. Ideological confrontation has been supplanted by burgeoning global relations across every field of human endeavor. There is intense alienation but also civilized discourse. There is acute hostility but also significant effort for peaceful resolution in place of violence and bloodshed.

Most importantly, the long sought prospect of a world free of the apocalyptic threat of nuclear weapons is suddenly within reach. This is an extraordinary moment in the course of human affairs, a near miraculous opportunity to realize that noble goal. But, it is also perishable: the specter of nuclear proliferation cannot be indefinitely contained. The urgent attention and best efforts of scholars and statesmen must be brought to bear.

Leaders of the nuclear weapon states, and of the de facto nuclear nations, must keep the promise of nuclear disarmament enshrined in the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970 and

clarified and reaffirmed in 1995 in the language codifying its indefinite extension. They must do so by commencing the systematic and progressive reduction and marginalization of nuclear weapons, and by declaring unambiguously that their goal is ultimate abolition.

Many military leaders of many nations have warned that all nations would be more secure in a world free of nuclear weapons. Immediate and practical steps toward this objective have been arrayed in a host of compelling studies, most notably in the Report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. Among these proposals, we, the undersigned, fully subscribe to the following measures:

- Remove nuclear weapons from alert status, separate them from their delivery vehicles, and place them in secure national storage.
- Halt production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons.
- End nuclear testing, pending entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- Launch immediate U.S./Russian negotiations toward further, deep reductions of their nuclear arsenals, irrespective of START II ratification.
- Unequivocal commitment by the other declared and undeclared nuclear weapon states to join the reduction process on a proportional basis as the U.S. and Russia approach their arsenal levels, within an international system of inspection, verification, and safeguards.
- Develop a plan for eventual implementation, achievement and enforcement of the distant but final goal of elimination.

The foregoing six steps should be undertaken immediately.

The following additional steps should be carefully considered, to determine whether they are presently appropriate and feasible:

- Repatriate nuclear weapons deployed outside of sovereign territory.
- Commit to No First Use of nuclear weapons.
- Ban production and possession of large, long-range ballistic missiles.
- Account for all materials needed to produce nuclear weapons, and place them under international safeguards.

The world is not condemned to live forever with threats of nuclear conflict, or the anxious fragile peace imposed by nuclear deterrence. Such threats are intolerable and such a peace unworthy. The sheer destructiveness of nuclear weapons invokes a moral imperative for their elimination. That is our mandate. Let us begin.”

[Alan Cranston continues...] This statement was drafted by a number of leaders, from a number of lands, primarily Americans and Russians.

Leaders were signing it up to the last minute. Altogether, when the list closed this morning, there were 117 signatures from 46 nations, including 47 past or present presidents and prime ministers.

Among them are former heads of state from four of the five declared nuclear powers: Michel Rocard of France, Mikhail Gorbachev and Egor Gaidar of the Soviet Union and Russia, Lord James Callaghan of the UK, and Jimmy Carter of the U.S. China, the fifth nuclear power, is represented by a former ambassador and by a prominent leader of what the Chinese uniquely call a G.O.N.G.O. — a Government Organized Non-Governmental

Organization. China’s official policy was stated at the UN on September 25, 1996, by Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Qian Qichen who said, “We always stand for the

complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.”

The three principle nations under the nuclear “umbrella” are represented by former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of Germany, Shin Hyon-Hwak of Korea, and — not surprisingly — five former prime ministers of Japan including the most recent, Tomiichi Murayama.

Notable among present heads of state on the list is President Eduard Shevardnadze of Georgia, who as Soviet Foreign Minister did so much, along with President Gorbachev, President Ronald Reagan and Secretary of State George Shultz, to reverse the super-power nuclear arms race.

Prominent individuals from two of the three threshold nuclear states, Israel and Pakistan, signed on. No one did from India, but India officially supports abolition — on condition that a deadline be set for achieving it. Two Indian Generals did sign the companion abolition statement made by professional military leaders a year ago.

The military statement gave new momentum to the drive to reduce and ultimately end nuclear dangers. We believe this civilian statement will further advance the cause. General Butler, in his brief summary of progress since the generals spoke out, mentions the remarkably rapid spread of Nuclear Weapons Free Zones in a literal tidal wave of treaties that now covers the entire land area of the Southern Hemisphere and is headed north. Maps are available at the press table showing the zones that have been formed and the more than 100 nations and areas they embrace. All five nuclear powers are parties to the treaty establishing the Antarctic zone and have signed protocols to one or another of these treaties acknowledging that they are prohibited from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against the contracting parties. All five, for diverse reasons, have also declined to sign such protocols to one or another of the treaties.

A leader of one nations in the African Zone, former President Obote of Uganda, signed the civilian statement but requested that we note his view that “small arms are a bigger problem to poor countries.”

On this day when the latest federal budget is made public I want to note nuclear weapons have cost American taxpayers approximately \$6 trillion dollars since 1940. According to a book, "Atomic Audit" edited by Stephen I. Schwartz and to be published by the Brookings Institution this spring, the cost in this year's budget will exceed over 34 billion. Over 24 billion of that sum will cover operation and maintenance of our nuclear arsenal. This cost will not diminish significantly year after year into the future unless our present nuclear policies are revised in view of the changes in the world that followed the end of the Cold War. The statement by civilian leaders points the way not only to reductions in dangers but also to reductions in spending.

These world leaders propose a prudent path which can and should be embarked upon immediately. They propose taking nuclear weapons off their present perilous hair-trigger alert posture, beginning immediate U.S./Russian negotiations towards deep reduction of nuclear arsenals irrespective of START II ratification, and working towards the ultimate goal of elimination. The U.S. Government believes that the principle threat today to our national security lies in the clear and present danger that terrorists or rogue states will somehow acquire nuclear weapons — and proceed to use them. The measures these leaders propose — particularly halting production of fissile materials, and placing all materials needed to produce nuclear weapons under international safeguards — would increase national and world security and decrease the possibility of proliferation into irresponsible hands.

As these well-respected world leaders urge, “Let Us Begin.” (Signers of the statement appear on the following pages.)

The State of the World Forum's web site is <http://www.worldforum.org>

International civilian leaders who have signed this Statement on Nuclear Weapons:

Argentina:

Raul Alfonsin, Former President

Australia:

Malcom Fraser, Former Prime Minister

Gough Whitlam, Former Prime Minister

Kim C. Beazley, Former Deputy Prime Minister

Richard Butler, Ambassador to U.N. and
Chair, U.N. Special Commission on Iraq

Gareth Evans, Former Foreign Minister,
Member of Parliament and Deputy Leader
of the Opposition

Bangladesh:

A.D.M.S. Chuwdhury, Former Deputy Prime
Minister and Deputy Opposition Leader,
Parliament

Muhammad Yunus, Managing Director,
Grameen Bank

Brazil:

Jose Sarney, Senator and Former Prime Minister

Calso L.N. Amorim, Former Foreign Minister

Bulgaria:

Nicolai Dobrev, Chair, National Security
Committee, Parliament,

Former Minister of Interior

Nicolai Kamov, Chair, Foreign Affairs
Committee, Parliament

Dimitra Pavlov, Minister of Defense

Canada:

Pierre Trudeau, Former Prime Minister

Douglas Roche, Former Ambassador for
Disarmament

Chile:

Juan Somavia, Ambassador to U.N. and
Past President, UN Security Council

China:

Qian Jiadong, Former Chinese Ambassador
to the United Nations

Chen Jifeng, Secretary General, Chinese People's
Association for Peace and Disarmament

Colombia:

Misael Pastrana Borrero, Former President
(Deceased Aug. 1997)

Costa Rica:

Jose Figueres, President
Oscar Arias, Former President
Rodrigo Carazo, Former President
Rebeca Grynspan Mayufis, Second Vice President
Rodrigo Oreamuno B., First Vice President

Cyprus:

George Vassiliou, Former President and
President, United Democrats

Egypt

Esmat Abdul Meguid, Secretary General,
League of Arab States,
Former Foreign Minister

Finland:

Kalevi Sorsa, Former President

France:

Michel Rocard, Former Prime Minister
Chair, Committee on Development
and Cooperation, European Parliament
Jacques Attali, Former Special Advisor to
President Mitterand

Georgia:

Eduard A. Shevardnadze, President

Germany:

Helmut Schmidt, Former Chancellor
Honorary Chair, International Council
Hans Modrow, Former Prime Minister, East Germany
Egon Bahr, Former Minister for Special Affairs
Angelika Beer, Spokesperson for Defense,
Alliance 90/Green Party, Member, Bundestag
Alfred Dregger, Hon. Chair, Christian Democratic
Party, Member, Bundestag
Hans Koschnik, Former Administrator,
European Union, Mostar
Markus Meckel, Former Foreign Minister, East
Germany, Member, Bundestag
Dr. Walter Romberg, Former Minister of Finances,
East Germany
Lothar Späth, Former Minister-President,
Baden-Wurtemberg
Hans-Jochen Vogel, Former Mayor, Berlin
Former Minister of Justice
Former Chair, Social Democratic Party

Hungary:

Ervin Laszlo, Founder and President,
Club of Budapest

Israel:

Yael Dayan, Member, Kneset

Japan:

Tsutomu Hata, Former Prime Minister
& Member, Diet

Morihiro Hosokawa, Former Prime Minister &
Member, Diet

Kiichi Miyazawa, Former Prime Minister
& Member, Diet

Tomiichi Murayama, Former Prime Minister
& Member, Diet

Noboru Takeshita, Former Prime Minister
& Member, Diet

Takako Doi, Former Speaker, House of
Representatives & Member, Diet

Masaharu Gotoda, Former Vice Prime Minister

Takashi Hiraoka, Mayor, Hiroshima

Ichio Ito, Mayor, Nagasaki

Yohei Kono, Former Vice Prime Minister

Hyosuke Kujiraoka, Former Vice Speaker,
House of Representatives, Member, Diet

Kenzaburo Oe, Nobel Laureate

Kyrgyz Republic:

Askar Akaev, President

Muratbek S. Imanaliev, Foreign Minister

Rosa Otunbaeva, Former Foreign Minister,
Ambassador to U.K.

Lebanon:

Sadim El.Hoss, Former Prime Minister

Malaysia:

Ismail Razali, President, UN General Assembly

Mexico:

Miguel de la Madrid, Former President

Mongolia:

Punsalmaa Ochirbat, Former President

Jalbuu Choinhor, Ambassador to U.S.

Namibia:

Sam Junoma, President

Nauru:

Lagumont Harris, Former President

Ruben Kun, Member, Parliament
Former President

David Peter, Former Speaker, Parliament

Netherlands:

Ruud Lubbers, Former Prime Minister
Minister of State

Andries van Agt, Former Prime Minister
Chair, Interaction Council

E. Korthals Altes, Former Ambassador to Madrid

J. van Houwelingen, Former Deputy Minister
of Defence

J.G. Kraaijeveld-Wouters, Former Minister
of Defence

Dr. D.J.H. Kruisinga, Former Minister of Defence

Mr. J. de Ruiter, Former Minister of Defence

Prof. Dr. J.C. Terlouw, Former Deputy Prime
Minister, Minister for Economic Affairs

New Zealand:

David Lange, Former Prime Minister

Sir Geoffrey Palmer, Former Prime Minister

North Ireland:

Mairead Maguire, Honorary President, Peace People
Nobel Peace Laureate

Pakistan:

Prince Sadrudin Aga Khan,
Former UN High Commissioner for Refugees
President, Bellerive Foundation
Mahbub ul Haq, President, Human Development
Centre, Former Minister of Finance & Principal
Architect of UN's Annual Human Development
Report

Panama:

Ricardo de la Espriella, Former President

Philippines:

Corazon Aquino, Former President

Portugal:

Maria de Lourdes Pintasilgo, Former Prime Minister

Republic of Korea:

Shin Hyon-Hwak, Former Prime Minister

Russia:

Egor Gaidar, Former Prime Minister
Director, Research Institute for the Economy
in Transition
Mikhail Gorbachev, Former President, Soviet Union
Georgi Arbatov, President, Governing Board,
Institute of USA and Canada
Alexander Bessmertnykh, Former Soviet Foreign
Minister, Former Soviet Ambassador to US
President, Foreign Policy Association
Vitaly Goldansky, President, Russian Pugwash
Committee, Academician
Roland Timerbaev, Former Permanent Representative
of the USSR and Russia in IAEA
President, Center for Political Studies of Russia
Euvgeny Velikhov, Member, National Security
Council Academician
Alexander N. Yakovlev, Chair, President's
Commission on Rehabilitation of Repression
Victims, Chair, Russian Public Television;
Former Member, Politburo
Principal Domestic Advisor to President Gorbachev

South Africa:

F.W. De Klerk, Former President
Member, Parliament
National Leader, National Party
Bishop Desmond Tutu, Nobel Peace Laureate

Spain:

Enrique Baron Crespo, Member, European
Parliament, Former President, European Parliament
Fernando Moran Lopez, Chair, Committee on
Institutional Affairs, European Parliament
Former Foreign Minister

Sri Lanka:

A.T. Ariyaratne, Leader, Sarvodaya Movement
Gandhi Peace Prize, 1996
Anura Bandaranaike, Member, Parliament
Former Minister of Education
Former Leader of Opposition
Jayantha Dhanapala, President, NPT Review
and Extension Conference, 1995
Former Ambassador to U.S.

Suriname:

I.M. Djwalapersad, Speaker, Assembly

Sweden:

Goran Persson, Prime Minister
Ingvar Carlsson, Former Prime Minister
Maj Britt Theorin, Former Chair, UN Commission
of Experts on Nuclear Weapons
Member, European Parliament

Tanzania:

Al Hassan Mwinyi, Former President
Julius K. Nyerere, Former President
Chair, South Commission
Salim Ahmed Salim, Former Prime Minister
Secretary General, Organization of African Unity
President, U.N. General Assembly, 34th Session
Joseph Warioba, Former Prime Minister
Judge, International Tribunal on Law of the Seas

Thailand:

Anand Panyarachun, Former Prime Minister

Uganda:

Milton Obote, Former President
Dr. Paul Kacanga Ssemogerere,
Former Deputy Prime Minister/Foreign Minister
Dr. Naphali Akena Adoko, Former Chief of State
Security Justice Emmanuel Oteng, Former
Acting Chief Justice

United Kingdom:

Lord James Callaghan, Former Prime Minister
Member, House of Lords
Lord Denis Healey, Former Secretary of Defense
Former Chancellor of Exchequer
John Edmunds, Former Chief Negotiator, CTBT
Former Head, Arms Control & Disarmament,
Foreign Office
Betty Williams, Nobel Peace Laureate

United States:

Jimmy Carter, Former President

Zimbabwe:

Dr. Robert Mugabe, President

Beyond Nuclear Madness: An Air Force General Speaks Out Against Nuclear Weapons.

By retired Air Force General Lee Butler, former
Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Strategic Command. From
an address to the National Press Club, February 1998.

For thirty years I was intimately involved with nuclear weapons. I was among the most avid of the keepers of the faith in them, and for that I make no apology. Like my contemporaries, I was moved by fears and fired by beliefs that date back to the earliest days of the Atomic Era. For us, nuclear weapons were the savior that brought an implacable foe to his knees in 1945 and held another at bay for nearly a half-century. We believed that superior technology brought strategic advantage, that greater numbers meant stronger security, and that the ends of containment justified whatever means were necessary to achieve them.

Two years ago I became engaged in the debate for the abolition of nuclear weapons, joining hundreds of other retired generals, admirals, and present and former heads of state from a host of nations. I am persuaded that in every corner of the planet the tide of public sentiment is now running strongly in favor of diminishing the role of such weapons--that nuclear arsenals can and should be sharply reduced, that high alert postures are a dangerous anachronism, that first-use policies are an affront to democratic values, and that proliferation of nuclear weapons is a clear and present danger. Indeed, I am convinced that most people are well out in front of their governments in shaking off the grip of the Cold War and reaching for opportunities that emerge in its wake.

Conversely, it is evident that for many, nuclear weapons retain an aura of utility and of legitimacy that justifies their existence well into the future. The persistence of this view lies at the core of the concern that touches my soul.

When I was commissioned as an officer in the United States Air Force, the Cold War was heating to a fever pitch. I knew the moment I entered the nuclear arena I had been thrust into a

world beset with tidal forces, towering egos, maddening contradictions, alien constructs, and insane risks. Its arcane vocabulary -- “de-target,” “mutual assured destruction” -- and apocalyptic calculus defied comprehension. Its stage was global and its antagonists locked in a deadly spiral of deepening rivalry. It was in every respect a modern day holy war, a cosmic struggle between the forces of light and darkness.

*“We have no greater
responsibility than to bring the
nuclear era to a close.”*

I participated in the elaboration of basing schemes that bordered on the comical and force levels that in retrospect defied reason. I was responsible for war plans with more than 12,000 targets, many to be struck with repeated nuclear blows, some to the point of complete absurdity. I became steeped in the art of intelligence estimates, the psychology of negotiations, the interplay of the strategist, and the demanding skills of the air crew and missileer. I have been a party to their history, shared their triumphs and tragedies, witnessed heroic sacrifice and catastrophic failure of both men and machines.

And in the end, I came away from it all with profound misgivings and with a set of deeply unsettling judgments: That from the earliest days of the nuclear era, the risks and consequences of nuclear war have never been properly weighed by those who brandished it; that the stakes engage not just the survival of the antagonists, but the fate of humankind; that the likely consequences have no acceptable political, military, or moral justification. And therefore, that the threat to use nuclear weapons is indefensible.

Why were we so willing to tolerate the risks of the nuclear age? For all of my years as a nuclear strategist, operational commander, and public spokesman, I explained, justified, and sustained America’s massive nuclear arsenal as a function, a necessity, and a consequence of deterrence. Bound up in this singular term, this

familiar touchstone of security dating back to antiquity, was the intellectually comforting and deceptively simple justification for taking the most extreme risks and the expenditure of trillions of dollars. It was our shield and by extension our sword.

But now I see it differently--not in some blinding revelation, but at the end of a journey, in an age of deliverance from the consuming tensions of the Cold War. How is it that we subscribed to a strategy that required near perfect understanding of an enemy from whom we were deeply alienated and largely isolated? How could we pretend to understand the motivations and intentions of the Soviet leadership absent any substantial personal association? Why did we imagine a nation that had survived successive invasions and mind numbing losses would accede to a strategy premised on fear of nuclear war?

Deterrence in the Cold War setting was fatally flawed at the most fundamental level of human psychology in its projection of Western reason through the crazed lens of a paranoid foe. While we clung to the notion that nuclear war could be reliably deterred, Soviet leaders saw the matter differently. Their historical experience gave them the conviction that such a war might be thrust upon them and, if so, must not be lost. Driven by that fear, they took Herculean measures to fight and survive no matter the odds or the costs. Deterrence was a dialogue of the blind with the deaf. In the final analysis, it was largely a bargain we in the West made with ourselves.

Deterrence is flawed equally in that the consequences of its failure are intolerable. History teaches that nations can survive and even prosper in the aftermath of unconditional defeat. Not so in a nuclear era. Nuclear weapons give no quarter. Their effects transcend time and place, poisoning the Earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation. They leave us wholly without defense, expunge all hope for meaningful survival. They hold in their sway not just the fate of nations but the very meaning of civilization.

Deterrence is a slippery conceptual slope. It is not stable, nor is it static. Its wiles cannot be contained. It is both master and slave. It seduces the scientist yet bends to his creation, it serves the ends of evil as well as those of noble intent. It holds guilty the innocent as well as the culpable. At best it is a gamble no mortal should pretend to make. At worst it invokes death on a scale rivaling the power of the creator.

At the end of my journey I hear voices long ignored, the warnings muffled by the still lingering animosities of the Cold War. I see with painful clarity how, from the very beginning, we deprived ourselves of the objective scrutiny and searching debate essential to adequate comprehension and responsible oversight.

Vitally important decisions were taken routinely without adequate understanding, assertions too often prevailed over analysis, requirements took on organizational biases, technological opportunity and corporate profit drove force levels and capability, and political opportunism intruded on calculations of military necessity. The narrow concerns of a multitude of powerful interests intruded on the rightful role of key policy makers, constraining their latitude for decision. Many were simply denied access to critical information essential to the proper exercise of their office.

Only now are the dimensions, costs, and risks of these nuclear nether worlds coming to light. What must now be better understood are the causes, the mindsets, and the belief systems that brought them into existence. They must be challenged, they must be refuted, but most important, they must be let go. We have no greater responsibility than to bring the nuclear era to a close.

We cannot at once keep sacred the miracle of existence and hold sacrosanct the capacity to destroy it.

It is time to reassert the primacy of individual conscience, the voice of reason, and the rightful interests of humanity.

A Statement Supporting the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons -- Signed by Sixty Retired Generals and Admirals from Seventeen Countries -- December 5, 1996

We, military professionals, who have devoted our lives to the national security of our countries and our peoples, are convinced that the continuing existence of nuclear weapons in the armories of nuclear powers, and the ever present threat of acquisition of these weapons by others, constitute a peril to global peace and security and to the safety and survival of the people we are dedicated to protect.

Through our variety of responsibilities and experiences with weapons and wars in the armed forces of many nations, we have acquired an intimate and perhaps unique knowledge of the present security and insecurity of our countries and peoples.

We know that nuclear weapons, though never used since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, represent a clear and present danger to the very existence of humanity. There was an immense risk of a superpower holocaust during the Cold War. At least once, civilization was on the very brink of catastrophic tragedy. That threat has now receded, but not forever -- unless nuclear weapons are eliminated.

The end of the Cold War created conditions favorable to nuclear disarmament. Termination of military confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States made it possible to reduce strategic and tactical nuclear weapons, and to eliminate intermediate range missiles. It was a significant milestone on the path to nuclear disarmament when Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine relinquished their nuclear weapons.

Indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995 and approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by the

UN General Assembly in 1996 are also important steps towards a nuclear-free world. We commend the work that has been done to achieve these results.

Unfortunately, in spite of these positive steps, true nuclear disarmament has not been achieved. Treaties provide that only delivery systems, not nuclear warheads, will be destroyed. This permits the United States and Russia to keep their warheads in reserve storage, thus creating a "reversible nuclear potential." However, in the post-Cold War security environment, the most commonly postulated nuclear threats are not susceptible to deterrence or are simply not credible. We believe, therefore, that business as usual is not an acceptable way for the world to proceed in nuclear matters.

It is our deep conviction that the following is urgently needed and must be undertaken now:

First, present and planned stockpiles of nuclear weapons are exceedingly large and should now be greatly cut back;

Second, remaining nuclear weapons should be gradually and transparently taken off alert, and their readiness substantially reduced both in nuclear weapons states and in de facto nuclear weapons states;

Third, long-term international nuclear policy must be based on the declared principle of continuous, complete and irrevocable elimination of nuclear weapons.

The United States and Russia should -- without any reduction in their military security -- carry forward the reduction process already launched by START -- they should cut down to 1000 to 1500 warheads each and possibly lower. The other three nuclear states and the three threshold states should be drawn into the reduction process as still deeper reductions are negotiated down to the level of hundreds. There is nothing incompatible between defense by individual countries of their territorial integrity and progress toward nuclear abolition.

The exact circumstances and conditions

that will make it possible to proceed, finally, to abolition cannot now be foreseen or prescribed. One obvious prerequisite would be a worldwide program or surveillance and inspection, including measures to account for and control inventories of nuclear weapons materials. This will ensure that no rogues or terrorists could undertake a surreptitious effort to acquire nuclear capacities without detection at an early stage. An agreed procedure for forcible inter-national intervention and interruption of covert efforts in a certain and timely fashion is essential.

The creation of nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world, confidence-building and transparency measures in the general field of defense, strict implementation of all treaties in the area of disarmament and arms control, and mutual assistance in the process of disarmament are also important in helping to bring about a nuclear-free world. The development of regional systems of collective security, including practical measures for cooperation, partnership, interaction and communication are essential for local stability and security.

The extent to which the existence of nuclear weapons and fear of their use may have deterred war -- in a world that in this year alone has seen 30 military conflicts raging -- cannot be determined. It is clear, however, that nations now possessing nuclear weapons will not relinquish them until they are convinced that more reliable and less dangerous means of providing for their security are in place. It is also clear, as a consequence, that the nuclear powers will not now agree to a fixed timetable for the achievement of abolition.

It is similarly clear that, among the nations not now possessing nuclear weapons, there are some that will not forever forswear their acquisition and deployment unless they, too, are provided means of security. Nor will they forego acquisition if the present nuclear powers seek to retain everlastingly their nuclear monopoly.

Movement toward abolition must be a responsibility shared primarily by the declared nuclear weapons states -- China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, by the de facto nuclear states, India, Israel and Pakistan; and by major non-nuclear powers such as Germany and Japan. All nations should move in concert toward the same goal.

We have been presented with a challenge of the highest possible historic importance: the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free world. The end of the Cold War makes it possible.

The dangers of proliferation, terrorism, and new nuclear arms race render it necessary. We must not fail to seize our opportunity. There is no alternative.

Signed, [by retired generals and admirals of the following nations]

CANADA

Johnson, Major General V., (Ret.)
Commandant, National Defense College

DENMARK

Kristensen, Lt. General Gunnar (Ret.)
former Chief of Defense Staff

FRANCE

Sanguinetti, Admiral Antoine (Ret.) former
Chief of Staff, French Fleet

GHANA

Erskine, General Emmanuel (Ret.) former
Commander in Chief and former Chief of
Staff, UNTSO (Middle East), Commander
UMFI (Lebanon)

GREECE

Capellos, Lt. General Richard (Ret.) former
Corps Commander

Konstantinides, Major General Kostas (Ret.)
former Chief of Staff, Army Signals

INDIA

Rikhye, Major General Indar Jit (Ret.)
former military advisor to UN Secretary
General Dag Hammarskjold and U Thant

Surt, Air Marshal N. C. (Ret.)

JAPAN

Sakoiyo, Vice Admiral Naotoshi (Ret.) Sr.
Advisor, Research Institute for Peace and
Security

Shikata, Lt. General Toshiyuki (Ret.)
Sr. Advisor, Research Institute for
Peace and Security

JORDAN

Ajelilat, Major General Sahfiq (Ret.)
Vice President Military Affairs, Muta
University

Shiyyab, Major General Mohammed K.
(Ret.) former Deputy Commander,
Royal Jordanian Air Force

NETHERLANDS

van der Graaf, Henry J. (Ret.) Director
Centre Arms Control & Verification,
Member, United National Advisory
Board for Disarmament Matters

NORWAY

Breivik, Roy, Vice Admiral (Ret.)
former Representative to NATO,
Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic

PAKISTAN

Malik, Major General Ihusun ul Haq
(Ret.) Commandant Joint Services
Committee

PORTUGAL

Gomes, Marshal Francisco da Costa
(Ret.) former Commander in Chief,
Army; former President of Portugal

RUSSIA

Belous, General Vladimir (Ret.)
Department Chief, Dzerzhinsky
Military Academy

Garecy, Army General Makhmut (Ret.)
former Deputy Chief, USSR Armed
Forces General Staff

Gromov, General Boris, (Ret.) Vice
Chair, Duma International Affairs
Committee, former Commander of 40th
Soviet Army in Afghanistan, former
Deputy Minister, Foreign Ministry,
Russia

Koltounov, Major General Victor (Ret.)
former Deputy Chief, Department of
General Staff, USSR Armed Forces

Larinov, Major General Valentin (Ret.)
Professor, General Staff Academy

Lebed, Major Alexander (Ret.) former
Secretary of the Security Council

Lebedev, Major General Yuri V.
(Ret.) former Deputy Chief Department
of General Staff, USSR Armed Forces

Makarevsky, Major General Vadim
(Ret.) Deputy Chief, Komibyshev
Engineering Academy

Medvodov, Lt. General Vladimir (Ret.)
Chief, Center of Nuclear Threat
Reduction

Mikhailov, Colonel General Gregory
(Ret.) former Deputy Chief,
Department of General Staff, USSR
Armed Forces

Nozhin, Major General Eugeny (Ret.)
former Deputy Chief, Department of
General Staff, USSR Armed Forces

Rokhilin, Lt. General Lev, (Ret.) Chair,
Duma Defense Committee, former
Commander Russian 4th Army Corps

Sleport, Lt. General Ivan (Ret.) former
Chief, Department of General Staff,
USSR Armed Forces

Simonyan, Major General Rair (Ret.)
Head of Chair, General Staff Academy

Surikov, General Boris T. (Ret.) former
Chief Specialist, Defense Ministry

Teherov, Colonel General Nikolay
(Ret.) former Chief, Department of
General Staff, USSR Armed Forces

Vinogadov, Lt. General Michael S.
(Ret.) former Deputy Chief,
Operational Strategic Center, USSR
General Staff

Zoubkov, Rear Admiral Radiy (Ret.)
Chief, Navigation, USSR Navy

SRI LANKA

Karumaratne, Major General Upali A.
(Ret.)

Silva, Major General C.A.M.M. (Ret.)
USF, U.S.A.

TANZANIA

Lupogo, Major General H.C. (Ret.)
former Chief Inspector General,
Tanzania Armed Forces

UNITED KINGDOM

Beach, General Sir Hugh (Ret.)
Member U.K. Security Commission

Carver, Field Marshal Lord Michael
(Ret.) Commander in Chief of East
British Army (1967-1969), Chief of
General Staff (1971-1973), Chief of
Defense Staff (1973-1976)

Harbottle, Brigadier Michael (Ret.)
former Chief of Staff, UN
Peacekeeping Force, Cyprus

Mackie, Air Commodore Alistair (Ret.)
former Director, Air Staff Briefing

UNITED STATES

Becton, Lt. General Julius (USA) (Ret.)

Burns, Maj. General William F. (USA)
(Ret.) JCS Representative, INF
Negotiations (1981-88) Special Envoy
to Russia for Nuclear Dismantlement
(1992-93)

Carroll, Jr., Rear Admiral Eugene J.
(USN) (Ret.) Deputy Director, Center
for Defense Information

Cushman, Lt. General John H. (USA)
(Ret.) Commander, I Corps (ROK/US)
Group (Korea) (1976-78)

Galvin, General John R., Supreme
Allied Commander, Europe (1987-
1992)

Gayler, Admiral Noel (USN) (Ret.)
former Commander, Pacific

Horner, General Charles A. (USAF)
(Ret.) Commander, Coalition Air
Forces, Desert Storm (1991) former
Commander, U.S. Space Command

James, Rear Admiral Robert G.
(USNR) (Ret.)

Odom, General William E. (USA)
(Ret.) Director, National Security
Studies, Hudson Institute Deputy
Assistant and Assistant Chief of Staff
for Intelligence (1981-1985), Director,
National Security Agency (1985-1988)
O'Meara, General Andrew (USA)
(Ret.), former Commander U.S. Army
Europe

Pursley, Lt. General Robert E. USAF
(Ret.)

Read, Vice Admiral William L. (USN)
(Ret.) former Commander, U.S. Navy
Surface Force, Atlantic Command

Rogers, General Bernard W. (USA)
(Ret.) former Chief of Staff, U.S.
Army; former NATO Supreme Allied
Commander (1979-1987)

Seignious, II, Lt. General George M.
(USA) (Ret.) former Director Army
Control and Disarmament Agency

Shanahan, Vice Admiral John J. (USN)
(Ret.) Director, Center for Defense
Information

Smith, General William Y. (USAF)
(Ret.) former Deputy Commander, U.S.
Command, Europe

Wilson, Vice Admiral James B. (USN)
(Ret.) former Polaris Submarine
Captain

Six Arguments for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons

*compiled by the Staff of the
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation -- 1999*

[Editor's note: I take these to be six equally good arguments in favor of a citizen disavowing nuclear weapons development, planning and use. D.R.]

Reason One: The entire world would be more secure if the planet were free of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons are the only type of weapon in existence that have the capacity to annihilate the human species and countless other species.

The very existence of nuclear weapons leaves open the possibility that a nuclear exchange might take place. This could happen intentionally, inadvertently (as in the Cuban Missile Crisis when the U.S. and USSR almost blundered into nuclear war), or by an accidental launch. The list of historical false alarms is long; for instance, in 1979 someone fed a war game simulation into a North American Air Defense computer. Thinking that the alert was real, fighter planes were scrambled and nuclear bombers were readied before the error was discovered.

In the absence of total nuclear disarmament, terrorists might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a scenario has become more probable since the USSR dissolved. There have been many reports of attempts to smuggle weapons-grade plutonium from Russia. The fewer nuclear weapons there are in the world, the fewer there are for terrorists to try to steal. Every step toward the abolition of nuclear weapons would increase our security.

Without abolition, there is always the danger that nuclear weapons will proliferate — that more and more countries will obtain them. It is ultimately unrealistic to expect that in a world in

which some nations rely upon nuclear weapons, other nations will not seek to attain them. A world where there are many nuclear-armed countries would be even more dangerous.

The end of the Cold War has meant that there are no more nuclear-armed opponents, except India and Pakistan. Nuclear weapons do not serve even an arguable purpose when a country has friendly relations with a former opponent.

Reason Two: The threat or use of nuclear weapons has been declared generally illegal by the World Court.

The July 8, 1996 decision of the International Court of Justice stated that it is generally illegal to use or to threaten to use nuclear weapons. From a legal point of view, it would be virtually impossible to use nuclear weapons without violating the laws of armed conflict. The International Security and Arms Control Committee of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences concluded that “the inherent destructiveness of nuclear weapons, combined with the unavoidable risk that even the most restricted use of such weapons would escalate to broader attacks, makes it extremely unlikely that any contemplated threat or use of nuclear weapons would meet these [the Court’s] criteria.” If nuclear armed nations are serious about upholding international law, they ought to immediately commence negotiations for eliminating and prohibiting all nuclear weapons

Reason Three: Nuclear weapons are morally reprehensible.

The rightness of many issues is debatable, but nuclear weapons are morally insupportable. Even possessing something so deadly is wrong. These radiation-laden bombs can destroy most life on Earth and would be better described as national and global suicide devices rather than weapons. What could be more evil? As Joseph Rotblat, the 1995 Nobel Peace Laureate, urged when speaking against nuclear weapons,

“Remember your humanity!”

Father Richard McSorley has written, “Can we go along with the intent to use nuclear weapons? What it is wrong to do, it is wrong to intend to do. If it is wrong for me to kill you, it is wrong for me to plan to do it. If I get my gun and go into your house to retaliate for a wrong done me, then find there are police guarding your house, I have already committed murder in my heart. I have intended it. **Likewise, if I intend to use nuclear weapons in massive retaliation, I have already committed massive murder in my heart.**” (emphasis added)

Such intentions to harm violate the moral teachings of all religions. It is worth remembering that even in the middle of a war as bitterly fought as World War II, some generals and admirals opposed the use of the first nuclear weapons on the grounds that it was immoral to kill civilians. Their moral arguments are truer today than when first uttered, since a war with current, super-powerful H-bombs would poison entire continents. What kind of people do we become, if we accept the possibility of committing mass murder and suicide as part of our everyday government policy?

Reason Four: Nuclear weapons have not prevented wars, which is what they were supposed to do.

Nuclear weapons certainly have NOT prevented wars between nuclear weapons states and non-nuclear weapons states. (Ask any Vietnam or Gulf War veteran!) Nuclear weapons states have been involved in more wars than non-nuclear weapons states. Between 1945 and 1997, nuclear weapons states have fought in an average of 5.2 wars, while non-nuclear weapons states averaged about 0.67 wars.

Some advocates of nuclear weapons continue to claim that such weapons have at least prevented a large-scale conflict between major powers (specifically between the U.S. and the former USSR). Though there have not been any world wars since the development and use

of nuclear weapons, this is not proof that nuclear weapons have been responsible for keeping the peace. It is unclear that any of the major powers wanted to fight on a large scale with each other.

According to the Canberra Commission, the idea that the former Soviet Union was plotting to invade Europe is open to question in light of recent investigations made possible due to the end of the Cold War. The horrific experiences of World War II, in which some 40 to 50 million people died, had convinced leaders in both the East and the West that another world war should be avoided at almost any price.

Some even claim that the presence of nuclear weapons in war-prone regions such as India and Pakistan has introduced caution and served as a stabilizing force. Others suggest, however, that Pakistan’s acquisition of a nuclear capability has hardened its resolve not to settle the Kashmir crisis and allowed it to feel safe behind a “nuclear shield” as it supports Kashmiri militancy.

If the only use of nuclear weapons is to deter enemy use of nuclear weapons, then the best way to end the threat of nuclear war is to eliminate these weapons altogether.

Reason Five: Nuclear weapons are extraordinarily costly, and the costs continue into the indefinite future.

Although nuclear weapons were promoted in the 1950s with the idea that they would provide “more bang for the buck,” just the opposite is true. When the costs of research, development, testing, deployment, maintenance and associated intelligence activities are combined, the price tag is hefty. When costs of damage to the land, illnesses of uranium miners, cancer deaths from nuclear pollution, and storage of nuclear waste for centuries are added, the price becomes astronomical. Since the early 1940s, the U.S. alone has spent over \$4 trillion (\$4,000,000,000,000) on nuclear arms. Note that this is the approximate size of the U.S. national debt! (No one knows how much it will cost to clean up leaking waste sites now and

store weapons-related nuclear wastes for many thousands of years.)

If current policies are implemented, the U.S. will continue to spend some \$25 - \$30 billion per year on its nuclear forces. Consider the fact that the U.S. government has allocated \$27 billion for education, and \$17 billion for housing assistance for 1997. What is more important — educational assistance or bombs that can incinerate millions of people? As we consider the cost of nuclear weapons, we should also keep in mind that one in seven individuals in the U.S. lives below the poverty line, and some 30 million U.S. citizens are without adequate medical insurance. We have lots better things to spend our tax dollars on than gigantic weapons that are not related to any realistic estimate of our military needs.

Reason Six: Some countries have already given up nuclear weapons, showing that it is possible for a nation to be secure without them.

Three former Soviet republics, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine, became nuclear

weapons free states by voluntarily transferring their nuclear warheads to Russia after the breakup of the Soviet Union. South Africa actually developed a small nuclear arsenal clandestinely, and then dismantled it. Argentina and Brazil have also eliminated their nuclear weapons programs even though they achieved initial success in these programs.

On June 4, 1996, the U.S. Secretary of Defense met with the defense ministers of Russia and Ukraine to celebrate Ukraine's change in status from the world's third largest nuclear weapons state to a nuclear weapon free state. On the occasion, these defense leaders planted sunflowers and scattered sunflower seeds on a former Ukrainian missile base that once housed eighty SS-19 missiles aimed at the United States. U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry said, "Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil would insure peace for future generations."

Why Remember Hiroshima

By Dennis Rivers -- 1997

A preface to Toby Lurie's book-length poem,
Hiroshima, a Symphonic Elegy for Spoken Voices
On display at the Hiroshima Memorial Museum, 2000

As this elegy nears publication we are also nearing August 6th and people around the world are preparing to mark the deaths and injuries of the inhabitants of the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (many of whom were children, women and noncombatants), who were the victims of the first atomic bomb attacks. In spite of the passing of half a century, many Americans are still unreconciled to the tragic events of World War II, and especially to those of August, 1945. I am one of those Americans.

The aspect of World War II that I find most disturbing is that, *as concerns the methods of war*, Hitler won. The war was portrayed at the time as a conflict over high principles. And in the end one of Hitler's most important principles prevailed: the mass murder of civilians in order to achieve military and/or political goals. Early in the war Hitler began gassing, incinerating or otherwise killing large numbers of civilians. By the end of the war American and British air forces were fully engaged in the mass murder of civilians through the fire-bombing of entire cities. That this fire-bombing campaign began as righteous revenge for Hitler's air raids against British cities only demonstrates how quickly the participants in war can come to resemble one another.

The atom-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki represented a stunning leap forward in the technology of murder by fire and poison. By August, 1945, massive fire-bombing air raids had already burned most large Japanese cities to the ground. But these raids required thousands of planes and days of conflagration. Now it could be done in a moment, with a single B-29: a portable Auschwitz that the United States could inflict on anyone, anywhere.

Well, you may say, that was half a century ago. Why should we continue to think about these tragic and unfortunate events when there are plenty of current tragedies to lament?

For me, the answer is that we Americans have still not acknowledged our capacity for mass murder, which we continue to euphemize and depersonalize with such terms as "collateral damage." Collateral damage consists of all the people we have killed or injured, whom we did not particularly intend to kill or maim, but who just happened to be in the way, and whose presence we have consistently refused to acknowledge. According to various sources, there were at least *half a million* civilian casualties in Japan, *another million* in Vietnam and who knows how many in Korea, Iraq and so on. It seems to me, as an American, that Americans have taken the moral principle that intentions matter and applied it mind-numbingly backwards. Since we can tell ourselves that we did not specifically intend to kill these many persons, the tragedy of their deaths does not seem to matter to us.

The technologization of violence plays a key role in making these victims invisible. High technology weapons *intoxicate* their possessors with God-like powers of destruction, *distract* their possessors with the complex details of their operation, and *remove* their possessors from the scenes of injury and death. Thus for decades the United States, from a giant, electronics-packed bunker carved into a mountain, has targeted its complex and all-powerful missiles on various military installations in what was the Soviet Union, willfully ignoring the fact that a nuclear strike on those targets would result in the death by incineration and radiation poisoning of millions of nearby civilians. It just did not seem to matter. Tell me, then: Although we had the war crimes trials, whose rules of war prevailed after World War II? Ours, or Hitler's?

If a team of evil geniuses had come to Harry Truman in August of 1945 with a dozen Japanese babies and a blowtorch, and said, "Mr. President, just take this blowtorch in your hands and burn these infants to death one at a time, live on worldwide radio, and we guarantee that the Japanese will surrender right away," Truman, I'm sure, would have turned away in disgust. But, under the multiple spells of revenge, racism, weapons-intoxication, and self-deceiving abstractions like "the enemy" and "military target," Harry Truman and his earnest, sober colleagues

consigned thousands of infants and children to their fiery deaths. (“To avoid a bloody invasion of Japan,” some say, even to this day, perhaps not realizing the grisly pragmatism they are espousing: kill the children and you can bend the adults to your will.)

Unfortunately, the same hypnotic spells and fevered rationalizations that led to the first use of nuclear weapons continue to circulate in the collective psyche of the entire world, tempting people everywhere to try to resolve their conflicts or defend their interests with the latest whiz-bang, laser-blinding death ray, land mine, Stealth fighter, poison gas or supposed “smart bomb,” never mind who’s down there on the ground. Mechanized violence is a sort of underground religion of the twentieth century, a cult of the explosion, worshipped in a thousand movies and

ritually enacted each day by millions of video game players exulting in virtual mayhem.

Only by acknowledging how vulnerable we all are to these murderous enthusiasms, confusions and self-deceptions, to which the souls of the Hiroshima dead bear silent witness, can we avoid repeating the moral catastrophes of our past.

Why remember Hiroshima and Nagasaki? If the memory of those who suffered there continues to remind us of *how easily we can slip into the blind trance of violence*, then those who suffered may yet save the lives of innumerable others, perhaps even our own lives. With this in mind we can add our voices to Toby Lurie’s elegy and, full of both hope and sorrow, “weep for the mothers, weep for the sons, weep for the dying ones.”



What actions do the children of the Earth, present and future, need from us today to make a more livable world?

Cooperating Sponsors of this Resource Guide:

The *Nuclear Age Peace Foundation*, which provided many of the documents included in this guide, is located in Santa Barbara, California, and sponsors one of the largest online libraries of nuclear-related documents. The Foundation advances initiatives to eliminate the nuclear weapons threat to all life, works to establish the global rule of law, and seeks to build an enduring legacy of peace through education and advocacy.

Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1
Santa Barbara, California 93108-2794
Telephone (805) 965-3443 -- Fax (805) 568-0466.
www.wagingpeace.org and www.nuclearfiles.org

The *Peacemaker Community* is a global, multifaith community training, empowering and connecting peacemakers around the world. Our purpose is to create a more peaceful world in which all beings sense with joy the underlying mystery and unity of life, acting with compassion toward each other and all life; see with open hearts and minds when there is suffering, and act with compassion to heal that suffering.

Peacemaker Community and Zen Peacemaker Order
P.O. Box 5391, Santa Barbara, CA 93150
Phone (805) 565-7566 -- Fax (805) 565-7586
www.peacemakercommunity.org

Dennis Rivers: I have been studying, writing and teaching about nonviolence and cooperative communication since the mid-1970s, most recently through the Community Counseling Center in Santa Barbara, California. In the course of my sixty years of earnestly wandering through life I earned a BA in religious studies at UCSB, an MA in interpersonal communication from the Vermont College Graduate Program, and a PNG (persona non grata) from the UCSB Department of Sociology (for wanting to change the world more than I wanted to measure it). I am a member of both the communities mentioned above and also part of several loosely-knit affinity groups including Turn Toward Life and Plutonium Free Future. I am deeply grateful to more people than I can list here, and especially to Gene Knudsen Hoffman, Joanna Macy, David Krieger, Ramon Panikkar, Paloma Pavel, Kaz Tanahashi, David Hartsough and the late Walter Capps, for teaching me by luminous example. You can find more of my writing online, in the Library section of my educational web site: the Cooperative Communication Skills Internet Resource Center (www.coopcomm.org).

Dennis Rivers
133 E. De la Guerra St., PMB420, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
E-mail: rivers@coopcomm.org