

Permit  
Public Comment / May 6, 2010



In 2007, after being approached by Faithful Security: The National Religious Partnership on the Nuclear Weapons Danger, the NMCC board of directors adopted non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and waste as one of its top priorities. Since then we have worked closely with the "Interested Parties" who have participated in this hearing on behalf of the people of New Mexico, especially Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety and Honor Our Pueblo Existence.

I would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Bob Gilkeson, Don Hancock, Scott Kovac, Dave McCoy, Marian Naranjo and Joni Arends for the extraordinary service they and their organizations provide to all of us. We are deeply grateful for your brilliant and effective work.

I am reminded of the refrain from a Bob Dylan song:  
Well, it may be the devil or it may be the Lord  
But you're gonna have to serve somebody.  
Indeed, we all are gonna serve somebody.

Clearly, these ~~five~~<sup>six</sup> and their organizations serve people rather than profits, and therefore serve the best interests of God's creatures and creation.

Which brings us to the issue of profits. We understand that LANL is currently operated by for-profit corporations that are committed to protecting and increasing those profits. That is the nature of for-profit corporations. However, we are witnessing the devastating consequences of allowing such corporations to compromise safety standards, most notably the decision by British Petroleum to not install a turn-off valve on their oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico presumably to save the \$500,000 cost. Their decision was supported by the regulatory agencies at the time, persuaded by BP that public concerns were unwarranted.

The damage inflicted by LANL since 1943 on the environment and surrounding communities of New Mexico is not so dramatic but it is arguably even more insidious. Only eleven lives have tragically been lost in the latest oil rig explosion in the Gulf of Mexico. There is, however, reliable documentation that shows the alarming number of cancer and autoimmune <sup>disease related</sup> deaths in counties surrounding LANL, and the Trinity site where an estimated 19,000 men, women and children were living when the first atomic bomb was detonated in 1945. (see exhibit provided)

Science can be manipulated to support just about any position one wishes (as can theology). Therefore, we are not persuaded by LANL's testimony that open burning is safe any more than we are persuaded by Philip Morris that second hand smoke from cigarettes is safe to those down-wind.



We are not persuaded that our groundwater is safe from the 21 million cubic feet of radioactive, hazardous and toxic waste buried in unlined pits, trenches and shafts in and around Pajarito Plateau. We are inclined to trust Dr. Barcelona's testimony that the monitoring wells are ineffective and that LANL needs to start over.

We are not persuaded that the physical repository at Northern<sup>New Mexico</sup> College is unnecessary, and continue to believe that it is a reasonable and affordable request. We trust that LANL will consider it a worthy investment and offer it as a gift to the community that has suffered so much, for so long by living in the shadow of the lab.

In the event that the NMED draft Hazardous Waste permit is compromised by the efforts of the applicant the NMCC will continue to work with the "Interested Parties" until health and safety regulations are put in place<sup>at</sup> LANL and clean-up is complete.

We do not share the opinion of some that New Mexico and the world would better off if the Los Alamos National Laboratory was shut down. We believe that the brilliant minds and expertise at LANL have a vital role to play in achieving our vision for a nuclear weapons free world. This is a vision shared by<sup>a</sup> growing number of citizens, government officials, national and world leaders, people of faith and people of conscience.

On September 21, 2009, the National Council of Churches issued a statement entitled: Nuclear Disarmament: The Time is Now. I will provide a copy of that resolution and a copy of the Spring 2009 issue of Reflections published by Yale Divinity<sup>school</sup> entitled: The Fire Next Time: Faith and the Future of Nuclear Weapons.

I would like to share a quote from that document. *see page 2b*

I would like to close on a positive note from another song. This time from the song "Imagine" composed by John Lennon.

Imagine that LANL stops producing and designing new nuclear weapons and commits their collective intellect, innovation and resources to leading the global campaign for nuclear disarmament, a goal that will require decades of work....and profits.<sup>generate</sup>

Imagine that instead of working to defend questionable safety practices LANL commits itself to designing the highest safety standards, and embarks on research into the handling and storage of nuclear waste, and demonstrates its efficacy by using it to restore the Pajarito Plateau.

Imagine that instead of opposing the physical<sup>in formation</sup> repository at Northern<sup>NM</sup> College LANL becomes its benefactor and helps to educate the next generation of scientists dedicated to nuclear disarmament, clean-up and restorative justice.

For over sixty years, the United States has relied on the possession of an arsenal of nuclear weapons in order to impose world peace and deter attack. It has accomplished neither. Rather, it has siphoned off untold billions of dollars that could have been spent on far more just and productive means of ensuring global "security" through economic and cultural development and cooperation. It has poisoned our air, our water, and our children. It has produced toxic waste products that will remain radioactive for millions of years. Many believe it has also engendered a false sense of security coupled with inordinate pride, much resented by other nations. This has only served to degrade the status and esteem accorded to the U.S. by other peoples of the world, not to maintain or improve them. The same might be said of other nations that possess nuclear weapons.

It is understandable that conventional wisdom would dictate that this is not the time for the United States to eliminate its nuclear shield. Rather, we should maintain a strong nuclear arsenal as a deterrent to attack. This reasoning breaks down for a number of reasons.

As Jonathan Granoff (president of the Global Security Institute) puts it, "Nuclear weapons are of no value against terrorists, they're suicidal to use against a country that has them, and it's patently immoral to use them against a country that doesn't have them. So why do we have them?"<sup>2</sup>

But what about "rogue states," such as North Korea and Iran, which have recently acquired or may soon develop their own atomic bombs? Here, we must rely on the diplomatic weight of the entire rest of the world coming down on them, peaceably, in order to induce change. This will not happen, however, until the United States takes the lead.

...we cannot compel the rest of humankind to do our will based solely on the sheer magnitude of our military power.

Is it possible to put the genie back in the bottle? Yes, because, once the current worldwide stockpile of weapons is eliminated, it will become extremely difficult to assemble the raw materials to make a new one without the rest of the world taking notice and forcing an end to such efforts. This would require continued support for the U.N.'s international inspection system. This would also keep nuclear devices out of the hands of terrorist organizations—the technology and construction of a nuclear device is so extremely complicated and energy intensive that it is not feasible to imagine that a terrorist group could actually make and employ one on their own successfully.<sup>1</sup> The prospect for what might happen if we do not act is too terrible to contemplate: nuclear winter, the end of all human life on earth, and the transformation of much or all of our planet into a radioactive hell. This far outstrips the potential damage that could be done by any other environmental threat. The end of the Cold War did not make the world safer; quite the opposite. It is time to finish what Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev began in Reykjavik. It is time to realize that we cannot ensure our own security by force of arms, even if they be the most powerful weapons ever created.

Imagine if the history of LANL became a new chapter in every history book read by our children's children, and their children for your decision to end your 67 year service to weapons of death and in the interests of national security turn your efforts to disarming, containing, controlling, and eliminating every one of the thousands and thousands of nuclear warheads that are scattered around the world before one of them falls into the hands of a terrorist organization.

Imagine if the staff of LANL became the first national laboratory to win the Nobel Peace Prize for its contribution to achieving a nuclear weapons free world.

Hsuy Beaumont on behalf of  
New Mexico Conference of Churches  
27 Old Galisteo Way  
Santa Fe, NM 87508

**Cancer and Autoimmune Deaths in Specified Counties in New Mexico 1999-2004**

Residence County or City	1999			National Rate	2000			National Rate	2001			National Rate
	Cause of Death				Cause of Death				Cause of Death			
	Autoimm une	Cancer	Cancer		Autoimm une	Cancer	Cancer		Autoir	Cancer	Cancer	
County	No.	No.	Rate		No.	No.	Rate		No.	No.	Rate	
Lincoln	0	144	764.5		0	166	851.8		0	158	798.7	
Otero	1	430	694.6		2	438	700.4		2	432	690.1	
Sierra	3	220	1678.7		1	209	1568.2		1	215	1582.6	
Socorro	0	118	657.1		0	131	721.6		0	145	793.4	
<b>City</b>												
Alamogordo	1	305			2	299			1	310		
Carrizozo	0	15			0	12			0	15		
Tularosa	0	40			0	51			0	47		
Residence County or City	2002			National Rate	2003			National Rate	2004			National Rate
	Cause of Death				Cause of Death				Cause of Death			
	Autoimm	Cancer	Cancer		Autoimm	Cancer	Cancer		Autoir	Cancer	Cancer	
County	No.	No.	Rate		No.	No.	Rate		No.	No.	Rate	
Lincoln	1	163	820.3		0	189	929.5		0	139	664.9	
Otero	3	453	723.5		2	483	771.0		6	494	781.8	
Sierra	0	221	1620.5		0	242	1772.6		1	195	1428.9	
Socorro	1	125	682.3		1	156	849.6		1	131	712.4	
<b>City</b>												
Alamogordo	3	320			1	343			6	337		
Carrizozo	0	14			0	17			0	12		
Tularosa	0	40			0	45			0	57		

Rate per 100,000 population

Cancer: ICD-10 C00-C97

Autoimmune diseases: ICD-10 Lupus (L93, M32), Rheumatoid Arthritis (M06.9), Scleroderma (M34.9), Multiple Sclerosis (G35), Fibromyalgia (M79.0).

# NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT: THE TIME IS NOW

Adopted by the Governing Board, National Council of Churches USA

September 21, 2009

*"I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly."*

- John 10:10, RSV

*"Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation."*

- 2 Corinthians 6:2

## INTRODUCTION

Jesus Christ, the Good Shepherd, declared that He had come to bring "abundant life" to humanity. Nuclear weapons, which have the capacity to destroy entire cities and nations, and, indeed, all life on earth, represent the diametric opposite to this. In fact, the only thing that they are capable of producing is "abundant death." The time has arrived to eliminate all of them, before they eliminate all of us. Be it therefore resolved that the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. hereby recommits itself to the total worldwide eradication of nuclear weapons.

For over sixty years, the United States has relied on the possession of an arsenal of nuclear weapons in order to impose world peace and deter attack. It has accomplished neither. Rather, it has siphoned off untold billions of dollars that could have been spent on far more just and productive means of ensuring global "security" through economic and cultural development and cooperation. It has poisoned our air, our water, and our children. It has produced toxic waste products that will remain radioactive for millions of years. Many believe it has also engendered a false sense of security coupled with inordinate pride, much resented by other nations. This has only served to degrade the status and esteem accorded to the U.S. by other peoples of the world, not to maintain or improve them. The same might be said of other nations that possess nuclear weapons.

Many expected that the nuclear menace would gradually disappear twenty years ago with the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union. While commendable progress was made towards reducing nuclear arsenals and defusing the tension between the two sides, these measures did not go far enough. Efforts have faltered, due in part to the perception that the "nuclear club" states believe that they are entitled to ignore commitments made under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to eliminate their own weapons. But there is "a core hypocrisy" here: "The possession of these weapons and the readiness of a handful of countries to use them upgrades their perceived value and thus stimulates their proliferation and undermines efforts to control their spread."<sup>1</sup> This has provided a convenient opening for a growing number of nations to seek after these deadly weapons and thus threatens to ignite a second arms race. Even more frightening is the prospect that inadequately-secured fissile material will get into the hands of suicidal terrorists.

It is understandable that conventional wisdom would dictate that this is not the time for the United States to eliminate its nuclear shield. Rather, we should maintain a strong nuclear arsenal as a deterrent to attack. This reasoning breaks down for a number of reasons. As Jonathan

48 Granoff puts it, "Nuclear weapons are of no value against terrorists, they're suicidal to use  
49 against a country that has them, and it's patently immoral to use them against a country that  
50 doesn't have them. So why do we have them?"<sup>2</sup> But what about "rogue states," such as North  
51 Korea and Iran, which have recently acquired or may soon develop their own atomic bombs?  
52 Here, we must rely on the diplomatic weight of the entire rest of the world coming down on  
53 them, peaceably, in order to induce change. This will not happen, however, until the United  
54 States takes the lead.

55  
56

## 57 HISTORY

58

59 The National Council of Churches has a long history of advocating for the restriction, control,  
60 and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons (see the select bibliography attached). This  
61 commitment is based on solid theological grounding, which goes back to the earliest years of the  
62 organization. Thus, in 1951, a year after the current formation of the Council was founded, the  
63 following was included in the seminal policy statement, "The National Council of Churches  
64 Views its Task in Christian Life and Work":

65

66 History is purposeful and orderly because the world is in the hands of God, who  
67 made it. Cause leads to effect; and moral and spiritual factors are just as real as  
68 material factors -- even more real. Man, in the exercise of his free will, can no more  
69 disregard the moral laws of the universe with impunity than he can disregard the  
70 physical laws of the universe with impunity. He does not break them; he breaks  
71 himself upon them when he disregards them.

72

73 Man, being a creature of God, has a destiny above and beyond this world. Hence his  
74 essential security and his essential freedom are not derived from this world. They  
75 are not for this world to give or destroy. It is equally disastrous either for the powers  
76 of this world to try to destroy them, or for the people to try to find them in this world.  
77 They are ends which this world should serve. But essential security rests only in the  
78 righteousness of God, and essential freedom only in His service. The state or society  
79 that presumes to bestow or withhold either assumes the prerogatives of God. The  
80 man who expects either from the world denies God and surrenders himself to certain  
81 frustration and defeat.<sup>3</sup>

82

83 While the non-inclusive language may sound jarring to our ears, there are important theological  
84 principles that emerge from these paragraphs which still guide this Council's life and work. Two  
85 especially stand out: first, that the blatant violation of God's moral law is ultimately self-  
86 destructive: "He does not break them; he breaks himself upon them when he disregards them."  
87 These words perfectly describe the suicidal result of any future deployment of nuclear weapons,  
88 because in destroying the enemy, the perpetrators would also ensure their own, and everybody  
89 else's, annihilation.

90

91 Second, true security and authentic freedom derive only from our sovereign Creator.  
92 Consequently, when a state or society presumes to be able to bestow or ensure either, especially  
93 when based on the raw exercise of power, this is to assume "the prerogatives of God." In other  
94 words, it is idolatry, and it will inevitably fail. A country may amass the greatest and most

95 sophisticated military machine in history; it may extend its power and influence and economic  
96 might to every corner of the globe; but none of this – least of all, our nuclear arsenal – guarantees  
97 our “national security”. All it took was a small group of committed fanatics with nothing more  
98 deadly than box cutters and with commercial jets as their missiles to demonstrate this truth.  
99 Later in the same document, sound scriptural direction is provided, regarding the proper  
100 application of the concept of “security.”

101  
102 Christ taught us to seek the well-being of our neighbors but He showed little  
103 concern for His own personal security. To seek security for others is a  
104 requirement of justice. It is ennobling. To seek security for ourselves at the  
105 expense of others is debasing and self-defeating for the nation and for the  
106 individual. The United States will not inspire the world by making its own  
107 security its chief end. It may even lose it by seeking it. “Whosoever will save his  
108 life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it.”<sup>4</sup>

109  
110 Considering how many *trillions* of dollars we have spent on nuclear weapons over the last seven  
111 decades, and how little we have to show for it, these words are sadly prophetic.

112  
113 Condemnation of the use of atomic weapons was first expressed in an American ecumenical  
114 context in 1945 by the predecessor organization to the NCC, the Federal Council of Churches,  
115 shortly after the attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.<sup>5</sup> It is clear that these church leaders were  
116 horrified by the indiscriminate death caused by such a weapon of mass destruction. Such  
117 misgivings soon gave way to a cautious acceptance of their “defensive” use, however, as the  
118 Cold War got underway. Nevertheless, we already see a call for an end to the arms race by the  
119 Governing Board of the National Council of Churches in 1951. At that time, they stated the  
120 following: “History offers convincing evidence that the kind of peace for which Christians pray  
121 cannot be achieved by piling gun upon gun and bomb upon bomb. We warn the people of our  
122 churches that the civilization which they treasure may be destroyed unless the nations agree on a  
123 plan for the control of armaments on a global scale.”<sup>6</sup>

124  
125 Control and reduction of armaments was called for in 1957 and again in 1958, in response to the  
126 beginning of the “Space Age,” which presented such dangerous implications for the use of space  
127 for purposes of nuclear war.<sup>7</sup>

128  
129 In 1960, we see the first mention of the need for “enforceable agreements to eliminate weapons  
130 of death,” clearly referring to those “ultimate weapons, which threaten victim and aggressor alike  
131 with mutual suicide.”<sup>8</sup> This was coupled with a strong message of support for the United  
132 Nations, as the most appropriate body in existence for overseeing the enforcement of any future  
133 arms agreements, and for creating a stable international order.<sup>9</sup>

134  
135 While the decade of the 1960’s was primarily preoccupied with pronouncements expressing  
136 concern about or opposition to the War in Vietnam, the issue of the nuclear threat was not  
137 ignored. In “Imperatives of Peace and Responsibilities of Power,” the Governing Board  
138 recognized that, “in order to avert nuclear holocaust it is imperative that limits be imposed upon  
139 the use of military might, and that the inherent limitation of force in the solution of human and  
140 social problems be recognized.”<sup>10</sup> Here, we hear echoes of the warnings about political hubris  
141 from 1951. The world is in God’s hands; we cannot compel the rest of humankind to do our



142 willbased solely on the sheer magnitude of our military power. The document, furthermore,  
143 called for a reassessment of our country's foreign policy assumptions and goals based on a more  
144 realistic acceptance of our true place in the world as one nation among many, rather than either  
145 the world's savior or the world's policeman. It again called for an increased reliance on the  
146 United Nations and other international bodies in order to foster peace with justice.

147

148 In that same year, the Governing Board published "Defense and Disarmament: New  
149 Requirements for Security." This remarkable document, far-reaching in its vision and clear-  
150 headed in its understanding of the larger issues regarding peace with justice, combined sound  
151 theological principles with practical, detailed prescriptions for the changes which, if they had  
152 been heeded, would surely have resulted in a quickening of the pace of nuclear disarmament and  
153 the consequent reduction in tensions between the great powers. It emphasized instead the need  
154 for international development and dialogue as the most appropriate and effective means for  
155 achieving lasting security for our nation and, indeed, the entire world.<sup>11</sup>

156

157 During the following two decades the NCC weighed in on all the major controversies of the day  
158 regarding the nuclear threat (see the Bibliography for the documentation):

159

160

- Opposed to the anti-ballistic missile program (1969)

161

- Supported the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (1971)

162

- Supported United Nations conferences on nuclear disarmament (1975 and later)

163

- Opposed nuclear fuel reprocessing because of the threat of proliferation (1976)

164

165

- Called for the complete cessation of all explosive nuclear testing (1977)

166

- Declared total opposition to the possession or use of nuclear weapons and called for their complete elimination (1977)

167

168

169

- Called for a nuclear weapons freeze (1981)

170

- Declared that the 1980's escalation of the arms race was "utterly in conflict with the Gospel of Christ" (1981)

171

172

173

- Celebrated the excellent work of the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in their 1983 Pastoral Letter on the nuclear crisis, "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and our Response," while also using this as an opportunity to recognize the serious "unresolved questions" that confront all Christians with regard to this difficult issue

174

175

176

177

178

179

- Expressed excitement and hope at the time of the Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting in Reykjavik, Iceland, that almost achieved a breakthrough with regard to the elimination of both country's nuclear arsenals (1986)

180

181

182

- Congratulated the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. on achieving an agreement in principle (later carried out) to eliminate intermediate nuclear forces from Europe (1987)

In 1999, the NCC General Assembly adopted “Pillars of Peace for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, A Policy Statement on the United Nations.” It enunciated the following Bible-based principles:

- 1) the transcending sovereignty and love of God for all creation and the expression of that love in the incarnation of Jesus Christ, whose mission was to reveal understanding about that divine presence, to proclaim a message of salvation and to bring justice and peace; 2) the unity of creation and the equality of all races and peoples; 3) the dignity and worth of each person as a child of God; and 4) the church, the body of believers, whose global mission of witness, peacemaking and reconciliation testifies to God’s action in history.<sup>12</sup>

These formed the theological foundation upon which seven “pillars of peace” were affirmed. Among them was “Peace and Conflict Resolution,” that called for the “end of the unrestrained production, sale and use of weapons worldwide.”<sup>13</sup> This document formed the basis for then-General Secretary Bob Edgar’s presentation “Ecumenical Witness for Peace, Justice and Sustainability” at the Millennium Peace Summit at the United Nations in 2000, and it still informs our work today.

## CONCLUSION

There are a number of compelling reasons why it is appropriate for the National Council of Churches to revisit the issue of total nuclear disarmament at this time:

- While the Council has a long history of involvement with this issue, it has not spoken directly about it since 1988. Much has happened since then to change the world. There is a strong consensus among experts in the field, that, given developments already underway towards acquiring or perfecting nuclear weapons in North Korea, Iran, and elsewhere, now may be the last time that the world can realistically come together to ban the bomb through diplomatic measures. However, influence can only be brought to bear on the “rogue” states if those who already have the bomb agree to fulfill the binding agreement made under the Nonproliferation Treaty--(emdash)to accept a gradual but constant draw-down of their nuclear stockpiles until none are left. As Brazil’s former Ambassador Sergio Duarte said in 2005: “(O)ne cannot worship at the altar of nuclear weapons and raise heresy charges against those who want to join the sect.”<sup>14</sup>
- There is a growing movement both worldwide and here in the U.S. to move towards elimination of nuclear weapons. It has gathered a lot of momentum because of the prominence of some of the key figures, such as George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn. It has strong support in the religious community as well as among various non-governmental organizations. World leaders, such as Presidents Barack Obama and Demetri Medvedev (Russia) have taken notice and have spoken favorably of this prospect. Public pressure is key to the success of this effort, however,

230 since it is reported that there is significant resistance to this campaign being exerted,  
231 especially from the military.

- 232
- 233 • 2011 will mark the end of the World Council of Churches *Decade to Overcome Violence*.
- 234 A strong NCC witness, based on action for education and advocacy here at home, would
- 235 be a most welcome contribution.
- 236

237 Is it possible to put the genie back in the bottle? Yes, because, once the current worldwide  
238 stockpile of weapons is eliminated, it will become extremely difficult to assemble the raw  
239 materials to make a new one without the rest of the world taking notice and forcing an end to  
240 such efforts. This would require continued support for the U.N.'s international inspection  
241 system. This would also keep nuclear devices out of the hands of terrorist organizations--the  
242 technology and construction of a nuclear device is so extremely complicated and energy-  
243 intensive that it is not feasible to imagine that a terrorist group could actually make and employ  
244 one on their own successfully.<sup>15</sup>

245

246 The prospect for what might happen if we do not act is too terrible to contemplate: nuclear  
247 winter, the end of all human life on earth, and the transformation of much or all of our planet into  
248 a radioactive hell. This far outstrips the potential damage that could be done by any other  
249 environmental threat. The end of the Cold War did not make the world safer; quite the opposite.  
250 It is time to finish what Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev began in Reykjavik. It is time to  
251 realize that we cannot ensure our own security by force of arms, even if they be the most  
252 powerful weapons ever created. Our lives are in God's hands. For once, let us put our trust in  
253 those hands as well. "*Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation.*"

## 254

## 255

## 256

## 257 RESOLUTION

258

259 THEREFORE, let it be resolved that the member communions of the National Council of the  
260 Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., speaking together through the Council's Governing Board,  
261 hereby reaffirm the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons and commit themselves:

- 262
- 263 • to make their voices heard in the halls of Congress and the White House;
- 264
- 265 • to participate fully in the remaining programs and events of the World Council of
- 266 Churches *Decade to Overcome Violence*.
- 267
- 268 • to support the work of the NCC staff and the appropriate working groups/committees in
- 269 carrying out an effective program advocating for nuclear disarmament, including but not
- 270 necessarily limited to: 1) producing new educational materials; 2) designating this issue
- 271 for special attention at future Ecumenical Advocacy Days; 3) drafting a letter from
- 272 council and church leaders to the members of Congress and the President; 4) sponsoring a
- 273 special conference, including the publication of the proceedings for wide dissemination.
- 274 The Justice and Advocacy Commission will be charged with oversight responsibility for
- 275 these efforts.
- 276

- 277 • to provide the financial support needed in order to carry out this mandate as well as to  
278 assist the Council in obtaining funding from outside sources.  
279

280 Be it further resolved that the President and the General Secretary of the NCC be instructed  
281 to communicate this commitment to the President of the United States and Congressional  
282 leaders.  
283

284  
285

286 NOTES

287

- 288 1. Jonathan Granoff, "The Call to a New Moral Imperative," in *Reflections*, Vol. 96, No. 1  
289 (Spring, 2009) – "The Fire Next Time: Faith and the Future of Nuclear Weapons," p. 15.  
290 2. *Ibid.*, p. 18.  
291 3. NCC Policy Statement, "The National Council of Churches Views its Task in Christian  
292 Life and Work," May 16, 1951, p. 9.1-2.  
293 4. *Ibid.*, p. 9.1-3.  
294 5. David Cortright, "Transcending Ambivalence: A History of Religious Engagement with  
295 the Bomb," in *Reflections*, Vol. 96, No. 1 (Spring, 2009), p. 35.  
296 6. NCC Policy Statement, "International Regulation and Reduction of Armaments,"  
297 November 28, 1951, p. 5.1-1.  
298 7. NCC Policy Statements, "Some Hopes and Concerns of the Church in the Nuclear-Space  
299 Age," December 5, 1957 and "The Churches Concern in Policies Related to the Control  
300 of Armaments and of the Use of Space," June 4, 1958.  
301 8. NCC Policy Statement, "Toward a Family of Nations Under God: Agenda of Action for  
302 Peace," June 2, 1960, 25.2-1- 25.2-2. (hyphen, not dash)  
303 9. *Ibid.*  
304 10. NCC Policy Statement, "Imperatives of Peace and Responsibilities of Power," February  
305 21, 1968, p. 25.6-3.  
306 11. NCC Policy Statement, "Defense and Disarmament: New Requirements for Security,"  
307 September 12, 1968.  
308 12. NCC Policy Statement, "Pillars of Peace for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A Policy Statement on the  
309 United Nations," November 11, 1999, p. 1.  
310 13. *Ibid.*, p. 2.  
311 14. Quoted in Granoff, "The Call to a New Moral Imperative," p. 15.  
312 15. See "This is Humanity's Climactic Moment – An Interview with Jayantha Dhanapala," in  
313 *Reflections*, Vol. 96, No. 1 (Spring, 2009), pp. 46-47.  
314

315

316 BIBLIOGRAPHY

317 NCC Statements Related to Nuclear Disarmament

318

319 Statement on the International Situation (NCC General Board Policy Statement; Jan. 17, 1951)

320

321 The National Council of Churches Views Its Task in Christian Life and Work (NCC General  
322 Board Policy Statement; May 16, 1951)

323

324 International Regulation and Reduction of Armaments (NCC General Board Policy Statement,  
325 Nov. 28, 1951)

326

327 Some Hopes and Concerns of the Church in the Nuclear-Space Age (NCC General Board Policy  
328 Statement; Dec. 5, 1957)

329

330 The Churches' Concern in Policies Related to the Control of Armaments and of the Use of Space  
331 (NCC General Board Policy Statement; June 4, 1958)

332

333 The Churches and the Use of Nuclear Energy for Peaceful Purposes (NCC Governing Board  
334 Policy Statement; June 2, 1960)

335

336 Toward a Family of Nations Under God: Agenda of Action for Peace (NCC General Board  
337 Policy Statement; June 2, 1960)

338

339 Resolution for a Special Emphasis on Peace (NCC General Board Resolution; June 5, 1964)

340

341 Imperatives of Peace and Responsibilities of Power (NCC General Board Policy Statement; Feb.  
342 21, 1968)

343

344 Defense and Disarmament: New Requirements for Security (NCC General Board Policy  
345 Statement; Sept. 12, 1968)

346

347 Background Paper for Study on "Defense and Disarmament: New Requirements For Security"  
348 (NCC Department of International Affairs Study Document; 1968)

349

350 Resolution on the Anti-Ballistic Missile (NCC General Board Resolution; May 2, 1969)

351

352 Resolution on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (NCC Department of International Affairs  
353 Committee Resolution; June 4, 1971)

354

355 Resolution on Military Force and Foreign Policy (NCC General Assembly Resolution; Dec. 6,  
356 1972)

357

358 Resolution on Senate Resolution 67 on Suspension of Nuclear Testing  
359 (NCC Governing Board Resolution; Oct. 14, 1973)

360

361 Resolution on a United Nations Conference on Nuclear Disarmament

362 (NCC Governing Board Resolution; Oct. 12, 1975)  
363  
364 Resolution on Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Resulting From Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing  
365 Technology (NCC Governing Board Resolution; Oct. 8, 1976)  
366  
367 The Complete Cessation of All Explosive Nuclear Testing (NCC Governing Board Resolution;  
368 May 4, 1977) <http://www.nccusa.org/pdfs/cessationofnucleartesting0577.pdf>  
369  
370 The United Nations and World Community (NCC Governing Board Policy Statement; May 4,  
371 1977)  
372  
373 Resolution on Nuclear Weapons (NCC Governing Board Resolution; Nov. 10, 1977)  
374 <http://www.nccusa.org/pdfs/resolutiononnuclearweapons1177.pdf>  
375  
376 Swords Into Plowshares: The Churches' Witness for Disarmament (NCC Governing Board  
377 Resolution; May 10, 1978)  
378  
379 Resolution to Curtail Supply of Anti-Personnel Weapons by U.S. to Israel and Other Nations and  
380 Restrict Use of Existing Supplies (NCC Governing Board Resolution; Board  
381 May 12, 1978.)  
382  
383 Resolution Concerning Follow-Up Action to the Consultation of the Churches on Disarmament  
384 (NCC Governing Board Resolution; May 9, 1980)  
385  
386 Resolution on Congressional Committees on "Security and Terrorism"  
387 (NCC Resolution; May 13, 1981)  
388  
389 Resolution on a Nuclear Weapons Freeze (NCC Resolution; May 14, 1981)  
390  
391 Action on Escalation of the Arms Race (NCC Governing Board Action Statement; Nov. 5, 1981)  
392  
393 Swords Into Plowshares: The Churches' Witness for Disarmament II (NCC Governing Board  
394 Resolution; May 13, 1982)  
395  
396 Peacemaking and Ecumenism: A Celebration of the Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter (NCC  
397 Governing Board Resolution; May 13, 1983)  
398  
399 The Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant Disaster (NCC Governing Board Resolution; May 23, 1986)  
400  
401 A Message Concerning Arms Negotiations following the Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting at  
402 Reykjavik (NCC Governing Board Document; Nov. 6, 1986)  
403  
404 Resolution on the Agreement in Principle between the USA and the USSR on the Elimination of  
405 Intermediate Nuclear Forces (NCC Executive Committee Resolution; Sept. 18, 1987)  
406  
407 Disarmament (NCC Governing Board Resolution; May 26, 1988)  
408

409 Commending President Bush for a Dialogical Approach to the Current Crisis in the USSR (NCC  
410 General Board Resolution; May 18, 1990)  
411  
412 Resolution to Endorse the Call for a Complete Ban on Anti-Personnel Landmines (NCC General  
413 Board Resolution; Nov. 17, 1995)  
414  
415 Pillars of Peace for the 21st Century: A Policy Statement on the United Nations (NCC/CWS  
416 General Assembly Policy Statement; Nov. 11, 1999)  
417 <http://www.ncccusa.org/about/pillars.html>  
418  
419 After September 11, 2001: Public Policy Considerations for the United States of America  
420 (NCC/CWS General Assembly Resolution, Dec. 16, 2002)  
421 <http://www.ncccusa.org/news/02news97b.html>