

AT THE MORAL CORE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS: **ARE PEOPLE OF FAITH STANDING TALL OR IN MELTDOWN?**

Bishop William Swing: Welcome to this one hour worldwide teleconference which will challenge us to have a heightened respect for the glories of our created order and to have a heightened sense of urgency about eliminating all nuclear weapons. These weapons are the ultimate enemy of life on this planet. My name is William Swing and I will be the moderator today. I'm the founder and the president of United Religions Initiative, URI; the world's largest grassroots interfaith organization. URI functions in 78 countries with over 500,000 members. Among URI's various constituencies is a Cooperation Circle that meets each month to mobilize Voices for a World Free of Nuclear Weapons. Three of our four speakers today belong to this Cooperation Circle.

Nuclear weapons are always seen in a context. The context of war, national security, deterrence, etc. But we see them in context of nature and as a divine gift. Therefore nuclear weapons must ultimately answer to the highest power. Most of all nuclear weapons have a spiritual and moral dimension. Therefore during this hour we will have several brief prayers to place us in context. And we will end this hour with a call to action. And here is the first prayer:

O Creator of the Universe, you made us fellow workers in your creation. Give us wisdom and reverence so to use the resources of nature, that no one may suffer from our abuse of them and generations yet to come will praise you for your bounty. Amen.

Now today we have a wonderful co-sponsor and leading this superlative group is Rick Ulfik. And Rick welcome.

Rick Ulfik: Thank you so much Bishop Swing it's a pleasure to work with you on this critical issue. On behalf of my organization, We the World, and our We Campaign at we.net and our co-sponsoring partner 4 Years Go at fouryearsgo.org, I'd like to welcome all our speakers, participants and listeners. This global teleconference is taking place under the Disarmament Theme of 11 Days of Global Unity, 11 Ways to Change the World, September 11–September 21 which is the UN International Day of Peace. Started by We the World and our many partners in 2004, 11 Days of Global Unity has become a platform for global collaboration and action. With partner events and programs taking place annually in over 60 countries around the world from September 11th through the 21st. To

find out more and get involved at any time during the year, please go to we.net. Back to you Bishop Swing!

Bishop William Swing: We have about 130 people on the phone call today and we'd like to hear from you as this progresses. Today we have four speakers who have devoted themselves to the abolition of nuclear weapons. Each will speak for about 5 minutes and I'll do the timing. And while they are speaking the listeners are invited to write a question or a comment to be addressed by the panelist. I'd like to ask Rick if he would explain how everyone can submit their question or comment.

Rick Ulfik: Yes. When we come to the question and answer period people will be able to kind of raise their hands by pressing the number 2 on the keypad. So let's wait until that point and then we'll invite people to do that. That will be after the speakers.

Bishop William Swing: Now we get to our first speaker and here I'm acting on faith because Jonathan Granoff is in the middle of...Oh he's here, my prayers are answered. Welcome Jonathan.

Jonathan Granoff: Thank you Bishop.

Bishop William Swing: Jonathan is the President of the Global Security Institute, he's co-chair of the International Law Section of the American Bar Association's Task Force on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and he's also a faculty member of Widener Law School. Now Jonathan, you're a Sufi Muslim I believe.

Jonathan Granoff: I consider myself a Universal Citizen.

Bishop William Swing: There you go, okay. Who's well read in many, many faiths and you are a lawyer and you're an advocate. What are the implications of nuclear weapons in international law that come to your mind?

Jonathan Granoff: During the time of President Kennedy, the KGB and the CIA looked at the situation of nuclear weapons and the threat because they were so alarmed from the Cuban Missile Crisis. And they determined that absent a legal regime that by the late 1970s they would have expected dozens of nuclear weapon states. And so a treaty called the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was negotiated. It entered into force during the time of Richard Nixon. And it's a core bargain that now has 189 countries in it. The bargain is that the 5 nuclear weapon states:

Russia, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and China would negotiate the elimination of nuclear weapons in exchange for the commitment of 182 other countries never to develop nuclear weapons and if they complied with that non-proliferation commitment have access to peaceful uses of nuclear technology. The treaty had within it a provision that after 25 years it would be reviewed and determined whether it would be extended indefinitely, terminated or extended for a particular period of time. That took place in 1995 and it was reaffirmed by the nuclear weapons states that they would work progressively and tangibly toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. At the last review of the conference all of those states made an unequivocal undertaking to obtain the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

So under that treaty and also under the advisory opinion of the highest court in the world, the international court of justice which called for the negotiations of a treaty eliminating nuclear weapons, there is a legal commitment to eliminate nuclear weapons that I believe that most people are unaware of.

Imagine if a biological weapons convention which prohibits biological weapons said that no country can use smallpox or polio as a weapon but 9 countries can use the plague as a weapon. We would immediately understand that that is unsustainable because of its fundamental inequity and also because we know clearly, intuitively that the plague is immoral to use as a weapon. I would contend that nuclear weapons are similarly immoral and that it is incoherent to keep a regime that says that some can have nuclear weapons while some cannot. It is impractical, it is illegal to not move toward elimination, and it is immoral.

Bishop William Swing: Jonathan? You've got 2.5 more minutes; you can keep right on going.

Jonathan Granoff: I was responding to your question, well okay. The Secretary General of the UN has put forward the proposition that we should begin negotiating a framework of instruments or a nuclear weapon convention. In other words what we have now is we have a series of threat reducing steps that are being negotiated cutting off the production of any more fissile/nuclear materials bringing into force the comprehensive test ban treaty. All of these things are very good and very important, but what happens is the focus on elimination has not been sufficiently firmly established in the minds of the leaders of countries and in the minds of people although it is a legal commitment. So I would contend that it is time that we started clearly working on a treaty

universally, legally, non-discriminatorily eliminating nuclear weapons. That the idea that we can simply manage this problem without being subject to accident design and have them be used is no longer realistic. Either we're going to have them spread because technology is spreading so fast or we're going to work together to eliminate them. That's the legal duty and that's what I believe is morally sane.

Bishop William Swing: Is the treaty that you're talking about the same as a convention?

Jonathan Granoff: Well, the treaty that exists is the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. It does not; it does not eliminate nuclear weapons. It contains a promise to negotiate their elimination. It will require another legal instrument and it will take time and it will be difficult to figure out what is the proper verification system, what is necessary to give militaries confidence that we can get rid of them and it will take time. But it's time to begin that process now. The treaty only promises that we would do it but we need another treaty or another set of legal instruments to actually get rid of them. And what's lacking is the political will to do that. I think the political will to do that should be based on the moral unacceptability of nuclear weapons. In the same way that one could never have abolished slavery by saying "well first we will treat slaves with dignity and kindness and then we'll move toward abolition." Now Wilberforce, the leaders of the abolition movement, made the moral position that slavery is an immoral institution and you can't really rectify the institution. I would contend that the only possible rational for having nuclear weapons ever was to prevent them from being used against you or using them against somebody else. But now we're no longer existential enemies with Russia or China or anybody. So the opportunity to move toward a saner more cooperative world is not only a legal imperative but in order to have the cooperation that we want to have to address the climate to live in the real world we live in, which is one world, the nuclear divide should be taken down.

Bishop William Swing: Jonathan, thank you so much. I know it's a busy day for you and I thank you for stepping out from one place and stepping into our place. If you have a chance at the end of your time it'd be fun to be with you in the questions and answers. But for this part we thank you.

Jonathan Granoff: If there was ever a group in which I could entrust my intelligence, conscience and heart it is the other people on this phone call. It is an honor to be amongst Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Sidney Drell and Tyler Wigg-Stevenson and yourself Bishop. And to the people all over

the world thank you, God bless you; please carry the torch for nuclear abolition.

Bishop William Swing: Thank you, thank you Jonathan. Jonathan just mentioned Tyler Wigg-Stevenson, lately of Nashville and now of Toronto. He is a Christian and an Evangelical Christian. Tyler, how does the threat of nuclear weapons impact you from a faith perspective, as a believer and as somebody who is passionate? How does all this affect you?

Rev. Tyler Wigg-Stevenson: Well Bishop Swing, I'd be happy to talk about that but first I just want to say what an honor it is to be on this call with a group of very distinguished people. I really count it a privilege, thanks for the invitation. I want to echo Jonathan's gratitude for the people who have called in. It is not really everyone who wants to take an hour out of their day to think about nuclear weapons. And so I think we've got a faithful room here that I feel pretty glad to be able to speak to.

You know, as I was thinking about what to offer to this call, I work at the intersection of faith and foreign policy and faith and nuclear policy in particular. And often times people want to bring religion and moral and theological discourse into the discussion; but often times that can also just take the form of simply adding an exclamation point to whatever it is they already think about policy. And this is something that I struggle with and so what I wanted to remark about and the way I would answer that question is the way that I think about this as a believer is in thinking about what's the contribution that theology and a moral perspective can bring to the conversation and public discussion about nuclear weapons. I have three thoughts on that that I wanted to share.

The first contribution that I think a theological perspective brings is the contribution of truth and asserting that as, if not the highest goal then certainly alongside love, faith, humility, etc. And by this I mean that theology helps us to see that nuclear weapons and the work to secure them and eventually to eliminate them is more than simply a cause; that it is a spiritual challenge that humanity has brought onto itself. And that none of us can run away from. This summer I had the privilege of, and one might say the coincidence or the providential good fortune, to visit Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Coventry in rather rapid succession. Some on the call might know that Coventry was the first British city that was really bombed to the ground by the Germans during WWII and it opened the floodgates of what would become this tactic of civilian bombing that then escalated through the war and reaches its climax at Hiroshima and

Nagasaki some years later. And when I was in Hiroshima/Nagasaki what really slammed home to me is that so far distant from the suits and conversations and political jockeying of Washington, this is what we see in nuclear weapons and what we recoil from instinctively; what makes us recognize them as a unique class of weaponry; the reason we're that having a conversation about nuclear weapons rather than just sort of arms in general is that nuclear weapons represent the weaponization of a tactic; the tactic of indiscriminate killing of civilians. We can talk about, and people will talk about, their tactical uses. Oh, well if you used one in this very precise situation maybe we could limit the damage, etc. But simply put the thing that nuclear weapons do uniquely well is kill a lot of people gathered together in one area. And so this weaponization of this tactic that the Nazis initiated and which developed throughout the Cold War and then reaches the form of, gets turned into a weapon with the nuclear bomb. I think the spiritual challenge that we now have to confront, that that's part of what we know how to do as a species. We have that capability and so we have to decide, we have to exercise responsibility what we're going to do with it.

The second thing that I wanted to offer about the perspective of theology and morality to the discussion about nuclear weapons is maybe diagnosing the terms of the battle and the possibilities in front of us. You know we represent different religions on this call and there's an inherent challenge to multi-faith organizing because you've got people coming from very different perspectives. Bishop Swing you know this as well as anyone having brought people together from various religions toward a common cause. I think that work is important, as I think that it's important that those of us who work within our own specific traditions to get our own houses in order so that we can make an effective contribution toward the whole. But I wanted to suggest for those on the call, for those who are sort of wondering well, how do I bring my spirituality, how do I bring my personal faith into this struggle that one of the unique gifts that I think religious people can bring to this struggle is their sense of being under authority. So we might disagree about the name and the character and the attributes of the authority itself. We might have profound disagreements about the nature of God, about the scriptures or whether there are scriptures, really the diversity of religious views. We can have profound disagreements about that but there's a certain shape and contour, there's a certain shape I think to the lives of people who understand themselves to be under an authority regardless of what that authority is. And that I think is a contribution that we can make regardless of which tradition we come from, because it gives us a certain humility, it closes off certain options to us. It says that we aren't at liberty

to do as we please with the world, but that we are accountable to a higher authority. And that also tells us where the opposition is, in that sinful human nature that always seeks in individuals and in institutions to usurp the place of God. And then finally what that does, what that recognition of authority does, is it also gives us, I think, tremendous hope and opens up the scope of possibility because we can say that nuclear weapons aren't a historical necessity they aren't something that we have to live with like tornadoes or earthquakes or something. They're something that we have collectively invented and that collectively we can and must take responsibility for. So often I'll hear, "well the genie can't be put back in the bottle," as an argument why we can't do anything about nuclear weapons. The logical fallacy of that argument is that it assumes that everything that we have known about nuclear weapons is going to be true about everything we will know about nuclear weapons and everything we can do about nuclear weapons. And those of us who have the broader perspective of being under an authority that created the world, I think we can say we can have a bit more humility and hope.

And then the final thing that I wanted to offer in terms of what I hope as a believer as someone who works in this field, what I hope the theological and religious perspective can bring is a vitality and a way to overcome what's a very natural paralysis, a sensation of paralysis when dealing with nuclear weapons. I mean, despite what I've just said about nuclear weapons being more than a cause or not a cause the fact is that they also are a cause. It's a day in, day out slog filled with policy minutiae often and change comes in fits and spurts when it comes at all and we're rarely, we're rarely saying "oh it's coming too fast in the right direction." So it's something that takes work and it's something that's very hard for most people to engage, especially from a pastoral perspective most people aren't living their lives worrying about how they can change massive global realities. Most people are worried about "how am I going to pay the rent or the mortgage, and is my kid doing okay at school and how's my marriage doing." The minutiae of life they press in on people and so how can most people realistically expect to engage something like nuclear weapons? And I think the theological perspective here, the contribution that it can offer is the freedom of vocation. And I offer this not knowing if there's an analog in Muslim or Jewish theologies or other theologies, but certainly in the Christian tradition the sense of vocation is calling, of having one's whole personhood called by God and you don't have to be a professional religious person to exercise this. That that vocation gives us a starting place for our activism. So instead of thinking well how am I going to get rid of nuclear weapons? Which is a daunting task for anyone to wake up thinking about. We can start where God has

called us to live and love and breath and work, the communities God's called us to be a part of and say "okay, God has put me here and I have this concern so I will do what I can from where I am." Rather than thinking "I must be in charge of the world and fix the whole thing." And I hope there's a liberating freedom in that, in the recognition that this massive historical shift is not any of ours to affect on our own. But that it gives us a sense, the theological perspective I think can give us an adequate humility and that's liberating humility of our place in the struggle and it's basically wherever God has called us to be.

Bishop William Swing: Tyler, thank you so much. And thank you for doing your homework ahead of time to be ready for this. I forgot to mention, he's the founder and director of Two Futures Project: A Movement of Christians for Nuclear Threat Reduction and the Global Abolition of Nuclear Weapons. Tyler we'll hear from you later and I thank you, thank you for what you've just said. Also I've got a little prayer. Let us pray:

O Creator of the Universe, you've made us smart enough to build nuclear weapons, make us wise enough to dismantle them. Amen.

The next speaker is going to be Sidney Drell, faculty member of Stanford University since 1956; Professor of Theoretical Physics, Emeritus at the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory; Senior Fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institute. Sid, welcome and could you, I have a little question for you, just a lead in. As a physicist and as a member of the Jewish faith, what is it about nuclear weapons that continues to haunt you or demand your attention?

Dr. Sidney Drell: Thank you Bishop Swing. I will answer that very quickly, but let me just say as a physicist I have worked throughout my life to improve our understanding of physical nature, motivated by faith that there are rational laws that govern the structure of matter that we see all around us. But I also recognize that scientific progress and the quest to understand nature has enabled us to create the greatest threat to humanity's survival in the form of nuclear weapons so deadly that we now have the capability to destroy our civilization, if not our very own existence. Bishop Swing, that's what motivates me. This presents a moral challenge that we all must face. Scientists have warned about this danger from the first moment. After the first atomic bomb exploded over Hiroshima Albert Einstein warned that, and I quote, "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything, save our modes of thinking. We thus drift toward an unparalleled catastrophe." And just 10 years later the

Hydrogen Bomb was built with a destructive power that was increased further by another factor of 100–1000. These are weapons so destructive that leading international scientists, including those who built the Hiroshima bomb, wrote that the use of such a weapon cannot be justified on any ethical ground. That its destructiveness makes its very existence and the knowledge of its construction a danger to humanity as a whole and concluded it is necessarily an evil thing considered in any light. Now a number of government leaders around the world have also echoed this view, however now, more than 20 years after the end of the Cold War and we still have many thousands of these weapons existing in this world and progress towards removing them is frustratingly slow. We must do better. Although the danger of a nuclear holocaust between the USA and the former Soviet Union is a fading nightmare of the past, new dangers are real and growing. They include the proliferation of nuclear weapons with the spread of nuclear technology and know how, and the danger of the materials that fuel nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists or other irresponsible leaders. Making nuclear weapons is a difficult business but the hardest part is to get your hands on that nuclear fuel that exists in plentiful supplies around the world. As long as the material is there and the weapons exist, the danger that bad people can and will get their hands on them continues to grow. Now is the time the need is urgent, for the nations of the world to take practical and necessary steps towards countering these dangers and progress must start by building an international consensus to reverse reliance on nuclear weapons. This will require a commitment by nuclear as well as non-nuclear weapons states to achieving a common goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. The United States and Russia who possess more than 90% of these terrible weapons have a special responsibility and obligation to lead this effort. And we must do so with actions beyond just words. Words alone are not enough. Such actions include providing the highest possible security for all the nuclear fuel in the world today. There's enough plutonium and uranium to fuel many thousands of bombs and the commitment in this regard that was made in Washington, DC to do it in 4 years which was made 2 years ago by 47 world leaders should be implemented with alacrity. Also, the material that is part of the fuel cycle for civil reactors for civilian power must be placed under balanced international control. The comprehensive test ban treaty negotiated 15 years ago still needs to be ratified by 9 nations including the United States, China, India and Pakistan before it enters into force. It will provide the best barrier to prevent new weapons programs from achieving their goal. Inevitably there must be also be progress in reducing tensions in areas where regional strife is at or near the boiling point. Above all, one must build trust and cooperation so that compliance with treaties negotiated for

deep reductions in weapons can be verified. Yes, this sounds like a very daunting challenge but it is possible. Just consider the extensive, intrusive measures for cooperation, sharing information and onsite inspection that are incorporated in the new START treaty between the United States and Russia that was ratified this year. We have made breathtaking progress in regard to the Cold War. These kinds of cooperative steps are possible if there is a will, and no matter how difficult the challenges there, because there is no alternative that's acceptable to getting to zero. This is a case of urgency and high priority; I've talked mainly of practical steps but I view it as a moral obligation. Thank you.

Bishop William Swing: Wow, thank you so much Sid. Thank you for all you do and for your words on this call. What you do is just been, you back up those words with a whole life of devotion to this. Thank you.

Now we've had three speakers and now we're going to have our fourth speaker, Mairead Corrigan Maguire. She's been a friend of mine for 40 minutes and her name Mairead means Margaret I think. She was a winner of the 1976 Nobel Peace Prize along with Betty Williams, who by the way helped us start the United Religions Initiative back in the 1990s. She's been the winner of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's Distinguished Peace Leadership Award in 1996. Mairead, as a Roman Catholic and as an advocate of peace building in the Nuclear Sphere, what is your focus today?

Mairead Corrigan Maguire: Well, Bishop Swing it's a great privilege to be with you all this evening and with all the other speakers and I totally concur with all their contributions and I believe passionately that the time has come for us to rid the world of nuclear weapons. And I remember Sir Joseph Rotblat who was a great non-violent peace activist and his dream was for a nuclear free world and a world without war and he passionately believed that this was possible. Joseph Rotblat was a scientist who was one of the men who went to Los Alamos and was active in the early stages of building the nuclear bomb in Los Alamos in New Mexico. And Joseph Rotblat discovered that it wasn't necessary to build a nuclear bomb, Germany wasn't building a bomb and in conscience he believed that you could never build a bomb or use it because these weapons were so destructful. So because his conscience wouldn't allow him to stay there and participate in this program he left and spent the rest of his life working for nuclear disarmament. I think there's a message in Joseph Rotblat's life, a dedicated scientist, a brilliant man but when his conscience kicked in he realized that really you couldn't drop nuclear bombs and

incinerate our fellow brothers and sisters around the world and he walked away from it. So really it's down to every one of us to ask in our conscience, what is my life about? What are my values? Could I really drop a bomb and incinerate men, women and children creating a genocide on a huge scale and creating ecocide, destroying the planet. Could I really do that? And I think that most men and women when they think about that their answer will be no. And that's where our hope lies.

And in the last few years I have as a peace activist gone on peace jaunts to visit some of the sites around the world where they're currently making nuclear bombs. I stood in Dimona in Israel at the nuclear site there. I was at the UK nuclear base in Faslane here just across the water from where I live. And I went to Los Alamos in New Mexico, the biggest bomb making factory in the entire world, I've been there several times. What shocked me so much was the normality with which decent and good men and women go into these places. Using very, very best brains, intelligence. Because they are intelligent and build nuclear bombs that can destroy human life on a great and large number. I think the most astounding thing that ever hit me was when I visited Los Alamos in New Mexico just a couple of years ago. We went in and it's like a big village where all the scientists, who are all millionaires now, live with their families, going to school. Well we visited the Catholic church inside that factory of death, really. And the little Catholic church was called and dedicated to Our Lady Queen of Peace, and this shocked me because I come from Belfast and growing up in West Belfast as a Catholic, Our Lady Queen of Peace had a very important significance for us because we believed that Mary, the mother of Jesus, and Jesus were totally non-violent. And you know this came home to me as such hypocritical thing for the church to be doing sitting in the middle of this. As a Christian I believe that you cannot read the Gospels and not know that Jesus was totally non-violent. And you know Jesus and a machine gun or nuclear weapons just is an impossible image to concoct in the mind. So I think that we need to call ourselves and our own conscience and each other as many women around the world, everywhere from faith traditions to no faith traditions. We need to call ourselves to account, we have created a world where we have lost sight of the importance of every single human being and the importance of our world. We were only given a living trusteeship of the world, we don't own the world. We are here as stewards and trusteeships and aren't we making an awful disaster of it because when you stand in Los Alamos in New Mexico you're standing on a mountain of nuclear waste that the scientists don't know how to get rid of. And we are continuing polluting our world with this stuff. And so I really feel that I'm glad to know that the religions are coming together in

an effort such as yourselves to say that we really have to stand up for the importance of human life, for the importance of our world and rid it of nuclear weapons. But we have to go a step further; we really have to say that we have to disarm our mindsets for as long as we have in our minds a nuclear mindset. A mindset that is militaristic, a mindset where we are arrogant enough to take it upon ourselves to say when people will die or when they will live, which is not our call. We really have to begin to use the power of love, the power of non-violence, the power of compassion because that is the great power in our world that will change the world. You know people say the greatest power are nuclear weapons and war, but those are the greatest powers of destruction and they won't bring any solutions they'll only see more men and women die. So I think that we're coming into a new consciousness which makes me very excited because we know the greatest threat to humanity isn't each other the real threat to humanity is climate changes that we have to cope with, poverty and no matter what religion you come from and all the religions we can agree that poverty in our world is shameful. We spend 100 billion dollars on the global nuclear weapon budget per year. How many children could we save with \$100 billion being wasted on weapons we cannot and will not, God grant, ever use. When we could take that money and we could feed the hungry, build houses, deal with the environment crisis, we could do so much with that. So I am hopeful because I see a great new consciousness coming about, a new way of seeking ways, institutions of living together as the human family without killing each other. So I live very hopeful that wonderful things are happening and the spirit of love is working.

Bishop William Swing: Mairead, thank you so much for your words and for your life and your witness. We're going to stop this section which has to do with the four speakers and Rick, could you explain to us now how we could in the next, say, 12 minutes have people respond and question the four people who are our speakers.

Rick Ulfik: Certainly, so if anyone wants to kind of raise your hand to ask a question of any of the speakers please press the number 2 button on your phone now and we'll be scanning the screen and choosing someone. I think there are some people are starting to raise their hands right now and I will turn this over now to Monica. I think we might be going a little bit over but that's okay, if we go a few minutes over I think that's fine because it's great to have the interaction with the people that are on the line.

Bishop William Swing: Monica is also United Religions Initiative's representative at the United Nations, so she and Rick are handling this part.

Monica Willard: I want to say hello to everyone and what a blessing to hear the voices we've just heard. There were a few people who had sent some information in ahead of time and two of the questions had to do with the kind of media coverage that this issue is and isn't getting at this time. And so I'd like people to think about that and we'll start out with the ones that came in writing.

[Please speak] on the publicity and what we might be able to do to make more of an impact on how it's written about and to get more people engaged.

Bishop William Swing: Okay, we're turning to Mairead and Tyler and Sid. How come there isn't more publicity in the direction of what the three of you have been advocating?

Mairead Corrigan Maguire: I think it's very difficult to get publicity on this. I mean, I've always been inspired by the American peace activists and campaigning against nuclear weapons in America which leads the world in nuclear weapons. And there are many hundreds of American peace activists in prison, doing long prison sentences, and continually they've been protesting that. But the press refuses to really speak to the issue of what these communities want and people want. You know people around the world have always protested nuclear weapons, they don't want nuclear weapons. The problem is that we have these big corporations who are manufacturing nuclear weapons and delivery systems. It's all about money. And then they go to the politicians and the politicians continue investing in nuclear weapons all the time having austerity cuts and people are being deprived of basic health care, education. I mean here in the UK our cutbacks on health care and education and poor people are becoming poorer and yet the UK government is continuing to replace its nuclear Trident machines. So I think we have to say that the people, you can work to get the different churches and cities and governments using the example of New Zealand and Norway, can begin the campaign for divestment from corporations which are involved in the manufacture of nuclear weapons and delivery systems. And they can focus on these divestments from the corporations until we begin to turn this thing around. And we have to be more imaginative now in trying to force our governments to stop wasting our tax money on weapons that we can never use.

Bishop William Swing: Good, now how about Sid? You were about to say something.

Dr. Sidney Drell: I just wanted to note that 25 years ago when Ronald Reagan, American President, and Mikhail Gorbachev, Soviet General Secretary, came close but failed to close a deal to agree to remove all nuclear weapons their effort was greeted with scorn by most people. But starting 5 years ago and work that has been going on here led by George Shultz among others, the call to resurrect that vision of a world free of nuclear weapons has received enormous political and public support expressed in the media around the world. Its trouble is getting the words turned into action, but Medvedev and Obama for example have committed themselves formally to work toward that goal as well as reducing reliance on [nuclear] weapons. I'm frustrated because the words are there now that weren't there before coming from leaders not just peace activists, but the actions don't seem to come at all commensurate with the danger.

Bishop William Swing: Great, Monica? Rick?

Monica Willard: I'm seeing a call from John O'Connell?

John O'Connell: Oh great, thank you. There's sort of two parts to this. One is: I'm concerned, as much as I think it would be wonderful to eliminate nuclear weapons, that there's anyway practically to do that without having a global peace pact that eliminates the other weapons; because I think unless the US particularly and Israel particularly, who have abundant nuclear weapons, perceive that they're safe from other threats the end game is that they're never going to give up their weapons at the end of it. I'm concerned or believe that we have to work for an overall peace plan and then we can get to the nuclear weapons and I wonder what you're speakers think and particularly Mairead who's been kind to us in the past and supporting our program.

Bishop William Swing: Mairead or Tyler or Sid?

Mairead Corrigan Maguire: I think we have to work at absolutely every level of our society in building peace. Nuclear weapons are about fear politics. And when people are afraid of other states, other countries then we have to deal with that fear and we have to build friendships, we have to build relationships. But you know part of our calling is that we make friends with our enemies and reach out the hand of friendship. All too

often leaders can divide people; they can raise fears that are not necessarily having any real depth to them. So it's very important that people, wherever they live in whichever communities, reach out the hand of friendship, build non-violent, non-killing societies where they live and also reach out across the world. So we have to do it working down at the level of community and working across the world, literally. There's a great deal of work to be done, but there's also a great deal to be happening, but I don't think we want to wait until we have a perfect world before we say "nuclear weapons and wasting 100 billion pounds on these weapons, we'll go along with that until we get to a situation where it's alright." Nuclear weapons are absolutely, they are dinosaurs in today's society, they belong to the last generation of the Cold War, they have absolutely no relevance, and they can't solve problems. When the 11th of September happened in New York, nuclear weapons had no relevance and they have no relevance today. So it's time we moved away from them and put that money into lifting up security based on non-violent peacekeeping forces, conflict resolution, dialogue, and negotiation amongst people. And our political leaders need to have some kind of new vision and fresh thinking to get us out of the absolute strait jacket we're now stuck in, where fear is beginning to be the order of the day.

Monica Willard: We have another question and I thank you very much for those responses, from Mrs. Earl Court?

Mrs. Earl Court: Yes, that's right. Alright, yes. Thank you very much everyone for your presentations, that is marvelous. My feeling is, and I've been in the peace movement for a long time, it's the work of my life, that the vast majority of people everywhere around the world want to have a peaceful world and they want to have nuclear weapons eliminated. It's my view and feeling that the big money powers, certainly we see them in the West, regard the nuclear industry, military and otherwise as a great source of profit and I believe that those are the ones who have obstructed our reaching a stage where we can eliminate nuclear weapons and war. I think Professor Sidney gave us a wonderful concept of the terrible dangers and the present policy that I regret that the West is involved in through NATO is holding onto nuclear weapons and reserving the right to use them preemptively. To my mind this is criminal and it is jeopardizing the life of every child on Earth. So I guess the question that I would like to pose to you marvelous people is: how do we translate the will of the people of the world for peace and the elimination of nuclear weapons, how do we translate that into actuality? We've been working for it for many years and it hasn't yet happened. Could you people please be so

kind as to say how we might do this collectively, globally, locally and in everyway? Thank you.

Bishop William Swing: Thank you. Tyler, you want to give it a shot?

Rev. Tyler Wigg-Stevenson: I'm glad you saved the easy question for me. Well that, that's the challenge that underlies the very reason for this call. I'll say that I don't know that I have, I certainly don't have the silver bullet. And I think that the best advice is really the same way you eat an elephant, bite by bite. I simply don't know that there is a way of translating public will. I maybe will depart from some of the other speakers, I actually think and some of the questions that have been asked, I think that the challenge or the challenge that's the heart of the question is that many, the vast majority of the world's people may want a world free from nuclear weapons, may want to live their lives in peace, but the fact is that the system that governs nuclear weapons, that accounts for them, that builds them, that deploys them, that is in charge of them is very small in terms of the number of people involved and does not intersect the lives of ordinary people hardly at all. So there's no, say, analog to climate change. I might have a personal conviction about that and I may not be able to radically reduce industrial emissions but I can change the light bulbs in my house and maybe it won't do much but I can feel like I'm playing a part. That's the problem with nuclear weapons, there's simply no place that that system intersects our ordinary, day in, day out lives. And because of that it's easy for them to be forgotten and so people might have this sentiment that yes this would be nice, but it's not a lived reality. I will be quite candid and say I don't see a solution to that absent some catastrophic event. I think the reason we got massive protests during the Cold War was because people felt the reality on a daily basis, ordinary people felt the fear and they reacted against it. That fear doesn't exist today. And I don't see, candidly as someone who works on this full time, this is what I do day in day out; I don't see a way of manufacturing it. I think there's this sort of rare group of people that can grasp the magnitude of the issue and for whatever reason is able to engage it. The vast majority of people don't. And so I think we have to work within the situation in which we find ourselves and in that context I really think that the work that Sid, for example, has been doing with George Shultz and others is really the critical work of reframing nuclear weapons, and this goes to the previous questioner's question, reframing nuclear weapons not as sort of the existential trump card that a government can, needs to hold onto because let's face it, nations will be nations and they're not going to eliminate nuclear weapons unless they're convinced it's in their interest. So the essential tasks is

communicating the fact that whatever you think of nuclear weapons during the Cold War, they are today, in a globalized world, the management of nuclear risk is impossible and that nuclear weapons have become a liability, a dinosaur Mairead described them as, I think that's quite apt. And it's this apprehension of nuclear weapons as a liability rather than as an asset that will lead to positive movement. How you get there as far as a popular movement is a totally different story and I wish I had a more constructive answer but I probably think you've been at it longer than I have so I would turn the question back.

Bishop William Swing: Let me jump in here because we need to begin to bring this to a conclusion, we said we were going to be one hour and it's 2 minutes 'til and we have 3 speakers, each one of you, do you have a final statement to make? And then I will close this.

Dr. Sidney Drell: Sure, yes. Okay. Bill quickly on what Tyler just said, we are prisoners of Cold War thinking and we've got to get out of that. The devastating potential of nuclear weapons was recognized and the armories were built up between the Soviet Union, which no longer exists, and the United States to deter each other from using it, recognizing to do so would be suicide. Now there is no such problem, it is the, by the way I should also say nuclear weapons relative to the armaments, conventional armaments, in the world are really a relatively small budget. But we've got to get out of that thinking, recognize these weapons as a dinosaur in the present world where we have to worry about proliferation, not the Soviet Union. But let me say, I talk mainly about practical matters and I don't know how to answer that last question either except by working day in, day out to try and change the thinking of people, building consensus. Where there are no immediate crises, the world has gleaned onto a world idea of a world free of nuclear weapons. Africa is a nuclear free zone; South America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, is nuclear free; down around the Australia region of the world. So when one can make progress in tempering strife, we can make progress. And so it is a political step, step by step by step. But my last word is because to emphasize just how fundamental this challenge is and we have to work at it even though it seems almost impossible. I'd like to quote a very close friend of mine, a Catholic Priest who teaches at Harvard, Brian Hehir who said the whole thing in 3 sentences. "For millennia people believed, but if anyone had the right to call the ultimate moment of truth, one must name that person God. Since the dawn of the nuclear age we have progressively acquired the capacity to call the ultimate moment of truth and we are not Gods. But we must live with what we have created." And that is a call that

says we have to keep working because the vision is the only surviving one for the world.

Bishop William Swing: Good, thank you. Mairead? Do you have a final comment?

Mairead Corrigan Maguire: Well we have 9 nuclear weapons states and all of the UN Security Council are nuclear weapons states and we have 4 of those states who refuse to sign the nuclear weapons treaties. This is the nuclear club. Now the nuclear club is seen as a very prestigious thing and other countries want to get into it by getting nuclear weapons. I think we have to name and shame these countries; and we have to make it a shameful thing that a country has nuclear weapons. And this is a club of shame. Because you have to remember that all officials in this nuclear weapons club and as all officials, these are our government officials, are under international law acting immorally, illegally and criminally. As their governments' nuclear policies break the Nuremburg principles by threatening and possessing nuclear weapons, so our leaders are acting criminally by having these weapons of mass destruction and breaking international law. So I think we have to say very, very clearly that they have to uphold the law, they're our leaders and under international law they are not allowed to act criminally. And we welcome President Obama's call for a nuclear free world and we thank him for what he's doing, but we maintain we want to see a nuclear free world in our day because these weapons are far too dangerous for us to have.

Bishop William Swing: Right, right. Very well said, thank you. Tyler, last comment?

Rev. Tyler Wigg-Stevenson: Just one closing thought. I would associate myself with the practical steps that have been suggested on this call by my fellow speakers. For the last word though, I think I want to offer a pastoral exhortation to those that are listening or those that might hear about this later that our activism not be devoid of anxiety. I think that it would be, in some ways it would be much easier if there was a vast sort of military/financial conspiracy that governed the whole thing and that was engaged in producing nuclear weapons and putting the whole world at risk and there was a group that met once a year and determined the outcome. But what I come across more and more, you get into these systems of power and that they're populated by people. And everywhere it's as banal and as profound and as sublime as people's lives simply are. And I think that none of us, we're all called with this passion to make a difference, to make change, but none of us is essential. We could be

called home tomorrow, we could be called home today and all of us, each of us only has today. And so I think that coming to a place where we are simply doing what we do because we believe it's the faithful response to God and that will liberate us to do whatever it is necessary and God willing we'll have the joy of understanding ourselves to be part of something that's efficacious, but we can't, we can't engineer the solution on our own. So that doesn't mean don't think strategically, it doesn't mean don't engage in good tactics and good plans, but I think, what I think if we're speaking from a religious perspective I think that what we really need to bring to it is this lack of anxiety, lack of fear that will liberate us to do the work that we need to do.

Bishop William Swing: Thank you. And thank everybody. Mairead, Sidney, Jonathan if you're there, Tyler. Thank you so much, your words on this call will be duplicated and other people can hear them and I want to thank Monica at the UN and our co-sponsor Rick Ulfik and the WE Campaign and the 11 days of global unity and 4 years go for getting all this together and the Maestro teleconferencing. This is our first little step into this world and I think it's an important step.

If anyone's out there listening to this and wants to get involved with us you can look into www.uri.org/nuclear and you'll see ways to join the Voices for a Nuclear Free World and our banner document which is called Call to Conscience: A Ban on Nuclear Weapons. Asking you to read that and to let us know your response and how you might be using that. So we think that today in our little Cooperation Circle we have 10 people, on this phone call we have 130 and tomorrow we think that we're going to have thousands until governments and politicians become convinced that there's a world of strident moral voices which will not be silent. Voices that declare that the only enduring security of all the nations lies in the eliminating of nuclear weapons once and for all. Thank you all for a wonderful hour together and let's stay in touch. Bye.