

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: DeGraffenreid, Kenneth E.: Files
Folder Title: Soviet "Active Measures" and the Freeze: Nuclear Freeze and the Catholic Bishops
Box: RAC Box 27

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This marker is used as an administrative marker by the Ronald W. Reagan Presidential Library Staff. This marker identifies the place of a publication.

Publications have not been scanned in their entirety for the purpose of digitization. To see the full publication please search online or visit the Reagan Presidential Library's Research Room.

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

ACTION

July 29, 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM P. CLARK

THROUGH: RICHARD T. BOVERIE

FROM: SVEN KRAEMER/ROBERT LINHARD

SUBJECT: Letter to Clare Boothe Luce Commenting on Draft
Pastoral Letter on Peace and War

Attached for your review and signature, if you approve, is a proposed letter (Tab A) from you to Clare Boothe Luce responding to her request for comment on the draft Pastoral Letter on Peace and War prepared for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (Tab B).

While there is much room for comments on any number of points raised by the Pastoral letter, we have focused your comments on two issues. The first of these is that the document, whose objective is to provide a comprehensive view of issues on peace and war, essentially ignores the record and substance of US efforts to achieve peace and to reduce the risks of war. The second issue is that the Bishops' letter badly misunderstands, and has an obsolete view of, current US nuclear deterrence strategy.

Your proposed response addresses the first issue by summarizing US efforts, especially the far-reaching proposals of President Reagan. The second issue is addressed by clarifying the actual US nuclear deterrence policy.

In addressing the nuclear deterrence policy issue, your letter responds to the Pastoral letter's "no-first use" and the "targeting of civilians" views in particular. We have provided some detail in your response, because we feel that these two issues form the basis of the letter's misperceptions about current approaches, and that you have a special opportunity to set things right.

In completing our draft, we learned today that the Bishops' Conference sent copies of the Pastoral letter for comment to ACDA, State, and OSD. We are now seeking copies of those agencies'

3

draft and/or mailed responses, and at the same time, are informally reviewing with those agencies the attached letter we have proposed for your signature.

Meanwhile, we recommend that you approve the attached draft letter, and that you sign it for transmission upon completion of the review. We do not anticipate any problems in this process today and will be in touch with you for final clearance.

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve the letter to Mrs. Luce, also providing the President's UN address, at Tab A.

Approve _____

Disapprove _____

Attachments

Tab A	Letter to Clare Boothe Luce
Tab B	Incoming Draft Pastoral Letter



5

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Clare:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft Pastoral Letter on Peace and War prepared for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Your membership on the Board of Directors of the Pope John Paul II Center of Prayer and Studies for Peace surely gives you a special responsibility in reviewing this important document.

As a citizen, religious layman, and official, I am impressed by the document's attempt to provide a comprehensive analysis of the ethical and technical issues involved in fostering the peace we all desire. In this light, it is important to affirm as a basis of American policy that we will never be the first to use any force, whether nuclear or conventional, except to deter and defend against aggression. As we make every effort to achieve arms reductions, trust, and reconciliation, we must continue to assure effective deterrence and defense and thereby to reduce the risks of war.

In this light, I have two major concerns with the Pastoral letter as currently written. First of all, I am troubled about what appears to be a fundamental misunderstanding in the letter concerning existing U.S. nuclear deterrence policy, and the comparison of that policy to the specific recommendations made in developing what the letter calls a "marginally justifiable" deterrent policy. Secondly, while the letter clearly calls for alternative approaches to current nuclear arsenals, it does so without presenting the reader who is concerned with issues of peace and war with any information about the very far-reaching efforts initiated by the United States to bring the world closer to peace and reconciliation.

Turning to the latter issue first, the United States has taken many steps in its efforts to reduce the world's military arsenals, as well as the causes and risks of war. This record is marked by our offers through the Marshall Plan to reconstruct both Western and Eastern Europe, by the Baruch Plan to control atomic weapons, by the Open Skies' proposal, and by the U.S. efforts in seeking effective nuclear test and strategic arms limitations.

In his recent address to the United Nations' Second Special Session on Disarmament, President Reagan reminded the world of America's sincere objectives and efforts and spelled out his broad agenda for peace. I hope and urge that every member of the Center of Prayer and Studies for Peace and of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, as well as concerned clergy and laity, will take the opportunity to read this important statement carefully. (I have enclosed a copy.) By both building on, and drawing lessons from, past efforts (efforts which regrettably failed to stem an unparalleled buildup of arsenals on the Soviet side), the President outlined negotiation proposals that mark truly giant steps in the right direction. The essence of the President's approach is that we must achieve major reductions in arsenals, that these reductions must emphasize the most threatening and destabilizing systems, that the reductions should be to equal levels, and that the agreements negotiated must be effectively verifiable, to include cooperative and confidence-building measures, which will help to overcome the mistrust that has existed between nations for far too long.

In the strategic arms reductions negotiations, we are proposing a one-third reduction in the number of warheads on the land- and sea-based ballistic missiles and a reduction in land-based missiles to fifty percent of current U.S. levels. A second phase would reduce the destructive potential of such missiles to equal levels lower than we now have and could include other strategic systems as well. In the current negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces, the President has proposed the total elimination of such forces considered the most threatening by both sides, the land-based missile systems. He and our NATO Allies have offered to cancel plans for the deployment of U.S. Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles in exchange for the corresponding destruction of Soviet SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles. In the multilateral negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions the U.S. and its Allies are proposing major initial reductions in military personnel and a wide-range of new verification measures. In the areas of nuclear testing and chemical and biological weapons, the U.S. is actively participating in discussions in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva to develop the verification and compliance procedures, which would make such limitations truly effective. In all of these ongoing negotiations and discussions, we are emphasizing the importance of substantial early reductions and of effective verification mechanisms.

I am troubled in reading the draft Pastoral letter to find none of these serious efforts described, or even noted in the text, even though they so clearly conform with many of the most basic concerns and hopes of the letter's drafters. I believe that as the Bishops' Conference reviews drafts of the letter, a presentation and study of these proposals might well lead to the Conference's strong support for them, support which would prove enormously helpful in making plain to the world our seriousness in these efforts.

My other major area of concern deals with the critical section of the draft Pastoral letter at IIIA (pp. 25-38), which addresses nuclear deterrence policy. In this section, the letter outlines, in its words, "what will be at most a marginally justifiable deterrent policy," and it concludes that it finds itself "at odds with elements of current deterrent policy." I am concerned that the authors have seriously misunderstood current U.S. deterrence policy and see differences between their "marginally justifiable" policy and U.S. nuclear policy where such differences simply do not exist.

U.S. nuclear strategy is to deter Soviet attack and coercion of the U.S. and its Allies. For this reason, we need strong and credible deterrent forces. But should deterrence fail, our policy is to terminate any conflict at the lowest level that would protect U.S. and Allied vital security interests.

To deter effectively, we must make it clear to the Soviet leadership that we have the capability to, and will, respond to aggression in such a manner as to deny that leadership its political and military objectives and impose on it costs which outweigh any potential gains. This requires that we have the capability to hold at risk that which the Soviet leadership itself values most highly -- military and political control, military forces, both nuclear and conventional, and that critical industrial capability which sustains war. For moral, political, and military reasons, it is not our policy to target Soviet civilian populations as such. Indeed, one of the factors that has contributed to the evolution of U.S. strategic policy is the belief that targeting cities and population was not a just or effective way to prevent war. An understanding of this point appears to be seriously missing from the draft letter.

This being said, however, no one should doubt that a general nuclear war would result in a high loss of human life, even though our targeting policy does not call for attacking cities, per se, and seeks to avoid population centers as much as possible. It is for this basic reason that it is clear that U.S. policy is to deter nuclear war and all situations that could lead to such war.

This leads to the issue of U.S. policy with respect to the first use of nuclear weapons. The letter discusses in some detail the issue of the "controllability" of escalation and largely on this basis, argues for a U.S. policy of pledging no-nuclear first use. The arguments made concerning the "controllability" of nuclear war deserve serious attention and further study. But the problem of the risk of undesired and uncontrollable escalation is not contained by a policy of "non-first use" which is applied only to nuclear weapons. The escalatory danger exists as soon as major powers engage in armed conflict. For this reason, a fundamental principle of both U.S. policy and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is to maintain sufficient force to deter aggression and to employ force only in response to aggression.

This principle is a key to NATO's strategy of flexible response, which, like our own national policy, is designed to prevent war by posing potential costs to an aggressor that far outweigh the gains he might hope to achieve by aggression. Given the enormous conventional military force of the Soviet Union, dropping this proven strategy -- which has kept the peace in Europe for over 30 years -- would be dangerous, as a potential aggressor could conclude that the costs of aggression might be manageable. A pledge of no-first use of nuclear weapons on the part of NATO could, in fact, lead the Soviets to believe that Western Europe was open to conventional aggression. Furthermore, such a pledge cannot be effectively verified and would not be effectively credible. As many Europeans have pointed out, deterrence would thus be undermined, and the risk of outbreak of war would be increased.

As former Secretary of State Alexander Haig noted in his recent Georgetown University speech on peace and deterrence, a speech which directly addressed this issue:

"Flexible response is not premised upon the view that nuclear war can be controlled. Every successive allied and American government has been convinced that nuclear war, once initiated, could escape such control. They have, therefore, agreed upon a strategy which retains the deterrent effect of a possible nuclear response, without making such a step in any sense automatic."

With this possibility of a nuclear response as an integral element, the Alliance's present strategy is a much more credible and effective means to prevent any conflict. In effect, the very controllability argument which so drives the discussion in the draft Pastoral letter as written, would, if expanded to include the risks associated with escalation due to significant conventional conflict, support the existing U.S. and NATO policy.

On the subject of overall nuclear deterrence strategy, then, I find that the position recommended by the Pastoral letter is remarkably consistent with current U.S. policy, with one notable exception -- the issue of no-nuclear first use. On that subject, I think that you can appreciate that we share the letter's basic concern about the risk of escalation, and for that reason (among others), feel that our current policy, which takes account of the full range of escalatory risk and the realities of the conventional balance in Europe is, in fact, a better and wiser position than that suggested in the letter.

I hope the above comments will prove helpful to you, to the Center, and to the Conference. I have highlighted some major concerns, gained after a careful reading of the 70-page draft document. I will surely have more thoughts on this document and on new drafts in the future, and you and your colleagues may well wish to address specific questions to me and my staff for further comment. Again, I welcome this opportunity to review the draft Pastoral letter, and I look forward to being in touch with you in the future. I will remain deeply interested in this effort.

Sincerely,

William P. Clark

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce
Shoreham West, Apartment 516L
2700 Calvert Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

President Reagan

Agenda for Peace

June 17, 1982



United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following is an address by President Reagan before the second U.N. General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament, New York, June 17, 1982.

I speak today as both a citizen of the United States and of the world. I come with the heartfelt wishes of my people for peace, bearing honest proposals, and looking for genuine progress.

Dag Hammarskjöld said 24 years ago this month, "We meet in a time of peace which is no peace." His words are as true today as they were then. More than 100 disputes have disturbed the peace among nations since World War II, and today the threat of nuclear disaster hangs over the lives of all our peoples. The Bible tells us there will be a time for peace, but so far this century mankind has failed to find it.

The United Nations is dedicated to world peace and its charter clearly prohibits the international use of force. Yet the tide of belligerence continues to rise. The charter's influence has weakened even in the 4 years since the first Special Session on Disarmament. We must not only condemn aggression, we must enforce the dictates of our charter and resume the struggle for peace.

The record of history is clear: citizens of the United States resort to force reluctantly and only when they must. Our foreign policy, as President Eisenhower once said, "... is not difficult to state. We are for peace, first, last and always, for very simple reasons. We know that it is only in a peaceful atmo-

sphere, a peace with justice, one in which we can be confident, that America can prosper as we have known prosperity in the past."

To those who challenge the truth of those words let me point out that at the end of World War II, we were the only undamaged industrial power in the world. Our military supremacy was unquestioned. We had harnessed the atom and had the ability to unleash its destructive force anywhere in the world. In short, we could have achieved world domination but that was contrary to the character of our people.

Instead, we wrote a new chapter in the history of mankind. We used our power and wealth to rebuild the war-ravaged economies of the world, both East and West, including those nations who had been our enemies. We took the initiative in creating such international institutions as this United Nations, where leaders of goodwill could come together to build bridges for peace and prosperity.

America has no territorial ambitions, we occupy no countries, and we have built no walls to lock our people in. Our commitment to self-determination, freedom, and peace is the very soul of America. That commitment is as strong today as it ever was.

The United States has fought four wars in my lifetime. In each we struggled to defend freedom and democracy. We were never the aggressors. America's strength and, yes, her military power have been a force for peace, not

conquest; for democracy, not despotism; for freedom, not tyranny.

Watching, as I have, succeeding generations of American youth bleed their lives onto far-flung battlefields to protect our ideals and secure the rule of law, I have known how important it is to deter conflict. But since coming to the Presidency, the enormity of the responsibility of this office has made my commitment even deeper. I believe that responsibility is shared by all of us here today.

On our recent trip to Europe, my wife Nancy told me of a bronze statue, 22 feet high, that she saw on a cliff on the coast of France. The beach at the base of that cliff is called Saint Laurent, but countless American families have it written in the flyleaf of their Bibles and know it as Omaha Beach. The pastoral quiet of that French countryside is in marked contrast to the bloody violence that took place there on a June day 38 years ago when the allies stormed the Continent. At the end of just 1 day of battle, 10,500 Americans were wounded, missing, or killed in what became known as the Normandy landing.

The statue atop that cliff is called "The Spirit of American Youth Rising From the Waves." Its image of sacrifice is almost too powerful to describe. The pain of war is still vivid in our national memory. It sends me to this special session of the United Nations eager to comply with the plea of Pope Paul VI when he spoke in this chamber nearly 17 years ago. "If you want to be brothers," His Holiness said, "let the arms fall from your hands."

We Americans yearn to let them go. But we need more than mere words, more than empty promises, before we can proceed. We look around the world and see rampant conflict and aggression. There are many sources of this conflict—expansionist ambitions, local rivalries, the striving to obtain justice and security. We must all work to resolve such disorders by peaceful means and to prevent them from escalation.

The Soviet Record

In the nuclear era, the major powers bear a special responsibility to ease these sources of conflict and to refrain from aggression. And that's why we're so deeply concerned by Soviet conduct. Since World War II, the record of tyranny has included Soviet violation of the Yalta agreements leading to domination of Eastern Europe, symbolized by the Berlin Wall—a grim, gray monument to

repression that I visited just a week ago. It includes the takeovers of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Afghanistan and the ruthless repression of the proud people of Poland. Soviet-sponsored guerrillas and terrorists are at work in Central and South America, in Africa, the Middle East, in the Caribbean, and in Europe, violating human rights and unnerving the world with violence. Communist atrocities in Southeast Asia, Afghanistan, and elsewhere continue to shock the free world as refugees escape to tell of their horror.

The decade of so-called detente witnessed the most massive Soviet buildup of military power in history. They increased their defense spending by 40% while American defense spending actually declined in the same real terms. Soviet aggression and support for violence around the world have eroded the confidence needed for arms negotiations. While we exercised unilateral restraint they forged ahead and today possess nuclear and conventional forces far in excess of an adequate deterrent capability.

Soviet oppression is not limited to the countries they invade. At the very time the Soviet Union is trying to manipulate the peace movement in the West, it is stifling a budding peace movement at home. In Moscow, banners are scuttled, buttons are snatched, and demonstrators are arrested when even a few people dare to speak about their fears.

Eleanor Roosevelt, one of our first ambassadors to this body, reminded us that the high-sounding words of tyrants stand in bleak contradiction to their deeds. "Their promises," she said, "are in deep contrast to their performances."

U.S. Leadership in Disarmament and Arms Control Proposals

My countrymen learned a bitter lesson in this century: The scourge of tyranny cannot be stopped with words alone. So we have embarked on an effort to renew our strength that had fallen dangerously low. We refuse to become weaker while potential adversaries remain committed to their imperialist adventures.

My people have sent me here today to speak for them as citizens of the world, which they truly are, for we Americans are drawn from every nationality represented in this chamber today. We understand that men and women of every race and creed can and must work together for peace. We stand ready to take the next steps down the road of cooperation through verifiable arms reduction. Agreements on arms control and disarmament can be useful

in reinforcing peace; but they're not magic. We should not confuse the signing of agreements with the solving of problems. Simply collecting agreements will not bring peace. Agreements genuinely reinforce peace only when they are kept. Otherwise we are building a paper castle that will be blown away by the winds of war. Let me repeat, we need deeds, not words, to convince us of Soviet sincerity should they choose to join us on this path.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has been the leader in serious disarmament and arms control proposals.

- In 1946, in what became known as the Baruch Plan, the United States submitted a proposal for control of nuclear weapons and nuclear energy by an international authority. The Soviets rejected this plan.

- In 1955, President Eisenhower made his "open skies" proposal, under which the United States and the Soviet Union would have exchanged blueprints of military establishments and provided for aerial reconnaissance. The Soviets rejected this plan.

- In 1963, the Limited Test Ban Treaty came into force. This treaty ended nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere, outer space, or under water by participating nations.

- In 1970, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons took effect. The United States played a major role in this key effort to prevent the spread of nuclear explosives and to provide for international safeguards on civil nuclear activities. My country remains deeply committed to those objectives today and to strengthening the nonproliferation framework. This is essential to international security.

- In the early 1970s, again at U.S. urging, agreements were reached between the United States and the U.S.S.R. providing for ceilings on some categories of weapons. They could have been more meaningful if Soviet actions had shown restraint and commitment to stability at lower levels of force.

An Agenda for Peace

The United Nations designated the 1970s as the First Disarmament Decade, but good intentions were not enough. In reality, that 10-year period included an unprecedented buildup in military weapons and the flaring of aggression and use of force in almost every region of the world. We are now in the Second Disarmament Decade. The task at hand is to assure civilized behavior among

nations, to unite behind an agenda for peace.

Over the past 7 months, the United States has put forward a broad-based comprehensive series of proposals to reduce the risk of war. We have proposed four major points as an agenda for peace:

- Elimination of land-based intermediate-range missiles;
- A one-third reduction in strategic ballistic missile warheads;
- A substantial reduction in NATO and Warsaw Pact ground and air forces; and
- New safeguards to reduce the risk of accidental war.

We urge the Soviet Union today to join with us in this quest. We must act not for ourselves alone but for all mankind.

On November 18 of last year, I announced U.S. objectives in arms control agreements: They must be equitable and militarily significant, they must stabilize forces at lower levels, and they must be verifiable.

The United States and its allies have made specific, reasonable, and equitable proposals. In February, our negotiating team in Geneva offered the Soviet Union a draft treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces. We offered to cancel deployment of our Pershing II ballistic missiles and ground-launched cruise missiles in exchange for Soviet elimination of their SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles. This proposal would eliminate with one stroke those systems about which both sides have expressed the greatest concern.

The United States is also looking forward to beginning negotiations on strategic arms reductions with the Soviet Union in less than 2 weeks. We will work hard to make these talks an opportunity for real progress in our quest for peace.

On May 9, I announced a phased approach to the reduction of strategic arms. In a first phase, the number of ballistic missile warheads on each side would be reduced to about 5,000. No more than half the remaining warheads would be on land-based missiles. All ballistic missiles would be reduced to an equal level at about one-half the current U.S. number.

In the second phase, we would reduce each side's overall destructive power to equal levels, including a mutual ceiling on ballistic missile throw-weight below the current U.S. level. We are also prepared to discuss other elements of the strategic balance.

Before I returned from Europe last week, I met in Bonn with the leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We agreed to introduce a major new Western initiative for the Vienna negotiations on mutual balanced force reductions. Our approach calls for common collective ceilings for both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. After 7 years, there would be a total of 700,000 ground forces and 900,000 ground and air force personnel combined. It also includes a package of associated measures to encourage cooperation and verify compliance.

We urge the Soviet Union and members of the Warsaw Pact to view our Western proposal as a means to reach agreement in Vienna after 9 long years of inconclusive talks. We also urge them to implement the 1975 Helsinki agreement on security and cooperation in Europe.

Let me stress that for agreements to work, both sides must be able to verify compliance. The building of mutual confidence in compliance can only be achieved through greater openness. I encourage the Special Session on Disarmament to endorse the importance of these principles in arms control agreements.

I have instructed our representatives at the 40-nation Committee on Disarmament to renew emphasis on verification and compliance. Based on a U.S. proposal, a committee has been formed to examine these issues as they relate to restrictions on nuclear testing. We are also pressing the need for effective verification provisions in agreements banning chemical weapons.

The use of chemical and biological weapons has long been viewed with revulsion by civilized nations. No peace-making institution can ignore the use of these dread weapons and still live up to its mission. The need for a truly effective and verifiable chemical weapons agreement has been highlighted by recent events. The Soviet Union and their allies are violating the Geneva Protocol of 1925, related rules of international law, and the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention. There is conclusive evidence that the Soviet Government has provided toxins for use in Laos and Kampuchea and are themselves using chemical weapons against freedom fighters in Afghanistan.

We have repeatedly protested to the Soviet Government, as well as the governments of Laos and Vietnam, their use of chemical and toxin weapons. We call upon them now to grant full and free access to their countries or to territories they control so that U.N. experts can conduct an effective, independ-

ent investigation to verify cessation of these horrors.

Evidence of noncompliance with existing arms control agreements underscores the need to approach negotiation of any new agreements with care. The democracies of the West are open societies. Information on our defenses is available to our citizens, our elected officials, and the world. We do not hesitate to inform potential adversaries of our military forces and ask in return for the same information concerning theirs. The amount and type of military spending by a country are important for the world to know, as a measure of its intentions, and the threat that country may pose to its neighbors. The Soviet Union and other closed societies go to extraordinary lengths to hide their true military spending not only from other nations but from their own people. This practice contributes to distrust and fear about their intentions.

Today, the United States proposes an international conference on military expenditures to build on the work of this body in developing a common system for accounting and reporting. We urge the Soviet Union, in particular, to join this effort in good faith, to revise the universally discredited official figures it publishes, and to join with us in giving the world a true account of the resources we allocate to our armed forces.

Last Friday in Berlin, I said that I would leave no stone unturned in the effort to reinforce peace and lessen the risk of war. It's been clear to me that steps should be taken to improve mutual communication and confidence and lessen the likelihood of misinterpretation.

I have, therefore, directed the exploration of ways to increase understanding and communication between the United States and the Soviet Union in times of peace and of crisis. We will approach the Soviet Union with proposals for reciprocal exchanges in such areas as advance notification of major strategic exercises that otherwise might be misinterpreted; advance notification of ICBM [intercontinental ballistic missile] launches within, as well as beyond, national boundaries; and an expanded exchange of strategic forces data.

While substantial information on U.S. activities and forces in these areas already is provided, I believe that jointly and regularly sharing information would represent a qualitative improvement in the strategic nuclear environment and would help reduce the chance of misunderstandings. I call upon the Soviet Union to join the United States in ex-

ploring these possibilities to build confidence, and I ask for your support of our efforts.

Call for International Support

One of the major items before this conference is the development of a comprehensive program of disarmament. We support the effort to chart a course of realistic and effective measures in the quest for peace. I have come to this hall to call for international recommitment to the basic tenet of the U.N. Charter—that all members practice tolerance and live together in peace as good neighbors under the rule of law, forsaking armed force as a means of settling disputes between nations. America urges you to support the agenda for peace that I have outlined today. We ask you to reinforce the bilateral and multilateral arms control negotiations between members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact and to rededicate yourselves to maintaining international peace and security and removing threats to peace.

We, who have signed the U.N. Charter, have pledged to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territory or independence of any state. In these times when more and more lawless acts are going unpunished—as some members of this very body show a growing disregard for the U.N. Charter—the peace-loving nations of the world must condemn aggression and pledge again to act in a way that is worthy of the ideals that we have endorsed. Let us finally make the charter live.

In late spring, 37 years ago, representatives of 50 nations gathered on the

other side of this continent, in the San Francisco Opera House. The League of Nations had crumbled and World War II still raged, but those men and nations were determined to find peace. The result was this charter for peace that is the framework of the United Nations.

President Harry Truman spoke of the revival of an old faith—the everlasting moral force of justice prompting that U.N. conference. Such a force remains strong in America and in other countries where speech is free and citizens have the right to gather and make their opinions known.

President Truman said, "If we should pay merely lip service to inspiring ideals, and later do violence to simple justice, we would draw down upon us the bitter wrath of generations yet unborn." Those words of Harry Truman have special meaning for us today as we live with the potential to destroy civilization.

"We must learn to live together in peace," he said. "We must build a new world—a far better world."

What a better world it would be if the guns were silent; if neighbor no longer encroached on neighbor and all peoples were free to reap the rewards of their toil and determine their own destiny and system of government—whatever their choice.

During my recent audience with His Holiness Pope John Paul II, I gave him the pledge of the American people to do everything possible for peace and arms reduction. The American people believe forging real and lasting peace to be their sacred trust.

Let us never forget that such a peace would be a terrible hoax if the world were no longer blessed with freedom and respect for human rights. The United Nations, Hammarskjöld said, was born out of the cataclysms of war. It should justify the sacrifices of all those who have died for freedom and justice. "It is our duty to the past," Hammarskjöld said, "and it is our duty to the future, so to serve both our nations and the world."

As both patriots of our nations and the hope of all the world, let those of us assembled here in the name of peace deepen our understandings, renew our commitment to the rule of law, and take new and bolder steps to calm an uneasy world. Can any delegate here deny that in so doing he would be doing what the people—the rank and file of his own country or her own country—want him or her to do?

Isn't it time for us to really represent the deepest, most heartfelt yearnings of all of our people? Let no nation abuse this common longing to be free of fear. We must not manipulate our people by playing upon their nightmares; we must serve mankind through genuine disarmament. With God's help we can secure life and freedom for generations to come. ■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division • Washington, D.C. • June 1982
Editor: Colleen Sussman • This material is in the public domain and may be reproduced without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

Bureau of Public Affairs
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Postage and Fees Paid
Department of State
STA-501



Official Business

If address is incorrect
please indicate change.
Do not cover or destroy
this address label. ➤

14

MILITARY VICARIATE
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

July 1, 1982

Office of the Vicar General

Dear Mrs. Luce:

It was truly gratifying to hold the first meeting of the Board of Advisors of the Pope John Paul II Center of Prayer and Study for Peace, on June 24, 1982 at the Center's new home, Shrine of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton.

At this point, I see no value in burdening you with formal minutes of the meeting. It was opened with a beautiful prayer by Sister Mary Clare Hughes, D.C., one of Saint Elizabeth Seton's "own" sisters. My perception would be that we accomplished the following:

- a. Met one another;
- b. Were given an overview of the background, purposes, current status and future possibilities of the Center;
- c. Unanimously agreed on the indispensability of prayer if just peace is ever to be achieved or maintained;
- d. Unanimously agreed on the crucial importance of persuasive educational activities.

All Board Members present offered their particular skills. Father Joseph Cahill, C.M., President of Saint John's University, offered the facilities of the University, to sponsor lecture programs, seminars, honor of individuals who try in a balanced, practical and sensible way to advance peace. Dr. Arthur Sackler offered possibilities related to the three foundations which he heads or with which he is intimately associated. (For example, he is currently negotiating a Pacem In Terris Award and the possibility of a university chair.) Sister Mary Clare, D.C., noted that the "Seton Sisters" have been committed to education since their inception, and would certainly be interested in contributing to education for just peace.

So with other Board Members present: Ambassador Smith offered realistic guidance based on thirty years of experience in arms control and negotiations; Sister Marjorie Keenan, RSHM, addressed educational needs from the perspective of her association with the Holy See's Justice and

15

Peace Commission and UN Disarmament activities; Monsignor John Nolan broadened the educational sights by way of his extensive knowledge of the Middle East; Dr. Bernard Pisani, M.D., pointed toward education in the relationship between peace and respect for all life, beginning in the womb.

Monsignor James G. Wilders, Executive Director of the Center, discussed plans for bringing groups of young people to the Shrine for prayer vigils, the dedication of a Mass for Peace each day, adoration before the Blessed Sacrament and other such prayer efforts. Personal letters have been mailed to every major religious superior of men and of women in the United States, asking that they invite all their members to join in prayer with the Center. Many beautiful replies have been received, with prayer commitments made.

Brother Austin David, FSC, Director of Research for the Center, described initial and long range plans for data gathering, the use of computers and other media for exploring both human conflict and the dimensions of just peace.

His Eminence, Terence Cardinal Cooke, put the entire movement in perspective, supported the need for intelligible and practical educational efforts, and reemphasized the primacy of prayer as the basic reason for the existence of the John Paul II Center.

During the buffet following the meeting, Bishop O'Connor gave a brief resume of the efforts of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops' Ad Hoc Committee on War and Peace, and offered to send each Board Member a copy of the first draft of a document prepared by this Committee. This draft is enclosed, with the reminder that it is, precisely, a first draft. It has been distributed to all bishops in the United States and is being sent to the Holy Father and to bishops in a number of other countries. A great deal of work will be done, and probably many modifications will be made before a final draft is proposed for approval by the bishops in November.

We are deeply grateful for your interest in the Center and for your support, and will keep you informed of developments.

Faithfully in Our Lord,



+John J. O'Connor
Chairman of the Board

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce
Shoreham West, Apart. 516L
2700 Calvert Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

16

MILITARY VICARIATE
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

June 4, 1982

Office of the Vicar General

Dear Mrs. Luce:

It gives all of us here great pleasure that you are willing to serve on the Board of Directors of the Pope John Paul II Center of Prayer and Study for Peace. The enclosed brochure will provide some general information, but since this is a new venture, with no model to pattern it on, as far as we know, I would have to suggest very frankly that we will have to design specifics as we gain experience. This is one reason why we have asked you to serve on the Board. [REDACTED]

By the time you receive this letter, His Eminence will have announced that the Center will be formally dedicated on June 24, at 7:30 in the evening, with a Mass. At the same time, Monsignor James Wilders will be installed as its Executive Director and as an Episcopal Vicar to the Military Vicariate. Monsignor Wilders is a priest of the Archdiocese of New York and Pastor of the Shrine Church of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton, new home of the Pope John Paul II Center.

We should like very much to have our first Board of Directors' meeting on that same date, at the Center, convening at 5 o'clock in the evening. The meeting would continue through a buffet supper, prior to the Mass at 7:30.

I am keenly aware of the short notice this letter provides, and that June is a packed month for most of us. If you could conceivably attend this first meeting, however, it would be most helpful.

Perhaps you will be able to write to me directly or to call me at (212) 355 3457. Should I be out of the office (and this job does keep me on the road a great deal), my young secretary, Ellen Stafford, is exceptionally capable and will contact me.

We are most grateful.

Faithfully,



+John J. O'Connor
Vicar General and
Auxiliary Bishop

Mrs. Claire Boothe Luce
Shoreham West, Apart. 516L
2700 Colvert Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

NOTE: I think CBL spoke
with Bishop O'Connor

Phoned:
CBL as Honorable -
may not return until
Fall. Correct spelling
names -
6/9/82

17

PARTICIPANTS IN BOARD MEETING OF JUNE 24, 1982

Very Rev. Joseph T. Cahill, C.M.

Sister Mary Clare Hughes, D.C.

Sister Marjorie Keenan, RSHM

Rev. Monsignor John G. Nolan

Doctor Bernard Pisani

Doctor Arthur Sackler

Ambassador Gerard Smith

Rev. Thurston N. Davis

18

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS

1312 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

June 16, 1982

Your Eminence/Excellency:

Enclosed is the draft of the Pastoral Letter tentatively entitled "God's Hope in a Time of Fear" which the NCCB ad hoc Committee on War and Peace has prepared. The Committee has been at work for almost a year, meeting regularly to hear the views of a broad spectrum of witnesses.

The draft now before you has been through a three-stage process: an initial draft prepared by the Committee, with the assistance of Dr. Bruce Russett; an intensive three-day consultation where the draft was reviewed word by word and numerous changes were made; finally, another writing of the document based on the decisions made at the consultation. The Appendix to the Pastoral describes the procedure of our meetings and the witnesses we have heard, culminating with a session with representatives of the Reagan Administration. We still intend to meet with representatives of Congress before the final revision is completed.

The draft is now being sent to you for your initial reactions. In order for the Committee to meet the mailing deadline for the Administrative Committee meeting in September, we will need your comments by July 15. We will then meet again as a Committee to consider the responses we receive and prepare the Pastoral for the Administrative Committee's review in September. If at that time, the Administrative Committee approves the Pastoral's being presented to all the Bishops for their consideration at the November meeting, it will again be sent to you for suggestions and amendments.

The document is obviously long and complex. Both characteristics correspond to the challenge the topic poses. It was necessary to write a detailed, closely reasoned argument if we were to be faithful to the tradition we inherit as Catholics and equal to the challenge we face as citizens of a country possessing a vast nuclear arsenal. The Pastoral will benefit from the insights, diverse perspectives and competencies which the membership of the NCCB will bring to it. We are also sending the draft to the Holy See and to a number of other Episcopal Conferences with which our Conference has contact for their comment.

If I could share one guideline which the Committee found useful in its preparation of the Pastoral, it is the need to examine not only the individual sections or sentences in the Pastoral but to look at the document as a whole. Particularly in Part III, "War and Peace: The Socio-Political and Moral Issues," it is important to recognize that the principles set forth are interlocking ideas. When proposing a change in one principle or section, the Committee had to examine continually the impact of the change on the whole moral argument of Part III.

In closing, allow me to say in the name of the Committee that we have felt privileged to perform the work of placing before the NCCB a considered statement about the topic which many feel is the most pressing moral issue of our time. I am pleased to submit it to you with our unanimous endorsement. Now we await your judgment and advice. Please send your comments to me at Conference headquarters.

Fraternally yours in Christ,

Most Reverend Joseph L. Bernardin
Archbishop of Cincinnati
Chairman, ad hoc Committee on War and Peace

19

MILITARY VICARIATE
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

June 4, 1982

Office of the Vicar General

Dear Mrs. Luce:

It gives all of us here great pleasure that you are willing to serve on the Board of Directors of the Pope John Paul II Center of Prayer and Study for Peace. The enclosed brochure will provide some general information, but since this is a new venture, with no model to pattern it on, as far as we know, I would have to suggest very frankly that we will have to design specifics as we gain experience. This is one reason why we have asked you to serve on the Board.

[REDACTED]

By the time you receive this letter, His Eminence will have announced that the Center will be formally dedicated on June 24, at 7:30 in the evening, with a Mass. At the same time, Monsignor James Wilders will be installed as its Executive Director and as an Episcopal Vicar to the Military Vicariate. Monsignor Wilders is a priest of the Archdiocese of New York and Pastor of the Shrine Church of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton, new home of the Pope John Paul II Center.

We should like very much to have our first Board of Directors' meeting on that same date, at the Center, convening at 5 o'clock in the evening. The meeting would continue through a buffet supper, prior to the Mass at 7:30.

I am keenly aware of the short notice this letter provides, and that June is a packed month for most of us. If you could conceivably attend this first meeting, however, it would be most helpful.

Perhaps you will be able to write to me directly or to call me at (212) 355 3457. Should I be out of the office (and this job does keep me on the road a great deal), my young secretary, Ellen Stafford, is exceptionally capable and will contact me.

We are most grateful.

Faithfully,

+ *John J. O'Connor*
+ John J. O'Connor
Vicar General and
Auxiliary Bishop

Mrs. Claire Boothe Luce
Shoreham West, Apart. 516L
2700 Colvert Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

NOTE: I think CBL spoke
with Bishop O'Connor

*Phoned:
CBL in Honolulu -
now got return with
fax. Correct spelling
names -
ack
6/10/82*