

Contacts for ICND statement

bgrieves@episcopalchurch.org, mgardner@episcopalchurch.org, mshea@episcopalchurch.org,
Rebecca.Larson@elca.org,

Edgar, Bob redgar@nccusa.org, Kiereopoulos, Tony tkiereopoulos@nccusa.org.
GirtonMitchell, Brenda bgirtonm@nccusa.org

Robinson, Dave <paxusa@earthlink.net>

DRAFT

E-message to denominational staff regarding project to influence presidential candidates from Howard Hallman. To be adapted to different situations.

Dear

I would like to discuss with you a proposal to have the faith community in the United States seek to influence potential presidential candidates for the 2008 election by asking them to take leadership for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This would be a project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. I want to explore with you whether the Church would participate.

Already more than a dozen men and women are positioning themselves to run for the presidency in 2008. From now until the primary season intensifies in the fall of 2007 is a good time for religious leaders to engage them in dialogue and grassroots activists to approach them as they go about the country. I am proposing that we take advantage of this opportunity in the following manner.

REMAINDER OF 2005

1. Obtain commitment from religious denominations to participate.
2. Hallman work with denominational staff to develop a set of "asks".
3. Obtain commitment from heads of communion (or similar official) (a) to sign the asks and (b) to be willing to participate in delegation visits to candidates (as time is available) or designate some one to represent them.

2006 THROUGH SUMMER OF 2007

1. Delegations of top religious leaders call upon potential candidates to present our asks.
2. Hallman and denominational staff follow up with candidates' staff to feed in further information.
3. Grassroots activists from faith community work together in various states to approach candidates as they are making speeches and beginning to campaign around the country, especially in early primary states.

ASKS

I want to work with you and others to develop a set of asks of what we want candidates to do if elected, such as:

1. Make a commitment in inaugural address to take leadership in seeking the global elimination of nuclear weapons.
2. During the four year presidential term undertake a set of specified steps to achieve (a) verifiable, multilateral nuclear disarmament and (b) thorough-going nuclear nonproliferation. For example, during first year of term get all U.S. and Russian missiles off hair-trigger alert; in four years get U.S. and Russian deployed missiles down to 100 each or less; engage other nuclear powers in multilateral negotiations; in four years achieve complete lockdown of all fissile material and nuclear warheads worldwide; etc.

I will take the lead to develop these asks with you and others. In doing so we should seek advice from retired military leaders and civic sector experts on the practical steps that a president committed to global elimination of nuclear weapons could undertake. With this advice we

would seek consensus among ourselves for the asks. Then each denominational staff could request the head of communion to sign.

IMPLEMENTATION

We will need to work out a plan for implementation. I'm willing to devote time to this project in the next two years. It would be useful to have one staff person to handle the grassroots phase if funds can be obtained.

Would you be willing to work with me on this project? Do you think that might be willing to be a signer and, to extent schedule permits, call on potential presidential candidates?

I'll give you a call to discuss this further.

Shalom,
Howard

Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons: A Leadership Challenge for the 44th President the United States A Faith-based Proposal

Sixty years after atomic bombs devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the time has come to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

Numerous religious bodies consider possession and use of nuclear weapons to be inherently immoral. Many military leaders have stated that nuclear weapons have no legitimate military utility. Scientists and civilian leaders from around the globe want nuclear weapons.

Nevertheless, nine nation states have armed themselves with nuclear weapons and want to retain them. Other nations and non-state actors have ambition to acquire them. The danger that nuclear weapons might be used has increased in recent years.

Even though the United States and other nuclear weapons states pledged in 1970 in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to work toward the elimination of their nuclear arsenals, this has not occurred. Currently U.S. policy, as expressed in the 2002 Nuclear Posture Review, envisions retaining nuclear weapons for the foreseeable future. Other policy documents indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons preemptively. The United States has refused to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and has placed obstacles in the way of other international agreements that would reduce nuclear danger.

The United States can and should do better. The man or woman who will be inaugurated as the 44th President on January 20, 2009 has an opportunity to lead the nation and the world in the path toward the total, global elimination of nuclear weapons. This will entail simultaneously dismantling current nuclear arsenals and production facilities and pursuing a vigorous course of nuclear non-proliferation so that other states and non-state actors will not acquire nuclear weapons.

With that in mind the undersigned persons from the faith community present a set of suggestions to those who are considering a bid for the presidency in 2008. Based upon ideas offered by military and civic sector experts, we propose a series of actions that the next U.S. president can undertake. We address them to the future president.

Inaugural Pledge

In your inaugural address you can tell the nation that nuclear weapons have lost whatever utility they may once have had. The United States has no need for them other than to deter use by Russia with its huge nuclear arsenal. Any other function once envisioned for nuclear weapons can be achieved by other means.

Moreover, there is a perpetual danger that weapons in existing arsenals might be accidentally launched or that terrorist organizations might acquire nuclear warheads or fissile material. The world would be much safer if all nuclear weapons were eliminated with proper safeguards and all remaining fissile material made absolutely secure. If this happened, there would be no Russian arsenal to deter so that this remaining function would disappear.

Therefore, as the new president you can pledge to provide strong, decisive leadership for the total, global elimination of nuclear weapons. You can indicate that this effort will have two interrelated tracks: nuclear nonproliferation and nuclear disarmament.

Nuclear Nonproliferation

The greatest danger to the United States is that hostile nations or terrorists organizations will acquire nuclear weapons and will use them against the United States or our allies. Therefore, as president you can preside over a strong and thorough nuclear nonproliferation program. In the early months of your new administration you can take the following steps.

- 1.

Handbook for Non-Partisan Candidate Briefings

[Overview](#)

[Guidelines](#)

[Delegation](#)

[Request for Briefing](#)

[Success Story](#)

Overview

The materials following are intended to guide, assist, and inspire groups that work on issues of gun violence prevention and international peace to undertake non-partisan candidate briefings as a way to pro-actively assert these issues in electoral campaigns. This handbook is based on the experience of the Princeton, NJ-based Peace Action Education Fund in conducting seven such briefings for major party candidates in New Jersey for the US Senate Primary and in two Congressional Districts for the general election between December 1999 and July 2000.

The goals of the briefings were:

- To gain personal access to each candidate, and to inform them directly of facts on our issues as well as responding to any questions or concerns they had about them
- To begin a positive relationship and ongoing communication with each candidate, and with their appropriate issues staff, that could be carried through the election, and, if the candidate won, into their time as an elected representative.
- To lay the groundwork for a follow-up questionnaire which would be the basis for a Peace Voter Guide that was published in each of these races.

I'm happy to say that each of these goals was met. We found these briefings to be both successful in themselves, and highly valuable to our ongoing work. We were pleasantly surprised at how many candidates gave us access, meeting with us for up to two hours. The candidates were also quite receptive to meeting at a time and place that was convenient to our delegation, rather than primarily just to them.

We certainly were a more visible organization and movement to the candidates as a result of these briefings. I think it's also fair to say that a number of the candidates learned a great deal from the briefings. Even if they knew about some of the issues we raised, much of what we shared was new or additional information to them. This was particularly true for candidates who were seeking to move from a local or state elected office to a federal one, and to candidates who had never held office before.

We also found that our goal of establishing ongoing communications was met. We were undoubtedly more effective at getting responses to our questionnaire as a result of first conducting the non-partisan briefings. We established ongoing communication with the issues staff of several campaigns. And we received attention to our issues that might not otherwise have been offered.

There were even several "fringe benefits" to conducting the briefings that we had not anticipated. In one case, at the end of a briefing, a candidate proposed that we

sponsor a debate on these issues between him and his opponent during the general election campaign. In another case, we were able to cite the fact that we had several top physicists brief the candidate on Star Wars, but that his position still hadn't changed, as a reason we had to generate phone calls and public pressure on him to make such a change. In a third case, a candidate who had originally opposed cutting military spending in answer to a questionnaire changed her position to supporting targeted cuts following our briefing.

We encourage you to incorporate such briefings into your organizing. Feel free to contact our office to find out more about our experience. Finally, let me express our gratitude to the Ploughshares Fund for generously supporting the production and distribution of this handbook, both in this hard copy version and on our web site.

The Rev. Robert Moore, Executive Director
Peace Action Education Fund

Guidelines

Guidelines for organizing non-partisan candidate briefings on peace and gun violence prevention issues.

Below are guidelines for organizing non-partisan candidate briefings developed by the Princeton, NJ based Peace Action Education Fund (PAEF). They are based on having conducted seven such briefings for major party candidates in the June, 2000 New Jersey Senate Primary and in two New Jersey congressional districts (CD 12 and CD 3) before the November 12, 2000 general election. Further information is available from PAEF, 40 Witherspoon St., Princeton, NJ 08542; telephone (609)924-5022; fax (609)924-3052; email Email the Coalition.

- **Begin early.** Our single most important learning in organizing these briefings was that by requesting the briefings early, we got much better access to the candidates than we anticipated. For example, we requested briefing sessions with the six major party candidates in the June, 2000 New Jersey Primary for the open Senate seat in November 1999. The briefings took place in December, 1999 and January 2000. This was a time when the candidates were looking for recognition and allies, were mostly little known, and had fewer things on their campaign calendars. As a result, five of the six candidates were successfully scheduled.
- **Do polite, prompt and courteous telephone and fax follow-up.** We didn't just let the letters requesting the briefings sit there for months. We followed up the November 22, 1999 letter (sample in packet) with phone calls in early December 1999. For a number of campaigns, we had to re-fax materials, sometimes to a new campaign address (things are often in flux that early in a campaign). But by persistent, courteous follow-up, we succeeded in arranging briefings for 5 of 6 major party candidates.
- **Use your most credible non-partisan experts, as well as prestigious leaders, in the briefings.** This is a fairly obvious point, but we sometimes tend to rely too heavily on "activists" to make our case. In our case, we had three faculty members from Princeton University, a retired Episcopal Bishop, the state's most prominent gun control leader, two former Republican candidates, and a former Peace Corps volunteer (who has first hand experience on landmines). See full list enclosed.

- **Organize your agenda well.** Our delegation met ahead of time to decide who would cover each issue, and how much time they had. We made sure to use our most credible experts early, and to give them adequate time. One person coordinated the meeting, and made sure we kept to schedule. We began with one-hour briefings, and found they ran closer to 90 minutes. We left the last 20 minutes for dialogue/questions with the candidates, which gave us a good feel for where they were coming from, and how they received our information.
- **Give a packet of fact sheets, articles by your experts, and background to the candidate during the briefing.** A sample of most of the materials in our packet is included. We handed the candidate the specific items as that issue was discussed. It buttressed the "expert" credentials of our delegation that a number of the articles were by them and were in prestigious publications like the Washington Post, Scientific American, and Center for Defense Information. We also gave them materials that were written or endorsed by former military officials, e.g. the call to ban landmines published as an ad in the New York Times that had former top generals and admirals as signers.
- **Affirm areas of agreement, rather than focussing too heavily on disagreements.** Several of the Republican candidates we briefed were actually anxious to be seen as favoring gun violence prevention measures. As we affirmed this common ground, we found they became more receptive to our input on international peace issues.
- **Follow up the meeting with a candidate questionnaire.** We didn't try to fill out the questionnaire with the candidate during the briefing, since we wanted that to remain strictly informational. But we told the candidates that we would follow up with our candidate questionnaire (of course, the latter was under the auspices of our advocacy arm, the Coalition for Peace Action, so we could use the responses in the Peace Voter Campaign). This gave the candidate time to digest our materials before they had to indicate their initial position on our issues.
- **Find out the appropriate issues staff contact person.** We found that with several of the candidates, there was considerable dialogue that was initiated by our briefing. Their issues staff would call with questions (particularly after they got our questionnaire). This is like developing a relationship with staff of our elected officials, since they are the most trusted and knowledgeable advisors to the candidate as they make policy decisions.

Delegation

Delegation that Conducted Briefings with New Jersey Candidates for Congress and U.S. Senate

Below is a listing of persons who participated in one of more of candidate briefings for seven New Jersey candidates for U.S. Congress and Senate during the year 2000 to date. Several other briefings are still pending as of the date of this listing (9/6/00).

- **The Right Rev. G.P. Mellick Belshaw**, Bishop (retired), Episcopal Bishop of New Jersey; Chairperson, Peace Action Education Fund.

- **Dr. Frank von Hippel**, physicist, nuclear policy analyst, and Professor of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; President, Federation of American Scientists Education Fund; former Assistant Director of White House Office of Science Advisor
- **Dr. Harold Feiveson**, arms reduction expert and Professor of Political Science, Princeton University
- **Dr. Zia Mian**, physicist, Princeton University; editor of the book Pakistan and the Atomic Bomb
- **Marc Tolo**, Co-Chair, Committee for Political Action, Coalition for Peace Action
- **Carol Allen**, Co-Chair, Committee for Political Action, Coalition for Peace Action
- **Mary Tanner**, former Republican Councilwoman, Lawrence, NJ
- **Arnold Smolens**, former Republican candidate for Princeton Boro Council
- **Irene Goldman**, Vice-Chair, Peace Action Education Fund
- **Stan Johnson**, President, Princeton/Trenton United Nations Association
- **Bryan Miller**, Executive Director, Ceasefire New Jersey
- **The Rev. Robert Moore**, Executive Director, Coalition for Peace Action; Pastor of East Brunswick Congregational Church
- **Virginia Ahearn**, Executive Director, NJ Peace Action, Montclair

Request

December 20, 2001

Senator Robert Torricelli
 Attn: Sean Jackson
 Fax (973)639-0418

Dear Senator Torricelli:

In conjunction with our sister group, NJ Peace Action, we are seeking to meet with each candidate for Senate to offer a briefing on our whole range of issues-nuclear weapons abolition, a peace economy, and a halt to weapons trafficking-including guns in our communities.

We offer this briefing not only for the knowledge and expertise we have to share with you, but also in hopes this will help you address these issues during the campaign. With the danger of terrorism using weapons of mass destruction, and the President's withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, there is much we have to share and discuss.

Our Committee for Political Action recently met and felt the Congressional holiday recess from mid-December to mid-January would be a good time for such briefings, though we are open to dates further in the future if that is impossible. We could assemble the best team if the briefing were held here in Princeton, but we are willing to arrange it elsewhere if that is difficult for you.

Please have your scheduler contact me to arrange a mutually convenient time as soon as possible. To get maximum benefit from the briefing, we suggest allotting 90 minutes on your schedule.

I pray I'll hear your response to this request, hopefully favorable, in the near future.

Sincerely,

The Rev. Robert Moore
Executive Director

Success Story

Non-Partisan Candidate Briefings: A Success Story

The Peace Action Education Fund (PAEF), the tax-exempt arm of the Princeton-based Coalition for Peace Action, conducted a series of non-partisan briefings beginning in December 1999 for candidates for the US Senate Seat. The briefings were offered to all 6 major party candidates who declared for the June 2000 primary. Five of the six accepted, including Jon Corzine, the ultimate victor. The 90-minute briefing was conducted with Mr. Corzine and his issues staffperson in January 2000 in Princeton. Below is a description of what has resulted to date from the successful relationship begun at that time.

As a result of the candidate briefing and ongoing contact with issues specialists in the campaign staff of Jon Corzine, who ultimately won the November 2000 election for US Senator, we established a solid reputation and close working relationship with him and his staff.

While Mr. Corzine had been attentive and impressed with the quality of our delegation that originally briefed him in January, 2000, we had been somewhat disappointed in his answers to our candidate questionnaire that followed that in preparation for preparing our Peace Voter Guide distributed prior to the Primary, and again prior to the general election in November. Specifically, he had declined to oppose Star Wars, or to support the initiative for De-Alerting Nuclear Weapons. However, in contacts with his campaign manager and other staff, we learned that there was some flexibility in his positions on these issues, and that he was open to continuing dialogue with us. When several leaders of PAEF saw Mr. Corzine at an event in October 2000, they discussed these matters with him and he confirmed that he would welcome further dialogue.

A follow-up meeting was then set after the election in January, 2001, which was conducted by PAEF's sister organization, the Coalition for Peace Action (since at this point, we were lobbying our newly-elected Senator to support peace legislation). Senator Corzine and his new Chief of Staff, Tom Shea, both attended this 90-minute meeting in Princeton.

With President Bush having been declared the winner of the Presidential election, and therefore the fast tracking of a much larger Star Wars program on the horizon, Senator Corzine agreed with our position to strongly oppose that program. He

understood both the huge amounts of money that would be wasted, as well as the highly negative effect such a program would have on nuclear reductions efforts. Senator Corzine also for the first time understood that de-alerting could be done in phases, and said he would re-consider his original position opposing it.

We next met Senator Corzine in June 2001, and he agreed to strongly oppose the violation of the ABM Treaty that Star Wars could cause. He followed through on this by becoming one of just a half dozen senators to co-sponsor, at our request, Senator Diane Feinstein's bill to ban such a violation of the ABM Treaty. Even more significant, he became the lead sponsor of two bills: one to allow the President to go below the START I levels of nuclear warheads (the companion to Rep. Tom Allen's bill in the House); and another to encourage De-Alerting to begin. The latter one was actually delayed following the September 11 terrorist attack, but Senator Corzine's staff has assured me he remains committed to introducing it.

Finally, Senator Corzine was one of just three members of Congress (the other two were Rep. Rush Holt and Rep. Ed Markey) who appeared at an early September Capitol Hill press conference as part of the "Toaster" campaign of Back from the Brink advocating that De-Alerting begin.

Report composed by the Rev. Robert Moore, Executive Director, Peace Action Education Fund • December 28, 2001

For more information, contact:

Peace Action Education Fund
40 Witherspoon Street
Princeton, NJ 08542
(609)924-5022 Phone

First Draft, November 14, 2005

Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons: A Leadership Challenge for the 44th U.S President A Faith-based Proposal

Sixty years after atomic bombs devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the time has come to seek the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

Numerous religious bodies consider possession and use of nuclear weapons to be inherently immoral because of their effect on innocent people and the environment.¹ Many military leaders have stated that nuclear weapons have no legitimate military utility. Scientists and civilian leaders from around the globe want nuclear weapons eliminated. This goal reflects the highest aspiration of humankind.

The 44th president of the United States, who takes office on January 20, 2009, has an opportunity to lead the world in this direction. Therefore, the undersigned persons from the faith community ask presidential candidates (announced and unannounced) to consider the following ideas.

Nuclear Danger

People in the United States face nuclear danger from two sources:

- Nuclear attack from afar, particularly from the huge Russian arsenal which contains an estimated 4,000 nuclear warheads, xxxx of them deployed on hair-trigger alert.
- Nuclear weapons smuggled into the United States by terrorist organizations.

Other populations, especially in the Middle East and Asia, face the risk of regional nuclear war and attack by non-state actors.

As the danger is global, so must solutions be international. In both the short- and long-term the United States will gain greater security by joining other nations to (a) eliminate nuclear weapons on a mutual basis with adequate verification and (b) safeguard nuclear bomb material to prevent acquisition by malevolent persons.

Commitment Requested

We ask candidates for the presidency to make a commitment to work vigorously to reduce nuclear danger and to provide creative leadership in making progress toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We ask the winner in the 2008 presidential election to affirm this commitment in his or her inaugural address.

We ask candidates to consider the following specific actions that can and should be undertaken during the four year term of the 44th president of the United States.

¹ For examples, go to <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>.

Reaffirm support for international approaches.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is an essential instrument for reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear danger. The treaty is an agreement whereby non-possessors of nuclear weapons promised to forgo their development and the nuclear weapon states agreed to eventually eliminate their arsenals. At the beginning support in the United States was broadly bipartisan: signed by President Johnson in 1968, submitted to the Senate by President Nixon in 1969, ratified by the Senate later that year by a bipartisan vote of 83-15. In recent years the United States has lessened its commitment to the NPT. The next president should:

- Reaffirm U.S. support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
- Work with other nations to develop protocol to fill gaps in the NPT, such as [to be added]
- Support the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and seek to expand its authority to inspect and safeguard nuclear facilities around the globe.

Prevent terrorists and hostile states from obtaining nuclear weapons.

In cooperation with other nations the United States should work vigorously to prevent terrorist organizations and hostile states from obtaining nuclear bomb material and developing nuclear weapons. Specifically:

- Accelerate global nuclear security programs designed to secure vulnerable weapons and materials in the former Soviet Union and elsewhere. Complete this task by the end 2012.
- If not yet achieved by 2008, press for an international a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty that would [to be completed].
- Formalize the Proliferation Security Initiative that [to be completed].
- Encourage and support international initiatives to curtail nuclear weapon programs of North Korea, Iran, and any other state with nuclear ambitions.

Prevent nuclear attack on the United States from afar.

Even though the Cold War ended symbolically in 1989 with the fall of the Berlin wall, the United States and Russia retain huge nuclear arsenals that are deployed under the doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD). Each nation has from x to y nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert, ready to be launched on short notice. Whether this would occur by intent, accident, faulty intelligence, or action by rogue missile crews, destruction would be devastating. Therefore, the next president should:

- Quickly work out an executive agreement with the Russian president to take all missiles off hair trigger alert, to be achieved within one year with adequate verification.
- Strengthen the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty of 2002 by (a) adding verification measures (including extension of inspection system of START I), (b) requiring missiles and warheads taken out of service to be dismantled, and

(c) changing the goal to no more than 100 strategic warheads in service by the end of 2012.

Work with other nations to achieve nuclear disarmament.

Even though the United States and Russia possess by far the greatest number of nuclear weapons, the United Kingdom, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and possibly North Korea have nuclear arsenals. The world would be safer if these arsenals were all dismantled. For this to happen the United States should lead by example and should be engaged in international processes leading toward the ultimate global elimination of nuclear weapons. Specifically:

- Along with other nations maintain the moratorium on testing of nuclear weapons
- Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) that institutes a global ban on nuclear weapons testing with an international surveillance system.
- Cease development of new nuclear weapons.
- Reverse the current policy of potential preemptive use of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons do not exist in a vacuum but rather arise from political and military situations, such as the Cold War and regional rivalries. Working with other nations, the United States should:

- Promote peace processes in the Middle East that seek security for all, resolution of Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and creation of a weapons of mass destruction free zone.
- Encourage peaceful resolution of India-Pakistan rivalry and dismantlement of their nuclear arsenals.
- Engage in international negotiations to eliminate nuclear danger in Northeast Asia.

Conclusion

We recognize that this is an ambitious agenda. But we believe that is achievable through effective presidential leadership and support from the Congress. We in the faith community pledge that we will support the agenda and help develop public support for it.

Page 4 will have signers.

Author's note: This statement doesn't deal with tactical nuclear weapons, missile defense and satellite-killing weapon, or chemical and biological weapons. Should these be added?

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.
First draft, November 14, 2005

Second Draft, November 28, 2005

Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons: A Leadership Challenge for the 44th U.S President

We the undersigned persons from the faith community believe that the time is long overdue to seek the global elimination of nuclear weapons. The 44th president of the United States, who takes office on January 20, 2009, will have an opportunity to provide creative leadership to move decisively in this direction. Therefore, we ask persons who are exploring whether to run for the presidency in 2008 to consider the following ideas.

Our Concerns

We reaffirm the findings of numerous religious bodies¹ that *nuclear weapons are inherently immoral*. As weapons of mass destruction, their use would kill thousands, possibly millions, of innocent people and would ravage the environment. We also note that respected military leaders have stated that nuclear weapons have no legitimate military utility. Scientists and civilian leaders from around the globe want nuclear weapons eliminated. This goal reflects the highest aspiration of humankind.

We are concerned that people in the United States face *nuclear danger* from two sources:

- nuclear weapons smuggled into the United States by terrorist organizations and
- nuclear attack from afar, particularly from the huge Russian arsenal.

People elsewhere, especially in the Middle East and Asia, face the risk of regional nuclear war and attack by non-state actors.

Because the danger is global, *solutions must be international*. In both the short- and long-term the United States will gain greater security by joining other nations to (a) eliminate nuclear weapons on a mutual basis with adequate verification and (b) safeguard nuclear bomb material to prevent acquisition by malevolent persons.

Commitment Requested

We ask candidates for the presidency to make a commitment to work vigorously to reduce nuclear danger and to make substantial progress toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We ask the winner in the 2008 presidential election to affirm this commitment in his or her inaugural address.

Reaffirm support for international approaches.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is an essential instrument for reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear danger. We believe that the next president should:

- Reaffirm U.S. support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Work with other nations to strengthen the NPT.
- Support the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and seek to expand its authority to inspect and safeguard nuclear facilities around the globe.

¹ For examples, go to <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>.

Prevent terrorists and hostile states from obtaining nuclear weapons.

In cooperation with other nations the United States should work vigorously to prevent terrorist organizations and hostile states from obtaining nuclear bomb material and developing nuclear weapons. Specifically:

- Accelerate global nuclear security programs designed to protect vulnerable weapons and materials in the former Soviet Union and elsewhere. Complete this task by the end 2012.
- If not yet achieved by 2008, press for a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty.
- Formalize the Proliferation Security Initiative.
- Encourage and support international initiatives to curtail nuclear weapon programs of North Korea, Iran, and any other state with nuclear ambitions.

Prevent nuclear attack on the United States from afar.

Although the Cold War is long over, the United States and Russia retain vast nuclear arsenals with thousands of warheads on hair-trigger alert. The next president should:

- Quickly work out an executive agreement with the Russian president to take all missiles off hair trigger alert, to be achieved within one year with adequate verification.
- Strengthen the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty of 2002 by (a) adding verification measures, (b) requiring missiles and warheads taken out of service to be dismantled, and (c) changing the goal to no more than 200 strategic warheads in service by the end of 2012.
- Seek mutual elimination of all tactical nuclear weapons.

Work with other nations to achieve nuclear disarmament.

The United States should engage other states possessing nuclear weapons in negotiations for their elimination. To lead by example, the United States should:

- Along with other nations maintain the moratorium on testing of nuclear weapons
- Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- Cease development of new nuclear weapons.
- Reverse the current policy of threatened preemptive use of nuclear weapons.

To deal with the political and military context of nuclear weapons, the United States should work with other nations to:

- Promote peace processes in the Middle East that seek security for all.
- Encourage peaceful resolution of India-Pakistan rivalry
- Engage in international negotiations to eliminate nuclear danger in Northeast Asia.

Conclusion

We recognize that this is an ambitious agenda. But we believe that is achievable through effective presidential leadership and support from the Congress. We in the faith community pledge that we will support this agenda and develop public support for it.

Dear

On behalf of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament I am working with staff of religious denominations on a project to influence potential presidential candidates on nuclear weapons issues.

Specifically we want to ask these candidates to take leadership, if elected, for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We will have a set of "asks" that heads of communion or their representatives can present to persons positioning themselves to run for president in 2008. Grassroots activists, particularly in early primary states, can birddog candidates when they are in their states to raise this issue with them.

We would greatly appreciate your advice on what to ask. What would you want the next president to accomplish during his or her four year term? What five or six actions for nuclear disarmament? What five or six actions for nuclear nonproliferation? If you wish, you can quantify certain asks or provide a schedule for accomplishment. Your points can be concise.

We are meeting in mid-November to review a first draft of our asks. We hope to complete the writing process by the end of the year. By January 2006 we will request heads of communion and other prominent religious leaders to sign the statement with the asks. Thereafter, we will seek appointments with potential candidates and get grassroots activists to embark upon low-key bird-dogging to keep the issue before the positioners and announced candidates.

Thanks for your assistance,
Howard

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

Dear

On behalf of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament I am working with staff of religious denominations on a project to influence potential presidential candidates on nuclear weapons issues.

Specifically we want to ask these candidates to take leadership, if elected, for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We will have a set of "asks" that heads of communion or their representatives can present to persons positioning themselves to run for president in 2008. Grassroots activists, particularly in early primary states, can bird-dog candidates when they are in their states to raise this issue with them.

We would greatly appreciate your advice on what to ask. What would you want the next president to accomplish during his or her four year term? What five or six actions for nuclear disarmament? What five or six actions for nuclear nonproliferation? If you wish, you can quantify certain asks or provide a schedule for accomplishment. Your points can be concise.

I am working on a first draft of asks for review by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. We will add other ideas as we received them. We hope to complete the writing process by the end of the year. By January 2006 we will request heads of communion and other prominent religious leaders to sign the statement with the asks. Thereafter, we will seek appointments with potential candidates and get grassroots activists to embark upon low-key bird-dogging to keep the issue before the positioners and announced candidates.

Thanks for your assistance,
Howard

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

Change of Direction

The last five years has seen a retrogression of U.S. nuclear weapons policy. In spite of a commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970 to join other nuclear weapons states in the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, U.S. policies adopted in 2002 Nuclear Posture Review envisions retaining nuclear weapons for the foreseeable future. Other policy documents indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons preemptively. The present Administration has sought funding for new nuclear weapons (fortunately turned down by Congress). The United States blocked progress in the 2005 NPT Review Conference and has placed obstacles in the way of other international agreements that would reduce nuclear danger. Earlier in 1999 Congress refused to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that would provide a global ban on nuclear weapon testing.

Quest for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament

There has long been a global consensus that the world would be safer by curtailing the spread of nuclear weapons and by reducing and eventually eliminating the existing nuclear arsenals. This was expressed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1970, a treaty signed by xxx nations.

Since 1970 three non-signers – Israel, India, and Pakistan – have produced nuclear weapons. North Korea has withdrawn from the treaty and claims to have nuclear weapons. Iran appears to have nuclear ambitions. However, under international inspection Iraq dismantled its nuclear program after the Gulf War. Libya has agreed to cease its quest for nuclear weapons.

In 1970 the then five nuclear weapon states – United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, France, and China -- under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) made a commitment to “ In exchange most other nations pledged not to develop nuclear weapons.

Since then

Even though the United States and other nuclear weapons states pledged in 1970 in the to work toward the elimination of their nuclear arsenals, scant progress in this direction has occurred. Balkiness by the United States to honor this commitment at the 2005 NPT Review Conference has led to near collapse of the international system for nuclear non-proliferation.

Currently U.S. policy, as expressed in the

Under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1970 most nations of the world pledged not to develop nuclear weapons in exchange and the then five nuclear weapon states made a commitment “to

Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons: A Leadership Challenge for the 44th U.S President A Faith-based Proposal

Sixty years after atomic bombs devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the time has come to seek the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

Numerous religious bodies consider possession and use of nuclear weapons to be inherently immoral. Many military leaders have stated that nuclear weapons have no legitimate military utility. Scientists and civilian leaders from around the globe want nuclear weapons eliminated. This goal reflects the highest aspiration of humankind.

The 44th president of the United States, who takes office on January 20, 2009, has an opportunity to lead the world in this direction. Therefore, the undersigned persons from the faith community ask presidential candidates (announced and unannounced) to consider the following ideas.

Nuclear Danger

People in the United States face nuclear danger from two sources:

- Nuclear attack from afar, particularly from the huge Russian arsenal which contains an estimated xxxx nuclear warheads, xxxx of them deployed with hair-trigger alert.
- Nuclear weapons smuggled into the United States by terrorist organizations.

Other populations, especially in the Middle East and Asia, face the risk of regional nuclear war and attack by non-state actors.

The next president of the United States can and should confront this nuclear danger and provide creative leadership for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

Change of Direction

The last five years has seen a retrogression of U.S. nuclear weapons policy. In spite of a commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970 to join other nuclear weapons states in the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, U.S. policies adopted in 2002 Nuclear Posture Review envisions retaining nuclear weapons for the foreseeable future. Other policy documents indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons preemptively. The present Administration has sought funding for new nuclear weapons (fortunately turned down by Congress). The United States blocked progress in the 2005 NPT Review Conference and has placed obstacles in the way of other international agreements that would reduce nuclear danger. Earlier in 1999 Congress refused to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that would provide a global ban on nuclear weapon testing.

The next president should

Presidential Leadership

Retrogressive Policies

Quest for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament

There has long been a global consensus that the world would be safer by curtailing the spread of nuclear weapons and by reducing and eventually eliminating the existing nuclear arsenals. This was expressed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1970, a treaty signed by xxx nations.

Since 1970 three non-signers – Israel, India, and Pakistan – have produced nuclear weapons. North Korea has withdrawn from the treaty and claims to have nuclear weapons. Iran appears to have nuclear ambitions. However, under international inspection Iraq dismantled its nuclear program after the Gulf War. Libya has agreed to cease its quest for nuclear weapons.

In 1970 the then five nuclear weapon states – United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, France, and China -- under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) made a commitment to “ In exchange most other nations pledged not to develop nuclear weapons.

Since then

Even though the United States and other nuclear weapons states pledged in 1970 in the to work toward the elimination of their nuclear arsenals, scant progress in this direction has occurred. Balkiness by the United States to honor this commitment at the 2005 NPT Review Conference has led to near collapse of the international system for nuclear non-proliferation.

Currently U.S. policy, as expressed in the

Under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1970 most nations of the world pledged not to develop nuclear weapons in exchange and the then five nuclear weapon states made a commitment “to

Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons: A Leadership Challenge for the 44th U.S President A Faith-based Proposal

Sixty years after atomic bombs devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the time has come to seek the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

Numerous religious bodies consider possession and use of nuclear weapons to be inherently immoral because of their effect on innocent people and the environment.¹ Many military leaders have stated that nuclear weapons have no legitimate military utility. Scientists and civilian leaders from around the globe want nuclear weapons eliminated. This goal reflects the highest aspiration of humankind.

The 44th president of the United States, who takes office on January 20, 2009, has an opportunity to lead the world in this direction. Therefore, the undersigned persons from the faith community ask presidential candidates (announced and unannounced) to consider the following ideas.

Nuclear Danger

People in the United States face nuclear danger from two sources:

- Nuclear attack from afar, particularly from the huge Russian arsenal which contains an estimated xxxx nuclear warheads, xxxx of them deployed on hair-trigger alert.
- Nuclear weapons smuggled into the United States by terrorist organizations.

Other populations, especially in the Middle East and Asia, face the risk of regional nuclear war and attack by non-state actors.

As the danger is global, so must solutions be international. In both the short- and long-term the United States will gain greater security by joining other nations to (a) eliminate nuclear weapons on a mutual basis with adequate verification and (b) safeguard fissile material to prevent acquisition by malevolent persons.

Commitment

We ask candidates for the presidency to make a commitment to work vigorously to reduce nuclear danger and to provide leadership in making progress toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We ask the winner in the 2008 presidential election to affirm this commitment in his or her inaugural address.

We ask candidates to consider the following specific actions that can and should be undertaken during the four year term of the 44th president of the United States.

¹ For examples, go to <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>.

Reaffirm support for international approaches.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is an essential instrument for reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear danger. The treaty is an agreement whereby non-possessors of nuclear weapons promised to forgo their development and the nuclear weapon states agreed to eventually eliminate their arsenals. At the beginning support in the United States was broadly bipartisan: signed by President Johnson in 1968, submitted to the Senate by President Nixon in 1969, ratified by the Senate later that year by a bipartisan vote of 83-15. In recent years the United States has lessened its commitment to the NPT. The next president should:

- Reaffirm U.S. support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
- Work with other nations to develop protocol to fill gaps in the NPT, such as [to be added]
- Support the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and seek to expand its authority for inspection of nuclear facilities around the globe.

Prevent terrorists and hostile states from obtaining nuclear weapons.

In cooperation with other nations the United States should work vigorously to prevent terrorist organizations and hostile states from obtaining fissile material and developing nuclear weapons. Specifically:

- Accelerate global nuclear security programs designed to secure vulnerable weapons and materials in the former Soviet Union and elsewhere. Complete this task by the end 2012.
- If not yet achieved by 2008, press for an international Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty that would [to be completed].
- Formalize the Proliferation Security Initiative that [to be completed].
- Encourage and support international initiatives to curtail nuclear weapon programs of North Korea, Iran, and any other state with nuclear ambitions.

Prevent nuclear attack on the United States from afar.

Even though the Cold War ended symbolically in 1989 with the fall of the Berlin wall, the United States and Russia retain huge nuclear arsenals that are deployed under the doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD). Each nation has from x to y nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert, ready to be launched on short notice. Whether this would occur by intent, accident, faulty intelligence, or action by rogue missile crews, destruction would be devastating. Therefore, the next president should:

- Quickly work out an executive agreement with the Russian president to take all missiles off hair trigger alert, to be achieved within one year with adequate verification.

- Strengthen the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty of 2002 by (a) adding verification measures (including extension of inspection system of START II), (b) requiring missiles and warheads taken out of service to be dismantled, and (c) changing the goal to no more than 100 strategic warheads in service by the end of 2012.

Work with other nations to achieve nuclear disarmament.

Even though the United States and Russia possess by far the greatest number of nuclear weapons, the United Kingdom, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and possibly North Korea have nuclear arsenals. The world would be safer if these arsenals were all dismantled. For this to happen the United States should lead by example and should be engaged in international processes leading toward the ultimate global elimination of nuclear weapons. Specifically:

- Maintain along with other nations the moratorium on testing of nuclear weapons
- Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) that institutes a global ban on nuclear weapons testing with an international surveillance system.
- Cease development of new nuclear weapons.
- Reverse the current policy of potential preemptive use of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons do not exist in a vacuum but rather arise from political and military situations, such as the Cold War and regional rivalries. Working with other nations, the United States should:

- Promote peace processes in the Middle East that seek security for all, resolution of Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and creation of a weapons of mass destruction free zone.
- Encourage peaceful resolution of India-Pakistan rivalry.
- Engage in international negotiations to eliminate nuclear danger in Northeast Asia.

Conclusion

We recognize that this is an ambitious agenda. But we believe that is achievable through effective presidential leadership and support from the Congress. We in the faith community pledge that we will support the agenda and help develop public support for it.

Page 4 will have signers.

Author's note: This doesn't deal with missile defense and satellite-killing weapons or with chemical and biological weapons. Should these be added?

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.
Third draft, November 8, 2005

Suggestions for "Asks" of Presidential Candidates

Bob Musil 10-18-05

I'll want to involve staff here including Martin Butcher and Kimberly Roberts whom I have cc:ed. This should be fairly straightforward since we offer interim and practical steps toward abolition for our international colleagues who want it now. A visionary statement can be useful, but not without a series of realistic interim steps and goals.

Ivan Oelrich 10-18-03

I would be delighted to help with this in anyway I can. Can you give me a day or two to think about how I would craft the questions? I will get back to you.

Theresa Hitchens, Center for Defense Information, 10-19-05

My colleague Victoria Samson, who does much of our nuclear work, has formulated some ideas below. As a caveat, we think that what is best advocated are steps toward nuclear disarmament that can be implemented quickly. While we all share the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, it is probably unrealistic to ask for that as a first step.

So, some disarmament steps that would move us forward; rather than backward as the Bush administration seems to be moving:

1. Halt funding and work on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), designed to be used against bunker busters. This program is dangerous as it takes the U.S. a step closer to using nukes on the battlefield, and encourages other countries to follow suit.
2. Halt funding and work on the Reliable Robust Warhead for the same reasons above.
3. Push for the establishment of a timeline for implementing the reductions promised in the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty between the U.S. and Russia, and language to make those cuts permanent ones rather than simply cuts in the deployed arsenal.
4. Another idea might be to push for increased funding for DoE's Stockpile Stewardship program to keep current arsenal healthy. This may sound counterintuitive but it addresses the rationale given for RNEP and RRW: the need to keep nuclear scientists capable and interested so as to ensure the health of whatever nuclear deterrent remains.

On Nuclear proliferation:

1. Formalize the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) process into an institutionalized program rather than a loose "commitment" by nations.
2. Show support for the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) by working to fill holes in the treaty, such as pushing for the additional protocol to be signed by all nations including the United States.
3. Sign an agreement with North Korea that will allow for unannounced inspections of suspected nuclear facilities.
4. Work to stop Iran's nuclear program through diplomatic carrots and sticks rather than military means.
5. Increase the U.S. commitment to the Cooperative Threat Reduction program by resolving red-tape issues with Russia, expanding the program's coverage to the non-FSU states, and increasing funding.
6. Making a U.S. signing of the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty a priority.

Jack Mendelsohn October 21, 2005

A couple of obvious questions occur to me:

- 1) Will you continue the nuclear testing moratorium and will you seek Senate advice and consent to ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)?
- 2) Will you oppose development of new nuclear weapons such as the "bunker buster" and new low-yield nuclear devices?
- 3) Will you support a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT)?
- 4) Will you support further measures to help improve verification of the Biological Weapons Conventions (BWC)?
- 5) Will you scale back the billions of dollars scheduled for ballistic missile defense programs?
- 6) Will you seek to fill in the glaring blank spots (schedule of reductions; verification measures) in the Moscow Treaty (SORT)?
- 7) Will you seek further reductions in strategic nuclear weapons beyond those envisaged in the SORT Treaty (1700-2200 warheads) and speed up those scheduled for 2012?
- 8) Will you reconsider our "preventative/preemptive" war policies?
- 9) Will you increase funding for Global Nuclear Threat Reduction?
- 10) Will you reaffirm a US commitment to eventual nuclear disarmament?

Brian Finlay, October 28, 2005

When approaching candidates or sitting Members, I would very much encourage you to think less in terms of phrasing your ask as "nuclear disarmament" or "nuclear non-proliferation." These folks just don't get that... Particularly as they will simultaneously be thinking about education, health care, military base closings, the war in Iraq, and on and on and on. I think using the usual parlance of proliferation and disarmament complicates the issue unnecessarily. I would suggest you phrase this in terms of "preventing the use of a nuclear, biological or chemical weapon" or even better, "preventing a terrorist attack with a nuclear, biological or chemical

weapon."

To that end, I think the critical components of a layered strategy would look like this:

I. Keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists and hostile states

*Accelerate global nuclear security programs designed to secure vulnerable weapons and materials in the former Soviet Union and elsewhere. Complete this task within the next 5-6 years.

*Develop a comprehensive global inventory of nuclear weapons and fissile material, beginning with the U.S. and Russia. Develop a joint plan within the next 3 years for eliminating all excess weapons in this inventory.

*Appoint a senior White House official to coordinate all U.S. non-proliferation programs. Immediately.

II. Prevent the spread of biological and chemical weapons

*Secure and destroy biological and chemical weapons stockpiles in Russia and sustainably redirect all former weapons scientists involved in these programs. Complete this task in the next 5-6 years.

*Increase funds for monitoring disease outbreaks to determine if biological weapons are being developed or used (Immediately)

III. Build a partnership with Russia that protects Americans and the world

*Ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. (Immediately)

*Strengthen joint U.S.-Russian cooperation on early warning systems that detect missile launches (within the next 5 years)

*Dismantle, rather than store, warheads withdrawn from active forces (begin immediately)

*Work with the Russians as partners to reinvent the NPT so that no new enrichment/reprocessing facilities are created in new locations (begin immediately)

Michael Krepon – 11-3-05

I would ask the following questions relating to the preconditions for eliminating nuclear weapons

1) do you support the initiation of flight tests and deployment of satellite-killing weapons by the United States?

2) do you support the retention and extension of on-site inspections as a way to protect our country against the most dangerous weapons in the most dangerous hands? More specifically the last remaining intrusive inspections within Russia are set to expire in 2009. Would you extend them?

Rich, David, Barbara,

As follow up to our phone conversation, I have several suggestions on the write up of tasks that Rich is working on.

Describing ICND

“The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a cooperative venture of religious denominations and associations. It functions by consensus. Participating organizations choose which activities to join and determine what they will do. The Committee is non-hierarchical. Different persons take the lead for various activities. On legislative issues David Culp takes the lead. He is also convener and chair of Committee meetings. Rich Kilmer leads planning for Ecumenical Advocacy Days, aided by a committee of volunteers. Howard Hallman will be the lead person for the project to influence presidential candidates, but many others will take responsibilities for specific tasks.”

Tasks (filling out current draft)

- 1) Develop statement of asks (November-January)
 - a) Consultation with civic sector experts and military leaders
 - b) Review and finalize by ICND participants
 - c) Obtain sign-on by heads of communion and other religious leaders
- 2) Prepare for action (December-February)
 - a) Decide how publicized this venture should be
 - b) Determine timing and process for contacting candidates nationally
 - c) Select states for initial grassroots activity
 - d) Work out process for making and reporting contacts with candidates
 - e) Draw on available material to produce handbook for grassroots bird-dogging
- 3) Develop grassroots networks
 - a) Make contacts in suggested states (January-February)
 - i) Identify lead person from ICND for each state
 - ii) Field visits as necessary to organize and train coalitions
 - b) Obtain sign-on to statement by state religious leaders (February-March)
- 4) Initiate contacts with candidates (March onward)
 - a) In selected states
 - b) Nationally
- 5) Follow-up contacts in response to questions from candidates (continuous)

Regarding single issue

We discussed whether heads of communion or grassroots coalitions would want to commit themselves to only one issue. For the grassroots at least, if we tap into an existing coalition, it will have other issues. If we are organizing a new coalition, it can take on other issues as it chooses. In this sense we will be a catalyst for broader action.

Because nuclear weapons are so much a part of U.S. military strategy, any major change in the direction of reduction and elimination will have broad impact. This symbolic change could open the door for dealing with other military and foreign policy issues. We

must keep in mind, though, that Paul Nitze late in life wanted to eliminate nuclear weapons because the U.S. has plenty of conventional power to dominate other nations. Some say that nuclear elimination opens the door for conventional war. That's food for thought.

I'm working on a draft statement and should have something by the end of the week.

Shalom,
Howard

1. Develop statement of asks
 - a. Consultation with civic sector experts and military leaders.
 - b. Review by ICND participants
 - c. Obtain sign-on by heads of communion and other religious leaders.