



Citizens for
Global Solutions

CONGRESSIONAL Candidate Questionnaire 2006

GLOBAL SOLUTIONS PAC

Please return the signed Questionnaire Response Form via fax or mail to the address listed below.

Citizens for Global Solutions is a nationwide organization that inspires Americans to engage the world. Our members recognize that in today's interconnected world, our lives, our jobs and our families are increasingly affected by global problems. Challenges like terrorism, climate change, failed states and infectious diseases cannot be addressed by any one country alone, not even the United States.

Citizens for Global Solutions believes that countries can best solve global problems by working together to find global solutions. We promote closer American cooperation with and support for international institutions capable of responding to the threats and challenges of a new century. We work to build political will in the United States to ensure that our leaders work with our friends and allies to make the world a safer and better place for everyone.

418 7th Street, SE • Washington, D.C. 20003
Phone: (202) 546-3950 • Fax: (202) 546-3749
Website: www.globalsolutions.org • E-mail: pac@globalsolutions.org



Citizens for Global Solutions

2006 Candidate Questionnaire Background Information

U.S. GLOBAL PRIORITIES

In today's interdependent world, our lives, our jobs and our families are increasingly affected by global problems, such as terrorism, climate change, war and infectious diseases.

1. What global issues are most important to your constituents?

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH

Global health threats respect no national boundaries. In our increasingly interconnected world, not only do people and goods move quickly from country to country, but so do infectious diseases. Today we are confronted with endemic problems like malaria, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS and emerging global threats like bird flu. These threaten us all; basic functions like food production and security rely on a healthy, functioning, productive population.

By providing essential technical expertise, international bodies like the World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agriculture Organization and World Animal Health Organization successfully work in conjunction with national, state and local health services to fight – and eventually defeat – these threats.

When SARS emerged in East Asia, the international community rallied to contain its spread, keeping it from affecting people and communities around the world. Recently, WHO announced global cooperation helped eradicate polio from at least ten African countries. Today these organizations are working to prevent the next human flu pandemic. Yet only with sustained support – including adequate funding – from the international community can these organizations do their work.

2a. How will you work to address threats such as Avian Flu, SARS, HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria?

2b. Will you work to secure funding for global health initiatives to ensure international organizations such as the United Nations' World Health Organization have sufficient resources to meet these global challenges?

COOPERATION WITH THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

The United States has made promoting and protecting human rights, and the punishment for those individuals that abuse these rights, a cornerstone of its foreign policy. Americans acknowledge the need to prosecute individuals who perpetrate the most heinous crimes anywhere in the world.

At the end of the 20th century, one of the bloodiest in human history, the international community adopted a treaty creating the world's first independent and permanent court to investigate and prosecute individuals accused of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity – the International Criminal Court (ICC). This Court will act only if national courts are destroyed or unable to handle the case, or are deliberately shielding the accused from justice.

The United States played a key role in negotiating the Rome Statute, the treaty that created the ICC. Much of the ICC's rules of procedure and legal mechanisms are based on U.S. law, particularly due process protections and the guarantees of rights for the accused. The ICC embodies fundamental American values of accountability, equality and justice. It abides by the highest standards of fairness and judicial process. Participation in the ICC is essential to American leadership and credibility.

The U.S. can be a good neighbor to the Court even if it doesn't become a member. It can refer cases that it wants to see investigated and prosecuted to the ICC through the United Nations (UN) Security Council. The Bush Administration took an important first step in 2005 by abstaining when the Security Council referred the atrocities in the Darfur region of Sudan to the ICC. The U.S. can also participate as an observer in the Court's oversight body, the Assembly of States Parties, influencing the Court's development without any cost to the U.S. Engagement with the ICC will help rebuild bridges with the international community. The U.S. should move toward constructive engagement with the ICC, assisting the Court's efforts to bring to justice the world's worst criminals while monitoring and guiding its development from "inside the tent."

The U.S. must not turn its back on its long and distinguished record of bringing to justice those responsible for some of the most horrific crimes of the 20th century. American financial assistance and intelligence resources can strengthen the ICC, helping

it end impunity for the crimes that most deeply shock the conscience of all humankind such as the massive human rights violations we are seeing in Darfur, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda.

3. Will you support U.S. cooperation with the International Criminal Court in situations such as the Court's current investigations in Sudan, Uganda and the Congo where it is in the United States' interest to bring perpetrators of mass murder, war crimes and crimes against humanity to justice?

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Historically, the United States is second to none when it comes to helping poor people around the world help themselves. Investing in development is not only the right thing to do, but by giving people a stake in their societies and helping them build strong, stable states, it serves as an essential component of international security and helps diminish the appeal of terrorism and extremism. Giving people the chance to help themselves is what America is all about.

While the U.S. is outspoken about the importance of good governance, trade and investment, the U.S. lags behind its allies in its Official Development Assistance (ODA) commitments, a kind of government-to-government aid that supports critical projects that cannot be supported any other way. The U.S. allocates less to ODA as a percentage of GNP than any other industrialized country. In 2004, the U.S. gave \$19 billion in ODA, which is 0.16 percent of U.S. Gross National Income and 0.81 percent of the entire U.S. budget.

4. Will you actively work to allocate an additional one percent of the U.S. budget to Official Development Assistance in order to match the commitments of our G8 partners and other allies to help reduce hunger, poverty, disease and other agreed upon goals?

CLIMATE CHANGE

According to a recent Fox News poll, more than 77 percent of Americans are concerned about the potential dangers posed by a changing climate. The debate around global climate change no longer centers on whether or not it is occurring, but rather what its effects will be. A warmer climate could mean more extreme weather (including stronger hurricanes, longer droughts, or larger floods), new disease patterns and rising sea levels, any of which could dramatically alter

our way of life in the United States. Americans want their elected leaders to develop strategies that will help minimize and eventually reverse these threats.

This summer, the bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors recognized its obligation to protect their constituents from unnecessary risks and unanimously endorsed a resolution to immediately reduce greenhouse gas pollution in their cities. Many governments – local, state, and national – are already taking steps to protect against the risks of climate change. Portland, Oregon, the first U.S. city to put an emissions reduction strategy into practice, continues to experience solid economic growth. Governors in the West and Northeast are working together to develop joint approaches to the challenges posed by climate change. Taking action now to curb emissions is an investment in the health and well-being of our children and grandchildren. Smart, farsighted policy choices that create a new energy future for America will lead to new jobs, affordable power and safe and secure communities.

5. Recognizing the need to address the problem of global climate change, will you support mandatory reductions in greenhouse gas emissions as an important component of a comprehensive U.S. energy policy?

TORTURE

Since the disturbing photographs of abuse at the U.S.-run Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq first came to light, we have seen an important debate develop in Washington regarding the steps the U.S. needs to take to prevent this kind of horrific abuse – illegal under our own U.S. laws – from happening again. Much of this debate has surrounded changes that need to be made to interrogation practices to prevent repetition of such behavior. Thanks to the leadership of Senator John McCain, Congress adopted measures in December 2005 to prohibit American officials from using torture and other cruel and unusual punishment during interrogations. Many retired military personnel and civil society groups are now urging Congress to go further and create an independent bipartisan commission to examine what allowed these violations to occur. Advocates for this commission believe that the issue of torture and its consequences need to be investigated in detail before the U.S. can put Abu Ghraib and related matters behind it.

6a. Do you believe that an independent bipartisan commission should be set up to investigate U.S. interrogation policies?

6b. Would you be willing to call for its creation publicly?

PEACEKEEPING AND AMERICAN NATIONAL SECURITY

Currently, there are 17 UN peacekeeping missions deploying over 80,000 personnel in areas around the globe including Africa, Europe/Eurasia, the Middle East and the Caribbean. United Nations peacekeeping affords the United States tremendous benefits in places where we are unable or unwilling to use U.S. troops to promote peace, ensure stability and oppose extremism. Moreover, a study released in May 2005 by the RAND Corporation concludes that the United Nations has done an outstanding job leading such stability-building operations. Entitled "The UN's Role in Nation-Building: From the Congo to Iraq," the report cites the UN's low-cost structure, high success rate and most importantly, "the greatest degree of international legitimacy" among peacekeepers as reasons for its achievements.

The U.S. should be proud that it is the largest contributor to UN peacekeeping. It is currently assessed 27.1 percent of the total UN peacekeeping budget, down from 31 percent prior to 2001. However, legislation dating back to 1994 caps the amount that the U.S. can legally pay at 25 percent. In 2001, Senators Helms (R) and Biden (D) brokered a compromise. Since then, Congress has authorized the lifting of this 25 percent cap for periods of one or two years, but it has not developed a systemic and effective solution to meeting our financial obligations to the UN for peacekeeping activities.

The Bush Administration has said repeatedly that the United States should honor its promise to pay its fair share of peacekeeping costs. Additionally, Secretaries of State Powell and Rice have asked Congress to lift this cap. In a December 2005 report, entitled "United Nations Peacekeeping: Issues for Congress," the Congressional Research Service (CRS) wrote that Congress provided the full amount requested by President Bush for assessed U.S. peacekeeping contributions for fiscal year 2006. However, the report notes that "legislation increasing the 25% cap on U.S. peacekeeping assessments beyond 2005 was not passed."

7. Do you support lifting the cap on U.S. contributions to UN peacekeeping from 25 percent to the assessed level, currently 27.1 percent?

THE U.S./UN RELATIONSHIP

UN FUNDING

The past year has seen the single greatest opportunity in several generations to ensure that the United Nations is capable of responding to the threats and challenges of a new century. During the 2005 World Summit in September, over 150 heads of state discussed steps to make the UN more effective at dealing with global challenges. The United States will need to work with its allies to ensure that key measures – including fundamental management reforms, an effective human rights mechanism and a new peacebuilding commission – are enacted and running efficiently.

To make that happen, the United States must avoid the temptation of threatening to withhold – or actually withholding – its share of the UN budget as a means to push through much-needed reforms. History has demonstrated that such threats do not work – and often produce the opposite result. In an open letter to Congressional leaders in June 2005, eight former U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations, including John Danforth, Jeane Kirkpatrick and Madeleine Albright, wrote that "Withholding U.S. dues to the United Nations may sound like smart policy but would be counterproductive at this time, so soon after the Helms-Biden process [for resolving U.S. arrears] was completed. It would create resentment, build animosity and actually strengthen opponents of reform. It would place in jeopardy the reform initiatives most important to U.S. interests. The fact is reforms cost money and withholding dues impair the UN's ability to make the changes needed." The Bush Administration has strongly opposed any effort to use the withholding of American dues to secure UN reform.

8. Will you oppose legislation that attempts to secure changes at the UN through congressionally mandated withholding of U.S. dues?

UNEPS

The United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS) is proposed as a permanent emergency response service designed to complement, not replace, existing peace operations. It would also support U.S. efforts to reduce some of the burden placed on our own civilian and military personnel at a time when they have been tasked with numerous critical missions.

UNEPS would have a "first responder" capacity that would supplement the UN's ability to provide stability, peace and relief in deadly emergencies. It would individually recruit and train 10,000-15,000 personnel with a wide range of skills, including civilian police, military, judicial experts and relief professionals. This ensures that missions would not fail due to a lack of

skills, equipment, cohesiveness, experience in resolving conflicts, or gender, national or religious imbalance.

9. Will you support the creation of a United Nations Emergency Peace Service that could rapidly respond to man-made or natural disasters?

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), first proposed by the Bush Administration in 2002, focused on developing a new nuclear weapon that would penetrate deep into the earth before detonating. Administration officials argued that they needed a “bunker-buster” capability – a tactical nuclear weapon that could destroy buried targets, like underground bunkers. Opponents of the bunker-buster pointed out, however, that the proposed weapon, more than 70 times stronger than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, would cause unprecedented collateral damage and

could, depending on its yield and location, cause up to 1 million casualties. Further, they insist that researching new nuclear weapons would undercut U.S. efforts to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons abroad.

On October 25, 2005, Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM) revealed that funding was cut from the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill (H.R.2419) that was slated to study the creation of earth-penetrating nuclear weapons. The Bush Administration had requested \$4 million for a nuclear “bunker-buster” study in their FY06 budget request, but objections from opponents of new nuclear weapons research and concerns over the mounting budget deficit appear to have overcome administration pressure for the initiative.

10. Would you actively oppose the appropriation of funds for the research, development and deployment of earth-penetrating and other new forms of nuclear weapons?

Please complete, sign and return the attached 2006 Congressional Candidate Questionnaire Response Form via mail or fax to:

Citizens for Global Solutions
418 7th Street, SE • Washington, D.C. 20003
Phone: (202) 546-3950 • Fax: (202) 546-3749
Website: www.globalsolutions.org • E-mail: pac@globalsolutions.org

For a PDF form you can fill in electronically then print, visit www.globalsolutions.org/PAC.

For more information, contact Global Solutions PAC Coordinator Drew J. Asson at 202-546-3950.

Citizens for Global Solutions

2006 Candidate Questionnaire Response Form

Prepared By: _____ Date: _____
Campaign Manager: _____ Contact Phone: _____
Committee Name: _____ District: _____
Campaign Mailing Address: _____
City, State, Zip: _____ Email: _____
Phone: _____ Fax: _____ Website: _____

**I have read the attached 2006 Candidate Questionnaire Background Information.
(Note: Candidate must sign below)**

Candidate Name: _____

Candidate Signature: _____
(Please Print)

**Please complete, sign and return this form via fax or mail to the following address.
Write any additional comments on a separate piece of paper.**

Citizens for Global Solutions
418 7th Street, SE • Washington, D.C. 20003
Phone: (202) 546-3950 • Fax: (202) 546-3749

For a PDF form you can fill in electronically then print, visit www.globalsolutions.org/PAC.

U.S. GLOBAL PRIORITIES

1. What global issues are most important to your constituents?

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH

2a. How will you work to address threats such as Avian Flu, SARS, HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria?

2b. Will you work to secure funding for global health initiatives to ensure international organizations such as the United Nations' World Health Organization have sufficient resources to meet these global health challenges?

Yes No

COOPERATION WITH THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

3. Will you support U.S. cooperation with the International Criminal Court in situations such as the Court's current investigations in Sudan, Uganda and the Congo where it is in the United States' interest to bring perpetrators of mass murder, war crimes and crimes against humanity to justice?

Yes No

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

4. Will you actively work to allocate an additional one percent of the U.S. budget to Official Development Assistance in order to match the commitments of our G8 partners and other allies to help reduce hunger, poverty, disease and other agreed upon goals?

Yes No

CLIMATE CHANGE

5. Recognizing the need to address the problem of global climate change, will you support mandatory reductions in greenhouse gas emissions as an important component of a comprehensive U.S. energy policy?

Yes No

TORTURE

6a. Do you believe that an independent bipartisan commission should be set up to investigate U.S. interrogation policies?

Yes No

6b. Would you be willing to call for its creation publicly?

Yes No

PEACEKEEPING AND AMERICAN NATIONAL SECURITY

7. Do you support lifting the cap on U.S. contributions to UN peacekeeping from 25 percent to the assessed level, currently 27.1 percent?

Yes No

THE U.S./UN RELATIONSHIP

UN FUNDING

8. Will you oppose legislation that attempts to secure changes at the UN through congressionally mandated withholding of U.S. dues?

Yes No

UNEPS

9. Will you support the creation of a United Nations Emergency Peace Service that could rapidly respond to man-made or natural disasters?

Yes No

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

10. Would you actively oppose the appropriation of funds for the research, development and deployment of earth-penetrating and other new forms of nuclear weapons?

Yes No

GENERAL QUESTIONS

11. Have you made public statements, written articles or taken formal positions on any of the issues covered in this questionnaire or on any other foreign policy, national security or military intelligence issues? If so, please attach or provide reference.

Yes No

12. If offered, would you accept Citizens for Global Solutions' endorsement for election?

Yes No

13. If offered, would you accept a contribution from Global Solutions PAC?

Yes No