

IOWA ISSUES CAUCUSES
REPORT 1/7/04
Based on Analysis of 430 Ballots

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

From Oct 25 to Nov. 21, 2003, members and supporters of Iowa Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR), consulted with well over 1,000 Iowans in the first ever, all Iowa, Issues Caucus. After posting notices on an Iowa public radio station, in three local newspapers, and on numerous e-mail list serves, volunteers spread out across the state to discover the general level of knowledge and concern about important national and personal security issues. Highlighted were the issues which we in PSR felt were being inadequately addressed during this pre-election period: military spending versus domestic spending priorities, the role of military action versus humanitarian assistance in resolving complex world problems, and the resulting sense of security wrought by such policy priorities. These unique Issues Caucuses, and their related conversations and correspondence occurred from Davenport to Sioux City, Fairfield to Waterloo. As a result of these consultations, 430 Iowans took the time to vote on a 10 question "ballot" (Appendix A) as well as respond to our inquiry about other issues of concern to each of them personally. Ballot questions reflected the PSR alternative national security program, SMART Security (Appendix B). This report summarizes the Issues Caucus experience and ballot results.

GOALS:

The ambitious all Iowa Issues Caucus served several interconnected goals. First goal: to reach a broad demographic of Iowans whose voices may otherwise be uninvolved or overlooked in the pre-election process. Second: to educate and discuss with members of the general public aspects of important national and domestic security issues that receive little attention in the popular press. Third: to assess the public's knowledge and concern about these security issues. Lastly, to encourage everyone encountered to become registered and informed about how to participate in the caucuses and the general election in November.

BACKGROUND:

As current administration leaders responded to the attacks of 9/11 and the risk of future terrorist acts with ever more aggressive policies at home and military actions abroad, PSR members, along with many other foreign policy analysts and peace activists, became ever more alarmed. Such concerns arise especially because of the policy directives outlined in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). This policy, also referred to as the "Bush Doctrine," provides the rationale for the U.S. response to global terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, especially those allegedly located in Iraq and other countries in the so-called "axis of evil."

The NPR supports unilateral military action if world support for US policies is not forthcoming, and the abandonment of existing arms treaties. It promotes the development and use of new nuclear weapons, even against non-nuclear countries, and does not rule out their use in a first strike. New domestic policies are based on tax cuts primarily for the already wealthy, an across the board roll-back in environmental protections, shredding the social safety net and supports for universal education, and the elimination of personal civil liberties' protections, while increasing funding for military hardware, and financial incentives for large and powerful corporations.

While presidential candidates each address some aspects of these new policies, none are clearly addressing the profound and far-reaching nature of these policy changes, nor articulating a holistic or comprehensive response. As the first in the nation to vote on the candidates for the next election, Iowa has a unique position to provide leadership and direction to the rest of the country. Iowa PSR decided to launch a project to update Iowans on specific policy changes and their implications, and get their opinion about the state of current national and domestic security issues. Thus the idea of an issues caucus was born.

METHOD:

The Issues Caucus concept, the ballot, associated fact sheets, display boards, and its publicity, were conceived, designed, and modified by a dedicated team of about 20 members and supporters of Iowa PSR and affiliated peace groups. Logistical support came from a wide diversity of groups including, but not limited to the United Nations Association, Iowans for Peace, West Branch People for Peace, local members of the Unitarian Universalist Society and the American Friends Service Committee.

This same team also helped arrange for and promote the Issues Caucus at a variety of educational institutions, libraries, associations, businesses, events and other sites across Iowa. Exact sites were determined by an existing working or personal association enjoyed by a given committee member.

Once displays and signs inviting the public to participate were set up at each site, volunteers asked passerby if s/he would like to participate in the Issues Caucus. Interested people were given ballots to fill out. Questions were answered, information on displays and fact sheets were discussed to the degree the person involved had an interest. People were given the opportunity to register to vote if needed.

While people engaged by the Issues Caucus process were assuredly members of the public, given the non-random nature of Issues Caucus sites chosen, such a collection of people could not be called random in the sense of a scientifically randomized study of public opinion. The respondents would more accurately be labeled a convenience sample of Iowans.

ISSUES CAUCUS SITES:

PSR members and supporters took Ballots, fact sheets, informational displays and voter education materials to 24 different settings across the state. Members or volunteers spent a day at a mall in Sioux City, many hours in the libraries in Cedar Rapids, Iowa City, and Winterset, sponsored a specially convened meeting of an Iowa City Neighborhood association, and the Des Moines area Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Volunteers spoke with students at the University of Iowa, the UI Medical School, Iowa State University, Grinnell, Des Moines Area Community College, and the Kirkwood Iowa City and Cedar Rapids campuses. Caucus materials were prominently displayed at the Iowa Latino Convention, the UNA sponsored Night of a Thousand Dinners, and at the West Branch Community Center. Members showed up at both a caucus training and peace rally held in Cedar Falls. Thai Flavors Restaurant and Norma Jeans hair salon graciously agreed to be part of the process. Staff at the Emma Goldman Clinic filled out ballots, as did colleagues and friends of a number of caucus organizers

and supporters. A letter and ballot was mailed out to all PSR members, and sent out over the internet through the list serves of several endorsing organizations. A ballot was also available on line for printing and posting.

DEMOGRAPHICS BALLOT RESPONDERS

The exact numbers, ages, and political persuasions of the people contacted directly during the Issues Caucuses are hard to calculate. However, well over 1,000 Iowans had some form of direct on-site contact with the people promoting the Issues Caucus. Further, we are quite certain those contacted indirectly through friends, list serves, radio spots and newspaper articles makes the total number of Iowans aware of the Issues Caucuses, much larger.

430 Iowans took the time to respond. Of these, 48.89% were women, 41.6% were men, while 9.5% did not indicate their gender. The vast majority of our respondents were registered to vote, with 54.4% indicating they were “caucusers.” Thus, our respondents represented a much more politically active subset than the general public of Iowans. Of those who were not registered to vote, one was only 15 years old, and a handful were international students.

Our oldest respondent was 97 and our youngest was the above mentioned 15 year old. Most hovered in the 18-30 and over 50 years age ranges reflecting the fact that we were better able to contact people in the educational institutions or those retirees who frequent public places like the libraries. Only a handful of respondents were contacted through their places of employment.

<u>Site/contact types:</u>		<u>Ages of respondents</u>	
Educational Institution	158	30 years or less	158
Public Facility/events	131	31-49	100
Contacts, allied organizations	77	50-69	94
Church, workplace, others NS	64	70 and over	31
		Not indicated	47

This was not a scientifically designed study. However, the people who took the time to speak with us and answer the ballots were serious and thoughtful and grateful for the opportunity to express their concerns. Given our limited resources and Iowa’s relatively small income gap and small minority populations we did not check occupational status nor did we record ethnic or racial identity even though it might have been interesting or added to the robustness of the findings. Given the variety of sites chosen for the issues caucuses, opinions from each of these demographic categories have been included.

BALLOT RESULTS, RESPONSE HIGHLIGHTS

For each of the 10 questions highlighted on the ballot the following were the most commonly noted responses [paraphased for purpose of table].

Most Common Responses to Ballot Questions	%	Overall	Men	Women	Caucuser
1. B*US spends/relies too much on military; make peace by peaceful means	72.3	61.5	81.4	76.1	
2. A. Unilateralism, first strike, and new nuke policies make us less safe	75.6	73.2	80.0	83.3	
3. A. Support our troops; increase health care and active duty benefits	84.4	79.3	88.1	88.9	
4. C. Inappropriate to link school funding to military recruitment	68.8	62.0	77.1	76.5	
5. A. Universal Health Care by transparent, publicly accountable agency	67.0	65.4	69.5	74.8	
6. A. Reduce Dependence on Oil, Fossil Fuels, invest in renewables	83.0	81.0	85.2	84.6	
7. A. Guarantee working people a living wage, or no income tax	71.9	70.9	73.8	80.8	
8. C. Environment, Human Health linked; prioritize over industry, trade	87.4	83.8	93.3	90.2	
9. A. Ban Assault Weapons, hold gun industry liable for harmful products	64.2	55.9	72.9	69.7	
10.A. Prioritize global poverty elimination over military funding	77.4	74.3	83.3	83.8	

*Re: Question #1, 36 respondents supported a powerful but downsized military, or response C. Their downsizing suggestions varied widely. Some supported cutting funds for specific programs like Star Wars or Apache Helicopters, others mentioned a specific amount of financial support to cut ranging from about \$1 billion/month to half or more of the current budget.

Additional Write-in Personal Issues and Concerns:

People were asked to list other concerns not included in the ballot and then prioritize all the issues including those they added. These other issues were as varied as the respondents and fit rather loosely within 3 major groupings: modifications or elaborations of the given 10 questions; local, regional or national, domestic political, economic or social issues; and international political, economic, or social issues. Within these three very broad categories, a number of issues were particularly compelling, whether they built on issues addressed in the ballot, or were entirely unrelated.

Given the limitations within the ballot structure, complex issues were presented in very simple terms. Many caucus participants did not overlook these complexities but rather emphasized their importance. Questions #1 and #2 asked about the role of US military spending, weapons development and military policies, but 5 respondents expressed specific concerns about landmines and/or nuclear weapons, and not surprisingly, another 10 mentioned their special concerns about the US role in the war in Iraq, the Israeli/Palesinian conflict or other conflicts.

Question #4 asked for people's opinion about linking military recruitment and school funding. 26 respondents felt other education issues, most importantly funding for education in general, were the most compelling. Question #5 asked about access to health care, but 27 respondents expanded on the issue mentioning concerns about biotechnology and stem cell research, costs of prescription drugs, support for health research, for smoke free environments, mental health parity, and the like. Energy was addressed in question #6, especially fossil fuel energy, and several Iowans wanted to be certain that reliance on nuclear energy was addressed. While in question #7 living wage was presented as a personal security issue, 13 people added specific concerns about the social safety net including affordable housing, social security and child welfare.

For question #8 about health, industry and environment and 13 people presented other non-health related environmental concerns such as biodiversity, logging, over-population, and national resource management. Question 10 inquired about the role of the U.S. in prioritizing or addressing global poverty and development. Four respondents went on to mention debt forgiveness or the role of the WTO while 8 others mentioned the role of the US in global treaties or the importance of support for the work of the United Nations.

Several domestic social issues not addressed in the Issues Caucus ballots were prominent in the minds of many Iowans. The most frequently mentioned single issue was funding for education (26). The second most frequently mentioned single issue was election reform (22). A variety of Civil Rights/Human Rights for diverse minorities and women's reproductive rights were specified by a total of 55 respondents, while overlapping with these important issues were the 25 suggestions for reform of the criminal justice code including most importantly, the elimination of capital punishment and decriminalization of drug use/abuse.

Still others were quite concerned about the behavior of corporations, especially global corporations. 19 respondents addressed the need for corporate restraint suggesting reform of the global trade system with enforceable standards for fair trade, the elimination of sweatshops, and protection of rainforests, biodiversity, and water resources. Others were concerned about the role of U.S. government policies concerning civil liberties (14), agriculture (4), civil society issues, land use, transportation (12), and the separation of church and state (7).

Remaining miscellaneous issues concerned transparency, functions and truth in our national government (11), Labor Rights (8), Control and function of Media (8), Global health, especially AIDS (5), and various others (9).

Priorities:

Once the specific PSR questions concerning SMART security were answered and personal concerns added, respondents were asked to rank the 6 issues most important to them. Not surprisingly, a number of respondents mentioned how difficult it was to assign a rank order to issues they felt were equally important or strongly inter-connected. Thus, priority rankings were evaluated in two different ways. They were weighted according to the priority order listed on each ballot and then they were also counted by how many times each issue came up in a priority listing in any of the 6 allotted slots.

Interestingly, if evaluated by which issue most often had the highest priority or was mentioned most, Health Care (Q5) came in as the clear first priority concern. Military spending (Q1) was weighted second with energy concerns a close third. Public Health and the environment (Q8) came in being weighted 4th, however received second most frequent mentions. Military spending (Q1) ranked 3rd in numbers of times it was mentioned. The Nuclear Posture Review issues of unilateralism, first strike and new nuclear weapons (Q2) came in 6th in weight and 7th in mentions. Gun violence and support for the troops ranked lowest of all the issues of concern.

Despite, or rather as a result of the vast number of additional issues noted, none of them figured prominently within the priorities.

DISCUSSION

Issues Caucus results indicate most importantly that most people contacted shared the concerns felt by PSR members. A large percent of voters agree with us in principle and were eager to discuss most of the issues highlighted.

Our results indicate the trend for Iowa's Women responders and/or for the "caucuser" sub group were "more progressive" than the combined group or men alone. Perhaps most importantly, for many people this was the first time they had heard about the facts and numbers related to these vital issues. Many people were unaware of, surprised by, and alarmed by the size of our military budget, the administration's plans for new nuclear weapons, and the funding stipulations concerning our high schools and military recruiters.

We found out rather quickly that people who are not registered to vote were also not interested in responding to our ballot. We also learned more about who does/does not go to and utilize the opportunity presented by the caucuses. We hope we convinced a few more people to go to their caucuses than might have otherwise. However, it was noted that the caucus structure eliminates people with certain disabilities, second shift working people, single parents, and others.

Strengths: Weaknesses of Process and Ballot

Our goal of education while seeking opinions created a 2 edged sword. Asking an opinion without first providing some background meant asking for uninformed opinions. We felt it was important to use the opportunity to bring issues to people's attention, but many felt that such information made our ballot biased or too leading. Fortunately, since volunteers were on site most of the time, these concerns could be discussed amicably and resolved in a mutually respectful manner, as in a caucus!

Regarding the questions themselves, it was pointed out to the organizers that several of the questions did not provide an optimal number of choices or that choices were not mutually exclusive. One respondent even suggested that 5 choices for each question might have worked better. All of these comments will be kept in mind if anything similar is attempted in the future.

Disappointments:

We wanted to cover a lot of ground in any one encounter with a large number of people. Caucus planners were invigorated and very engaged by the process. The fact sheets produced for each question were intended to not only educate our audience but ourselves as well. Unfortunately, the public is not so inclined. While a few folks did review all the materials very carefully and others examined some of them in great detail, most people came and went in the time it took to fill out the ballots and ask a polite question or two. Often times, many of the fact sheets, and even our exhibits remained unexamined.

Also, despite efforts to register new voters we found that most of our respondents were already registered and engaged in the democratic process. Had we realized this about the population who would respond to our caucuses, we might have organized ourselves a little differently.

CONCLUSIONS:

Many issues were on the minds of our Iowa respondents beyond the specific security issues addressed by PSR. While people were relatively uninformed and unengaged in issues and effects of military spending, priorities, and policies, the number of comments about the need to regulate powerful corporations, in our private and public lives, to public financing of elections, was unexpected. Similarly the numbers of people mentioning the undue influence of oil, chemical and other powerful conglomerates in our media, our government, and on our lives and global environment, and the need to support energy conservation and renewables, revealed a great deal of sophistication.

There is clearly room to do much more education about policies being pursued in the military. In a time of war, and in this particular historic time, discussion of this complex and emotional but essential subject is too often prohibited. It will be an up hill battle to get this information out to enough of the general public to begin a more honest inquiry and response. Obviously this was just one small step to promote grassroots participatory democracy in decisions that affect people's lives. This form of outreach must become a vital ingredient in future organizing by PSR and other progressive groups if we are to experience any real change in a future government.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

In the short run Iowa PSR will continue to utilize the information gained about “caucusers” and community supporters to promote SMART Security Platform for the State Parties. Along with several other state PSR chapters, Iowa PSR will work hard to be certain that the SMART Security Platform becomes a part of the national platforms of the major parties. The many fact sheets that were printed up and left over will be made available for anyone who would like to use them in other settings and at other events.

A SPECIAL THANKS to....

The People who helped develop and promote the Issues Caucus without whose kind and generous assistance it would not have happened!:

1. Nader Ajluni, Physician, Des Moines, PSR and Peace Time
2. Ellen Ballas Iowa City, PSR
3. Peg Bouska. PA, Iowa City, PSR
4. Angela Christiansen, Iowa City, Iowans for Peace
5. Tim Eldridge, Medical Student, Iowa City, S-PSR
6. Ewing, Matt, Des Moines, Apollo Alliance
7. Mary Beth Gardam, Des Moines, STAR PAC
8. John Grinstead, Cedar Falls
9. Margie Haworth, West Branch People for Peace
10. Maria Hope, Iowa City, Amnesty International
11. Garry Klein, Iowa City
12. Veronika Kolder, Physician, Iowa City, PSR
13. Kirsten Meredith, Cedar Rapids, PSR, Iowans for the Prevention of Gun Violence
14. Tuyet Nguyen, UI Student Government, Iowa City
15. Greg Parker, Medical Student, Iowa City, S-PSR

16. Paul, Dorothy, Iowa City, United Nations Association, Rotary, PSR
17. Martha Perez, Spanish Professor, Iowa City
18. Wayne Osborn, Iowa City, United Nations Association, PSR
19. Maggie Rawland, Des Moines, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
20. Ann Stromquist, Iowa City, American Friends Service Committee
21. Renee Weinberg, Sioux City, PSR
22. Jeffrey Weiss, Des Moines, American Friends Service Committee

Appendices:

A. ENDORSING ORGANIZATIONS

Alliance for Social Justice, Ames
Amnesty International, Iowa City
Apollo Alliance
Iowa for Health Care
Iowa Mobilization for Global Justice
Iowa Physicians for Social Responsibility (Iowa PSR)
Iowa Student Physicians for Social Responsibility (Iowa SPSR)
Iowa United Nations Association
Iowa Women's Foundation
Iowans for Peace
Iowans for the Prevention of Gun Violence (IPGV)
Johnson County League of Women Voters
Norma Jean Hair Salon
Peace Action Iowa City
Peace Time, Des MOines
STAR*PAC
Thai Flavors
Trillium Women's Health Service
University of Iowa Student Government (UISG)
West Branch People for Peace
Women for Peace
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Women's Resource and Action Center
Yahoo Drummers

B. Ballot

ISSUES

My vote includes the following checked items; additional thoughts are written in. (Please indicate one response per question.)

MILITARY POLICIES: Do they promote or undermine national security?

1. Military Spending. The U.S. spends \$30 billion per year on our nuclear arsenal, and more on military hardware than all other countries combined. This impacts the nation's economy and domestic policies. We currently spend \$3.9 billion each month on the war in Iraq and \$400 billion annually to support weapons systems and troops around the world. This administration plans to advance a Missile Defense system that will cost many billions annually.

2. "Preventive" War, First Strike, "Usable" Nuclear Weapons, Unilateralism. The U.S. arsenal of nuclear weapons is capable of destroying the world many times over. Yet the administration requests more research on and deployment of new types of smaller nuclear weapons that could be more "usable" than existing "doomsday bombs." In doing so, this administration has abandoned decades of treaties and cooperative efforts with the world community.

3. Support for Our Troops, Our Veterans. The House recently defeated a bill that would authorize \$3.2 billion for veterans' medical care. While the V.A.'s medical budget has increased in the past seven years, spending on each patient has decreased. The Pentagon also opposes giving those serving in Iraq and Afghanistan "imminent-danger pay" and "family-separation allowances" approved by the House in April.

4. The Rights of Our Children to Quality, Public Education. The "No Child Left Behind" Act, the education law signed by President Bush in January 2002, contains a provision requiring high schools to provide their students' names, addresses, and phone numbers to military recruiters. Schools in violation of this provision are subject to having federal aid frozen or revoked.

5. Health Care Access. More than 43 million Americans lack health insurance. Nearly 60 million are without health insurance for at least a portion of each year. Employers face rising health insurance premiums, and employees face increasing cost-sharing. At the same time, physicians are pressed by new cost-containment schemes to work harder and faster, thus providing less care.

6. Energy. Dependence on oil contributes to conflicts in many countries, environmental devastation, and global warming. Investing in alternative energy sources could reduce our dependence on foreign energy and polluting fossil fuels, improve our infrastructure, and clean up the environment, while creating new jobs and stimulating the economy.

1. Do you agree that using finite resources to maintain our superpower status is the wisest response to a dangerous and unstable world?
- a. Despite the expense, maintaining and asserting military superiority is crucial for our security.
 - b. The U.S. relies too much on expensive weapons and military force to promote its policies in the world. We need to find peaceful means to achieve peace.
 - c. We need a powerful military for global stability; however, I would cut _____ from the military budget.

2. If we abandon treaties and reserve the right to act unilaterally, and pursue development of new nuclear weapons and threaten their use preventively, will we be more or less secure?
- a. Unilateralism, creation of new nuclear weapons, and threats of first strike are destabilizing and dangerous; following this policy will make the U.S. less, not more, safe.
 - b. Treaties fashioned during the cold war were only marginally effective then and have no role in the war on terrorism.
 - c. Working with other nations is ideal, but terrorism calls for decisive unilateral action by the world's only superpower.

3. What is your opinion on pay and health benefits for the military?
- a. We should support our troops by providing increased health care and special active-troop benefits.
 - b. We can't afford to increase troop and veteran benefits in a time of war.
 - c. Decisions on military matters are best left to those in the Pentagon.

4. What is your opinion?
- a. It is appropriate to begin military recruitment at an early age, and it is our duty to support and facilitate such recruitment in our public schools.
 - b. Military recruitment in schools is appropriate, but students should be able to withhold their names from automatic release to the military.
 - c. Recruiting in schools is inappropriate. Education should not be linked by law to the military, and a school's federal funding should not depend on its providing private student contact information to recruiters.

DOMESTIC POLICIES: What makes us personally more or less secure?

5. How should health care be addressed during this election cycle and by this or the next administration?
- a. I support an expanded and strengthened universal "Medicare-for-all" system administered by a transparent and publicly accountable government agency.
 - b. Given budgetary concerns, I support a modestly expanded Medicare system for elders and children through a Medicare drug plan and improved Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) benefits.
 - c. I prefer to retain the current private health-care system.

6. Is it time to consider committing serious funding to energy innovation and the production of energy from sustainable, clean, renewable resources?
- a. We need to reduce our dependence on oil (it involves us in wars, increases air, water, and soil pollution, while doing nothing to halt global warming), and to invest much more in pollution-free renewable energy options.
 - b. Our energy system is complex. Change must come slowly, incrementally, and carefully to avoid market chaos and weakening our economy.
 - c. High energy consumption is an American way of life to which I have a right.

OVER

7. Employment, Living Wages, Financial Security. The U.S. has lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs in the past 2½ years and now averages a loss of 68,000 jobs per month, blue collar and white collar combined. Wages for many of those who remain employed place them below the poverty level. This has contributed to personal suffering for millions of American families.

8. Public Health, Environment, and Industry. Under the current Clean Air Act, over 30,000 deaths and 603,000 asthma attacks per year are attributed to air pollution. The administration continues to weaken federal regulations governing air pollution from old coal-fired power plants, emissions that contribute to global warming, sales of land tainted with PCBs, drilling for oil and gas on federal land, scientific studies that underpin federal regulations, and other environmentally sensitive protections.

9. Crime and Gun Violence. More than 26,000 Americans die each year by guns—eight young people each day, far more than in any other industrialized nation. Gun violence costs the U.S. economy about \$100 billion annually. Legislation already passed in the U.S. House, and introduced in the Senate, would make gun manufacturers, distributors, and dealers immune to civil lawsuits filed by victims of gun violence. The current federal assault-weapons ban is due to expire in September 2004, at which time 19 additional military-style assault weapons will again be legal.

10. Multilateral Humanitarian Assistance. Two billion people suffer under the combined threats of hunger and malnutrition, inadequate water and sanitation, and life-threatening infectious diseases like tuberculosis, malaria, and AIDS. Education provides a critical base for all sustainable development, yet nearly 1/6 of the world’s population cannot read or write; the illiteracy rate exceeds 50% in more than 20 countries. The cost to provide adequate food, water, and education to the world’s poorest is only \$60 billion per year.

7. How should the U.S. respond to such a difficult situation for so many of its workers?

- a. All working people should be guaranteed a living wage, or, if below \$20,000, owe no income taxes.
- b. The marketplace and employers should determine wages; our economic recovery will help improve everyone’s situation.
- c. This Administration and Congress have far more pressing concerns beyond our borders, such as terrorism, and we all need to tighten our belts for the greater good.

8. As a country, how can we meet our material needs without harming public health or undermining environmental safeguards?

- a. The record on global warming and health threats from environmental pollution is controversial, exaggerated, and requires no intervention.
- b. There is no immediate threat from pollution or climate change for most of us. Human ingenuity and the market will respond to the environment as needed and in good time.
- c. Human survival ultimately depends on the health and vitality of our shared environment, and its protection must be given a high priority when determining industrial processes, corporate projects, and international trade agreements.

OTHER POLICIES affecting personal and public security and safety

9. Given the associated costs and risks to the public, should the U.S. Congress renew and strengthen the federal assault-weapons ban? Should the gun industry enjoy legal immunity?

- a. Assault weapons have no safe role in civil society and should continue to be banned. The gun industry should be held liable for harmful products as with any other consumer product.
- b. Assault weapons should continue to be banned, but the gun industry cannot be held liable for the way guns—legal products—are used.
- c. Gun control laws are unnecessary because it’s people who kill people; the right to bear arms is assured by the Constitution.

10. If the U.S. redirected its resources to supporting and empowering those in the poorest parts of the world by increasing the amount provided to multilateral humanitarian efforts, instead of military assistance, would the world be a safer, more secure place?

- a. If there were less poverty and inequity in the world, there would be less violence, and we would all be more secure. Prioritizing global poverty elimination over military aid would make us all safer.
- b. Unilateralism and military spending are more effective than multilateralism or humanitarian aid.
- c. Poor countries need more loans, not handouts; aid only makes them dependent, less willing to work.

Additional issues of special interest or concern not already covered include:

11.

12.

13.

Please arrange the 6 issues of highest priority to you, including your particular concerns added here at the end, in order from highest priority to lowest:

High _____ Low

Finally, please tell us your age _____ and your gender: M F

Are you registered to vote? Yes No

Do you plan to attend your caucus? Yes No

Do you plan to vote in the general election? Yes No

Thank you for participating in this survey

C. SMART Resolution

SMART SECURITY RESOLUTION for Iowa Caucuses (Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism)

We propose that the following SMART Security resolution is made part of the Iowa Democratic Party Platform:

WHEREAS, current U.S. Policy of unilaterally abandoning arms control treaties, launching unilateral preemptive attacks, and threatening other nations with nuclear strikes is dangerous and spurs other nations to obtain weapons of mass destruction, and

WHEREAS, the United States spends more on its military than the rest of the world combined but in fact buys less security,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Democratic Party of Iowa endorses a SMART Security Platform that would have the U.S. take leadership to:

- Strengthen international institutions and cooperative diplomacy to prevent acts of terrorism;
- Reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction by renouncing the development of new nuclear weapons and strengthening international disarmament treaties;
- Eliminate wasteful military spending;
- Invest in international peacekeeping and development and in meeting urgent domestic needs such as jobs, health care, and education.