



# U.S. nuclear-free pacific network

March 11, 1983

TO: USNFPN COORDINATING COMMITTEE & KEY REGIONAL CONTACTS  
FROM: CHED MYERS, S.F. OFFICE  
RE: PREPARATIONS FOR UPCOMING NFIPC/83, DELEGATE SELECTION, ETC.

This is a memo many of you have been waiting for; my apologies for its delay. Because of all the things going on around the Pacific, the report is that most regions have gotten a late start in the conference preparations/delegate selection. The following will summarize the conference enclosures, and then attempt to make recommendations for how we should proceed with the many tasks before us. These recommendations are only that, and come from my perspective as pre-1980 Conference organizer for our region, delegate to NFPC/80, and Steering Committee member for the past 3 years. This memo deals with the content of decisionmaking for NFIPC/83.

## SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE LOGISTICS

You will get a good overview of the structure of the Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Conference (NFIPC/83) by reading carefully both the enclosed Conference brochure (which many of you may have already seen) and especially the PCRC memo entitled "Decision Related to NFIPC/83 by PCRC Steering Committee (SC)". These two things clarify the present policies regarding NFIPC/83; if you have any specific questions or need clarification you may call me or talk directly to PCRC. I wish to call your attention to the following things in particular:

- the conference will be held in the newly independent (1980) Republic of Vanuatu (formerly the New Hebrides), located some 900 miles east of Queensland, Australia. The conference will be held in a village, not a hotel with western accommodations. Vanuatu is supportive of the NFIP movement at the governmental level (it declared itself the Pacific's first nuclear-free nation last year), and because of its progressive stances on many Pacific issues, is under some pressure from surrounding western-aligned countries (e.g. Australia, N.Z.); its situation would be somewhat similar to Nicaragua's in terms of regional profile. Thus, delegates will need to be aware of this situation, and endeavor to be sensitive to it in terms of their own conduct and expectations.
- the conference will have two different parts: a four day prolegammon to which guests will be invited and consisting of regional reports and major addresses, and a 6 day working conference open to participants only.
- the U.S. will have 6 participants (the same number as NFPC/80). It is stipulated that three of these be indigenous persons. Also, I will attend as lame-duck SC member (thus, not counted as one of the 6).
- the north American region (U.S. and Canada) can also invite 3 guests (to attend the first part of the conference); these would be representatives of important fraternal organizations, and/or any others in a field that might contribute to the conference. There may be one person from No. America who would attend as invited guests of the conference (not of the region); Rosalie Bertell has already been invited by the Conference, for example.

mentioned that a Freeze representative should come. These people should definitely represent an organization we wish to push towards involvement with our Network, and which has the resources to send someone at their own expense. Nominations I think should also be sent to the CC.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

There are many potential pitfalls in this process. The above is intended only to stimulate thinking and dialogue among us, not to imply decisions/policy. Policy on these matters can only be made by USNFPN Coordinating Committee members, in consultation with USNFPN staff. The above recommendations come strictly from my personal viewpoints as present SC member, as expansion upon already set PCRC policy or our experience here in the U.S. over the last 3 years. Responses and correspondence should be directed to me at the S.F. office, or to the CC member nearest you. The present CC members are:

- Rebecca Clark (6319 28th Ave. NE, Seattle, WA 98115)
- Martha Fort (c/o Peace Resource Center, 5717 Lindo Paseo Dr, San Diego, CA 92115)
- Angela Gennino (c/o Friends of the Earth, 1045 Sansome St., San Francisco, CA 94111)
- Betsy Taylor (P.O Box 11135, Washington D.C., 20008)
- Paul Hutchcroft (c/o CALC 198 Broadway, Rm 302, N.Y., N.Y. 10038)
- Micael Bedford (12 Thorpe St. Somerville, MA 02143)
- Wes Uemura (c/o CALC, 220 S. State St, Suite 2020, Chlcago IL 60604)

The CC members will be doing preliminary consultation by conference call within the next few weeks, so please try to have your first reactions to them or us here as soon as possible. The CC will be receiving another memo about this consultation next week.

Since many of you are interested in ongoing PCRC SC issues, I also enclose three things of related interest: a list of upcoming PCRC publication projects, a tentative draft of the last SC discussion of future SC structure and size, and a draft statement of the relationship between the Vanuatu office and Hawaii office, which has been the occasion for much confusion as the Pacific movement has expanded.

- May 1 has been chosen by PCRC as the deadline for participant confirmation. This is both for administrative and logistical reasons. Although it may not be possible for us to meet this deadline, it would be to our advantage, since travel arrangements and fundraising need to take place.
- No. American participants must fund themselves! That means quite a bit of fundraising, since the average total cost of each participant will be about \$2,000! More on this below.
- Aside from participant selection, we must also choose a new SC member for the next term; that would preferably be done before rather than at the conference.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING PARTICIPANTS, CRITERIA, FUNDRAISING, ETC.

A. Participants. In 1980, we chose participants pretty much by regional representation; there were persons from the Pacific Northwest, Bay Area, So. California, Washington D.C., the Southwest (N.M.), and Black Hills (S.D.). Ethnically, the breakdown was three Anglos, one Asian American, and two Native Americans. I include this for reference only; we may choose to represent ourselves quite differently this time. Of the 1980 participants, only a couple continued to actively pursue NFP work after the conference in any significant way. Therefore, I would make the following recommendations concerning participants:

- a)-that regional representation be less a criteria than some assurance that the person will be substantially committed to ongoing NFP work after the conference; thus, C:6 d in the PCRC memo is an outstanding criteria. If the national NFP Network here is to continue to do serious work, we need committed people with first-hand experience of the Pacific movement. Participants represent the next generation of NFP activists in the U.S. context.
- b)-there are certain advantages and disadvantages to directly representing an organization of size (e.g. national). On the one hand, that organization can provide financial and office/resource support for the participant (we have had good experience for example with CALC on this). On the other, the person as staff is less free to give program time to NFP issues, unless the organization make a clear stipulation that the person can be set aside for this purpose to some stated extent. Again, in my opinion it is more important for the participant to be free to do ongoing NFP work, especially now that a national Network has been established; organizational affiliation should be considered with that in mind.
- c)-over the last year we have had more to do with both Asian-American disarmament groups and Pacific island groups here on the mainland. It would be great if we could have the participant breakdown be 2 Native Americans, and at least 1 Asian-American and 1 Pacific-American among the 6. This may not be possible, and other criteria need to be met, but we need to reckon with the fact that Asian- and Pacific-Americans will continue to be important constituencies in the future of mainland NFP organizing.
- d)-at least one of the participants should be office staff of the USNFPN.
- e)-participants should have at least several months previous experience with NFP organizing of some kind here.

There are obviously many other factors to consider; fundraising capability, representation from environmental, land rights, disarmament, anti-nuclear, human rights, and church constituencies (we have not had a great deal of contact with labor; but I do not think this is the right time to experiment with new constituencies); personal and political skills, etc. The above is simply the things I think need to be stressed in thinking through participant criteria. I stress again that these are my perceptions and recommendations; the choice is up to the Network. Needless to say, participants also must have skill in handling cross-cultural and diverse ideological situations; being an articulate American is not as important as this setting as being a good listener and learner, ready to translate concerns back into the U.S. milieu.

B. Fundraising, logistics. U.S. Participants from the U.S. are expected to fund themselves to the conference. It is important that groups locally and nationally consider this in the participant selection process, i.e. involve themselves in the financial responsibility for participants. Assuming that participants will probably come from areas with some local NFP support presence, that local group should plan events and outreach during the spring to help raise funds.

The national Network office has fundraised around a budget that included \$6500 for Participant expenses at NFIPC/83. That sum was about 12% of our total budget projected for 1982-3. We have raised a little over half of that budget; 12% of what we have raised (about \$30,000) is \$3600. If we dive that among the 7 persons going to the conference, that works out to roughly \$500 per person that the Network could offer in financial aid, if the coordinating committee decides that we should spend our money in this way. I would recommend that the Network subsidize the travel of each participant and SC member by \$500.

We have found locally that we can fundraise by charging honoraria of e.g. \$50 per speaking engagement, using our slide show. There are also many other ways to fundraise. I think our Network can use the fundraising task as an opportunity to get people involved with concrete NFP projects. Meanwhile, our office will continue to fundraise around operating expenses, and may have more to offer.

Local groups can help prepare and orient participants after they have been chosen. The S.F. office will take responsibility to prepare orientation packets for each participant. I will host an orientation gathering the first day people arrive in Vanuatu; I will be in Vanuatu a week before the conference begins for SC meetings. Travel arrangements should be made with local agents.

C. Selection process and SC member. At this point I am uncertain about how to have an orderly nomination/selection process. My inclination is to have local groups make nominations to the Coordinating Committee, which will have final decisionmaking authority together with the Network staff. Accompanying nominations should be some kind of resume of the individual and perhaps a couple of written recommendations. The Native American participants would be selected autonomously by Indian groups as they were last time, since there are at present no Native Americans represented on our CC. There should be consultation however on final choices. The SC member should also be selected by the CC. Note that the new SC member does not have to be a participant in NFIP/83, though that would obviously be optimal. The following things need to be kept in mind concerning a new SC:

- the entire SC structure may be changed at NFIPC/83, such that it is even possible that No. America might not have an SC, or would have 2... anything is theoretically possible, and there is no guarantee that the previous SC structure will be renewed (in fact, chances are slim that it would be identical).
- should there be a generally similar structure, the SC member should probably be one of the staff at the USNFPN (this was recommended by the July 1982 meeting). This is because SC responsibilities involve both alot of responsibility, correspondence, travelling and meetings, and it is only fair to ask this of a staff or else someone who can volunteer this substantial commitment.
- SC person should have particular skills and background in the work and its cross-cultural nature; they would have to have a primary commitment to the NFP movement both here and out in the Pacific.
- I will also spend the time necessary with this person to orient them to the SC work. The new SC will meet after the NFIPC/83, so the person should plan to stay a couple of extra days in Vanuatu.

D. Thoughts on Guests. You may want to put some thought into which 3 people we should recommend to the conference as guests of our region (inclusive of Canada, although participants from Canada will be chosen separately). Several people have