

TRANSCRIPT: THE POPE AND THE BOMB
September 8, 2015

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS:

E.J. DIONNE, JR.
Opinion Writer for the Washington Post
Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution
Government Professor at Georgetown University
Author of "Our Divided Political Heart"

BISHOP OSCAR CANTÚ
Bishop of Las Cruces, New Mexico
Chairman of the U.S. Bishop's Committee on
International Justice and Peace

SAM NUNN
Former Member, U.S. Senate
Co-chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Nuclear Threat Initiative

MARYANN CUSIMANO LOVE, PH.D.
Associate Professor of International Relations at
the Catholic University of America
Member of the U.S. Catholic Bishops International
Committee and the State Department's working group
on Religion and Foreign Policy
Author of "Beyond Sovereignty" and "Morality
Matters: Ethics and the War on Terrorism"

Introduction

GERALD POWERS
Director, Catholic Peacebuilding Studies, Kroc Institute for International Peace
Studies

MR. POWERS: The Pope will not be able to join us this morning, but we have the next best thing, a terrific panel.

Bishop Oscar Cantú will lead us off. He is bishop of Las Cruces, New Mexico, and chairman of the U.S. Bishop's Committee on International Justice and Peace. As chairman of that committee, he is the lead spokesman for the U.S. bishops and questions of nuclear weapons. In August, he was part of the 70th anniversary commemorations in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. When Bishop Cantú was appointed auxiliary bishop of San Antonio in 2008, he was the youngest bishop in the United States. You will not always remain the youngest bishop.

(Laughter)

MR. POWERS: Senator Sam Nunn has been a leading voice on nuclear weapons issues for four decades. He is co-chairman and chief executive officer of the Nuclear Threat Initiative. For 24 years, he was the U.S. Senator from Georgia. As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee for many of those years, one of his landmark legislative achievements was the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, which secured and destroyed the excess nuclear, biological and chemical weapons in Russia and the former Soviet Republics. In the past decade, his work with George Shultz, William Perry, and Henry Kissinger has been a singular factor in legitimizing the case for moving toward a world free of nuclear weapons.

Dr. Maryann Cusimano Love is an associate professor of International Relations at the Catholic University of America. She is a member of the U.S. Catholic Bishops International Committee and the State Department's working group on Religion and Foreign Policy. Her books include "Beyond Sovereignty" and "Morality Matters: Ethics and the War on Terrorism." And just to be different, her publications also include five children's books, which have won awards and appeared on the *New York Times* bestselling list. None of these books, however, are on nuclear annihilation. I'm not sure why.

(Laughter)

MR. DIONNE: That's a good one.

MR. POWERS: Our moderator is E.J. Dionne, Jr., one of those who no doubt will be busy in the coming days providing typically insightful commentary on the Pope's visit. He is an opinion writer for the *Washington Post*, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a government professor at Georgetown University and a frequent commentator for *National Public Radio*, ABC's "This Week," NBC's "Meet the Press" and many other media outlets. He's the author of five books including his most recent, *Our Divided Political Heart*, the battle for the American idea in an age of discontent,

and his first, the award-winning *Why Americans Hate Politics*.

And with that, let me turn it over to you, E.J.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. It was very generous of you to assume that my commentary will actually be "insightful."

(Laughter)

MR. DIONNE: We pray to the Holy Spirit. I want to say what an honor it is to be here with Bishop Cantú. I have always wanted to meet you, sir. So I'm honored that I can do it this way, and Senator Nunn whose work on nuclear nonproliferation has been extraordinary, to which we are all grateful, and also Professor Love. It is absolutely perfect that we have a very distinguished academic on the panel welcoming Pope Francis whose last name is Love.

(Laughter)

MR. DIONNE: And I suspect your work on children's literature may actually provide as many insights as any of your other work. And so thank you, all, for being here. Also I want to honor all the sponsors and particularly my friends at the Berkley Center with which I have an association.

I just want to say a couple of things because I'm here, just as you are, to learn from this distinguished audience. There is extraordinary excitement about Pope Francis' visit. There is always real excitement when a pope visits a country, but I think there is a special quality to the excitement that Francis brings about on a spiritual level and on, if you will, I'll use the term, "political level" because there is an intimate link between how you think about spiritual questions and how you think about political questions including the bomb.

This is a matter of some confusion sometimes. I had the great honor of covering the Vatican back in the 1980s and I took all of Pope John Paul II's trips around the world when I was covering. And one of my favorite moments was when we were traveling through Africa and we happened to be going to several countries on one day, and Victor Simpson, the brilliant and wonderful AP correspondent, we're sitting on the plane going through this big stack of speeches, and Victor absolutely understood the irony of what he said. He looked through all these speeches and said, what am I going to write today. There's nothing but religion here, he said of the Pope's speeches.

(Laughter)

MR. DIONNE: And of course, he was looking for a secular issue that might more broadly interest people beyond discussions of Catholic theology or the Virgin. I'm going

to begin today with simply two quotations and turn it over to Bishop Cantú. Your Pope Francis is well-known for having said that war begets war and violence begets violence, and we will hear more from Bishop Cantú on what he is going to say.

I just want to honor my friend, Father Drew Christiansen, and if a Benedictine and educated guy can give an assignment to a Jesuit, I'm not sure that's permitted. I'd love you to open the questioning if you are of mind to. Drew always has something good on this mind. But one of the reasons we're here today and the foundation on which Pope Francis builds (and he has acknowledged this), he acknowledged this by making him a saint is Pope John XXIII, and so I just wanted to introduce Bishop Cantú by reading one passage from *Pacem in Terris*, one of the most important documents ever issued by the Vatican. In *Pacem in Terris*, John XXIII wrote, "People are living in the grip of constant fear. They are afraid that at any moment, the impending storm may break upon them with horrific violence and they have good reason for their fear."

And today, we are making a small effort to try to break that fear. Bishop Cantú.

BISHOP CANTÚ: Thank you. I'm going to stand so I can see the rest of you. Thank you, E.J., for that wonderful introduction. I'm grateful to the co-sponsors of today's program and to my co-panelists for their time and expertise. My modest contribution is meant to frame our discussion of "The Pope and the Bomb," an interesting title.

Obviously the title was chosen because Pope Francis is visiting the U.S. and the U.N. next week, but a more accurate title would be "the Popes and the Bomb," because since 1963, every pope, beginning with Saint John XXIII, has called for a worldwide ban on nuclear weapons. Catholic teaching on nuclear weapons is rooted in respect for the life and dignity of the human person based on the belief that all are created in the divine image.

The church's teaching attempts to reconcile the need to avoid killing and the requirements to defend the lives of others. The tradition is expressed in just war principles. Three principles of that tradition are especially applicable to nuclear weapons; discrimination, proportionality and probability of success.

Discrimination, for use of force to be just, it must discriminate between combatants and noncombatants. One cannot intend to slaughter innocent civilians. The moral problem with nuclear weapons is that the devastation they wreck cannot discriminate between combatants and noncombatants.

Proportionality, the death and destruction caused by the use of force cannot be out of proportion to the goal of protecting human life and human rights. The raw destructive capacity and lingering radiation of nuclear weapons make their use morally unthinkable.

Probability of success, the use of force must have serious prospects of success for it to

be justified. What would success look like in a nuclear war? In 2006, Pope Benedict reminded us that in a nuclear war, there would be no "victors, only victims." In 1965, the Second Vatican Council declared, "the horror and perversity of war is immensely magnified by the addition of scientific weapons for acts of war. Involving these weapons can inflict massive and indiscriminate destruction, thus going far beyond the bounds of legitimate defense."

All these considerations compel us to undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude. The council also articulated profound concerns about deterrence and the arms race. The council argued that it is not a safe way to preserve a steady peace nor is the so-called balance resulting from this race a secure and authentic peace.

At the 2005 NPT review conference, the Holy See stated that when the church expressed its limited acceptance of nuclear deterrence during the Cold War, it was with a clear-stated condition that deterrence was only a step on the way to progressive nuclear disarmament. At a U.N. General Assembly meeting on nuclear disarmament in 2013, the Holy See maintained the chief obstacle to elimination of nuclear wars, of nuclear arms, is continued adherence to the doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

With the end of the Cold War, the time for the acceptance of this doctrine has long passed. The Holy See does not countenance the continuation of nuclear deterrence since it is evident it is driving the development of ever-new, newer nuclear arms. Building on this moral skepticism at the 2014 U.N. gathering in Vienna, Pope Francis affirmed the following, nuclear deterrence and the threat of mutually assured destruction cannot be the basis for ethic of fraternity and peaceful co-existence among peoples and states. The youth of today and tomorrow deserve far better.

The Second Vatican Council thought the arms race is an utterly treacherous trap for humanity and one which ensnares the poor to an intolerable degree. Rather than being eliminated thereby, the causes of war are in danger of being gradually aggravated. While aggregate sums are being spent for the furnishing of ever-new weapons, an adequate remedy cannot be provided for the multiple miseries afflicting the whole modern world.

The Holy See in its 2014 U.N. contribution, "Nuclear Disarmament: Time for Abolition", notes that with the end of the Cold War and the emergence of a multi-polar world, nuclear deterrence works less as a stabilizing force and more as an incentive for countries to break out of the nonproliferation regime. The "peace of a sort" promised by nuclear deterrence has led to enormous amounts of money being allocated for modernization of nuclear weapons to the detriment of human development while ignoring the underlying causes of war.

The Holy See also employed newer moral arguments related to the problem of intention and to the unnecessary suffering. For deterrence to be credible, one has to intend mass

destruction with intensive and lasting collateral damage, inhumane suffering, and the risk of escalation. And to be involved in a whole set of acts that are predisposed to use, one has to intend to do what is morally reprehensible. The Holy See also noted that scientists and international lawyers are now giving more attention to the unnecessary suffering inflicted by the use of nuclear weapons.

Pope Francis in his Vienna message greeted the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and called for more attention to unnecessary suffering. The bishops of the United States took up the call of the Second Vatican Council to evaluate war with a new attitude. In their 1983 pastoral letter, "The Challenge of Peace," echoing the tradition of Pope -- of Saint John Paul II, they argued deterrence is not an adequate strategy for a long-term basis for peace.

Ten years later, in "The Harvest of Justice is Sown In Peace," a document by U.S. bishops, they maintained the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal, it should be a policy goal. Ultimately the moral dilemma of nuclear weapons is not about principles and church statements. It's about people. In August, I visited Japan for the 70th anniversary of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was a life-changing experience, I must say. Both cities look peaceful today, but their museums contain stark images of destruction, bodies charred and burned, others so quickly incinerated that only their shadows etched on stone remain, and survivors severely disfigured by radiation exposure.

I heard the moving testimony of Sister Lucia (phonetic) who as a 10-year-old girl was at a school eight kilometers from the epicenter of the blast. For years, she sealed away those horrific memories of death and destruction, but now she decided it was time to share those memories to convey, as she put it, the reality of war. I came away humbled by the commitment of the Catholic bishops of Japan and of so many Japanese people, not just the survivors, but young people as well, to work for peace and a world without nuclear weapons.

In a 2010 letter to President Obama, Cardinal George, then-president of the Bishops' conference in the U.S. wrote, "We are pastors and teachers, not technical experts. We cannot map out the precise route to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, but we can offer moral direction and encouragement." The horribly destructive capacity of nuclear arms makes them disproportionate and indiscriminate weapons that endanger human life and dignity like no other armaments. Their use as a weapon of war is rejected in church teaching based on just war norms.

Although we cannot anticipate every step on the path humanity must walk, we can point with moral clarity to a destination that moves beyond deterrence to a world free of the nuclear threat. To achieve this goal, we must in the words of Pope Francis, acknowledge that now is the time to counter the logic of fear with the ethic of responsibility and so foster a climate of trust and sincere dialog. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. Senator Nunn.

SEN. NUNN: Thank you, E.J. I thought I was going to be the layman here this morning and joined by E.J. with the distinguished religious leaders we have here on the panel and Maryann and the bishop, but E.J. wrote an article in the paper this morning that was just loaded with biblical quotes.

(Laughter)

SEN. NUNN: So he has put me in a position of being the isolationist here, not being a religious or moral expert, but being keenly aware of how important the religious and moral aspects of this question are. As a matter of fact, from my point of view, the respected spiritual voice and the immense credibility of the Catholic Church and the Pope, as well as other religious leaders broadly speaking in the United States and around the world is important in my view. It's actually critical in reminding America and the world as to the moral side and ethical side of nuclear weapons policy.

And also, as the bishop just said the human stake. It's all about the human stake, the moral and the ethical. Those of us who are involved -- and I see a number of folks in the room like Daryl Kimball and others who are involved in this every day, and of course, Maryann here is extremely involved and has had tremendous influence -- those of us who are involved every day really need the help of the religious and moral leaders to make sure that the policy questions and discussions are not so abstract and arcane that they get divorced from the ethical and moral questions and the human questions. And also to get us to try to discuss these very important questions in terms that people can understand and people can understand the importance of.

Just a couple of minutes ago, Bishop Cantú quoted Cardinal George as stating -- I'll quote it again. "We cannot map out the precise route to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, but we can offer moral direction and encouragement." I totally agree and underscore that point. Breathing heart and soul into today's technology--particularly nuclear technology but not limited to nuclear technology--indeed may be our most difficult and most important challenge from a moral and ethical point of view and indeed from a policy point of view.

I think there are any number of questions in our period of technology where so many things are possible, but does that make them wise? We have to begin having this moral and ethical discussion almost as a condition precedent to policy makers being able to come to grips with the questions. And that's not limited to nuclear, but it's acutely involved in nuclear. So what about policy? No one can anticipate every step on the road to elimination of nuclear weapons.

But my experience in this arena -- and I'm certainly not a technical expert, but I have been engaged in policy for a long time -- tells me that the fundamental point of all nuclear weapon states, particularly the United States and Russia, if we are indeed serious about a vision of a world without nuclear weapons, must begin by deemphasizing the role of nuclear weapons and by making them less relevant in security planning and in forced deployments. That has all sorts of ramifications, but I think making nuclear weapons less relevant is absolutely essential as a very important psychological fundamental in terms of really moving, particularly our military leaders and political leaders responsible for security, around the world to reducing numbers.

Reducing numbers is not always the first and fundamental thing. There are a lot of other things that go with that, so that we can indeed reduce numbers, but the two things go together. You have to reduce the relevancy to be able to persuade others to reduce the numbers. In our 2007 *Wall Street Journal* article, George Shultz, Bill Perry, Henry Kissinger and I call for reversing reliance on nuclear weapons as a vital contribution to preventing their proliferation and ultimately ending them as a threat to the world. We outline several crucial steps in our actions that to us represent the fundamental policy pathway to achieve the vision of a world without nuclear weapons, and I'm just going to share a few of these in broad terms today.

First is taking all weapons off prompt-launch or what I call hair-trigger. And we have not made a lot of progress in that regard in the last few years. And Russia and the United States are the countries that are still in that posture where we basically have a matter of minutes, a matter of minutes to make decisions. I think it was Thomas Jefferson who once said when you're angry, count to ten and if you're *very* angry, count to a 100 before you speak. Well, how much does that apply to pulling the trigger on nuclear weapons? And warning time and survivability get into this equation very much, and taking weapons off of hair-trigger alert is enormously important for our own security and for Russia's security.

I don't want to go into great detail on this now, but we don't think about it. Even some of our military leaders don't think about it, although the more in-depth ones do. But we have an existential stake in the Russian warning systems working properly. We have an existential stake. If they don't work properly and if there is a false warning, the bombs will hit the United States. It's not much comfort to know that we can survive and retaliate because survival in a nuclear war, as Reagan and Gorbachev basically said, a nuclear war cannot be won and must not be fought.

That was a very important, I think, turning point in the way we should be thinking about nuclear weapons. So that's kind of number one on my list. I don't think these are necessarily in this order of priority, but they're all important.

Number two, securing weapons-usable nuclear material everywhere in the world. Weapons-usable nuclear material has to be secured. Countries that have huge arsenals

of nuclear weapons, including particularly the United States and Russia, are simply not going to make the kind of steps and the kind of cuts in their nuclear arsenals when they think other countries are going to build up as they build down. So this security of nuclear weapon material is all important, and it's also enormously important in preventing catastrophic nuclear terrorism.

We are in a new era now where the technology to make a crude nuclear weapon and the economics of affordability mean that nations no longer have a monopoly. Individuals and small groups have the access to technology and know-how and if we're not very careful with nuclear materials, that's the long pole in the tent for would-be nuclear terrorists -- getting the nuclear materials because those are not easy to manufacture. So securing nuclear weapons material all over the world is enormously important and it is the area where President Obama and his predecessor, President Bush -- particularly emphasized by President Obama -- have made the most progress.

We can have a lot of discouraging things coming out of this discussion probably this morning; it's inevitable in terms of the facts and the reality of what we face. But one bit of good news -- I think it's very good news, in the last 20 years, we've gone from 50 countries that had weapons-usable nuclear material to 25, from 50 to 25. So that is enormously important. It's what my organization focuses on more than any other feature, getting governments to secure nuclear material, weapons-usable nuclear material and getting rid of it, also getting rid of it over a period of time.

The third point is another one where we made some progress under George Herbert Walker Bush, but have not made much progress since mainly because in my view the Russians are not willing to play the game, which is eliminating short-range nuclear battlefield weapons designed to be forward-deployed in areas of tension and confrontation. When you deploy battlefield, tactical short-range nuclear weapons near the frontlines, as we did in NATO for many years, when you do that, it means your battlefield commanders, if a war breaks out, have to either use them or lose them or back them out of there very quickly because otherwise they'll be overrun. That was one of the things I spent the most time on my whole Senate career.

When I first went to Europe and found we had so many short-range battlefield nuclear weapons that had to be moved in any crisis or used in any crisis, it also means a lot less decision time because of the time urgency. We made big steps when Bush and Gorbachev basically decided to get rid of a lot of those tactical weapons, but we need to get rid of all of them. The bad news side is Pakistan is now developing the same type of posture that we had during the Cold War and Russia has become more reliant on battlefield tactical nuclear weapons. So number three is certainly uncompleted and a long way to go.

Number four, ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. I know there are people in this room who work on that all the time, and it's enormously important and

here the United States is the obstacle. We simply have not ratified it. Most other countries have, but until we do, it will not become a de jure principle for the world. It's de facto with a lot of countries, but not de jure, very important.

Number five, halting the production of fissile material globally for weapons purposes and phasing out the use of highly enriched uranium in civil commerce. There are legitimate civil uses for highly enriched uranium, but it's the most likely material to be used by terrorists, more likely than plutonium because it's not as dangerous to handle. And so we've got to phase that out. There are legitimate uses, but we are making some progress in that area.

Number six, the halting of fissile material for weapon purposes. Pakistan is the one who objects to that. Pakistan does not want to go into that. The other big nuclear powers are not any longer producing fissile material for military purposes. Of course, the downside of that is there's plenty available already. So they don't need to produce it. But Pakistan is continuing and they will not agree to that now.

The sixth thing is getting control of the fuel cycle. There are a lot of legitimate uses for civil nuclear power, and Bishop Cantú, your Catholic leaders have spoken to that subject, the legitimate uses. There are a lot of legitimate uses, but we have to get control of the fuel cycle. If you have one country after another that's producing highly enriched uranium through either reprocessing or through enrichment, we'll have Iran, Iran, Iran all over the world. We'll have a continuation of that.

So getting control of that fuel cycle is enormously important. My vision is that every country that produces nuclear weapons including the nuclear powers who have exempted themselves from a lot of this -- we're going way back in history -- have to be under some type of international camera monitoring. When you're producing material, though used for civil purposes legitimately, it could be used for nuclear purposes. The horrible dilemma, as most of you know, in the whole Non-Proliferation Treaty is that the technology by which you enrich to get low enriched uranium for nuclear fuel is the same technology if you go to a high level of enrichment that makes a nuclear weapon.

So it's what you call dual-use technology and therein lies the huge, huge challenge. On that point, I'll just mention that I attended in Kazakhstan about 2 weeks ago, an important step towards creating a fuel bank. We at NTI have worked on that for 10 years now. Warren Buffett put up \$50 million, allowed me to go to the IAEA and make the commitment that he would put up \$50 million if the world would match it 2:1, putting up a \$100 million, to create a fuel bank under the ownership of the International Atomic Energy Agency so we could basically begin psychologically to take away the reason, the legitimate reason for countries to feel they had to have their own enrichment process.

We think this is enormously important. Kazakhstan has agreed to be the host country.

That was the signing ceremony. It's going to take another two years to build the facility, but the money is there, about \$160 million, to buy the low enriched uranium and the idea is it's an insurance policy. The market plays first, but backing up the marketplace this fuel bank would be available if a country's in good standing under the Non-Proliferation Treaty. They'd come here and say we've been cut off in the marketplace because there's a thin market and we need this and we'll pay for it and replace it.

So we think that's one of the fundamental pillars of beginning a fuel cycle process internationally that inspires confidence and then allows the peaceful use of nuclear energy without having the terrible consequences. We'll see, but that's encouraging.

And I'm about to wind down, but the eighth point I would make and the very important point is redoubling our efforts to resolve regional conflicts that give rise to nuclear ambitions, like the Ukraine situation, like the Middle East situation. This is the most difficult. This is the most important because as countries begin to be willing to get rid of some nuclear weapons, if you have regional conflicts, it moves in the other direction. And we all have got to understand that. It's enormously important.

It's the most difficult, and since we wrote this article, I'd give the lowest score to this point in terms of the world, not the U.S. necessarily alone, but the whole world has got to bow down on this. And we've got example after example, and I guess my last two points continue to reduce the numbers of nuclear weapons. That's got to be led by the United States and Russia. We have 90 percent of them.

In spite of other countries having them, we have 90 percent of them, and that's why the Ukraine tragedy is such a blow to the kind of cooperation we need. That's got to take place in all states. It cannot just be the U.S. or Russia. Over a long haul, other states have to join in, but U.S. and Russia have to lead the way. Now we've done a good bit of that, but we have a long, long way to go and we still have all these weapons, as I mentioned, on hair-trigger alert, which is the wrong lesson for the rest of the world.

And then we've got to greatly strengthen verification and the will to enforce, and Iran is going to be a very big test of that. We have miles to go before we sleep. This whole list of fundamental steps combined with the vision that Schultz and Perry and Kissinger and I laid out is what I call the vision and the steps, and they go together. And to me, this is enormously important because without the vision of a world without nuclear weapons which is, of course, the Catholic Church's position, the actions will not be perceived as either urgent or fair. But without the actions, the steps, the vision will not be perceived as realistic or possible.

So these principles have to be married in my view. There are a lot of people even in the community who believe we got to get rid of all of nuclear weapons, who don't buy into the steps and the vision. They buy into the vision. There are a lot of people on the other side that buy into the steps, but not the vision. In my view, this is the essential point, the

two have to go together if we're going to really make progress, and we must.

Let me close -- and I know I've taken too long here. But let me close by talking about what the bishop referred to a minute ago and that is the human stakes. General Omar Bradley a long time ago after World War II, in fact, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, said in a speech and I quote him, "Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace. We know more about killing than we know about living," end quote.

Eric Schlosser who is a brilliant young man just wrote a book called *Command and Control*, and he points out what we're dealing with here that makes this different from any other weapon. And let me quote his book, "A hydrogen bomb, one hydrogen bomb is equivalent to all the explosives used in World War II, all of them including Hiroshima and Nagasaki multiplied by three." That's what we're talking about. That's the stakes involved.

The power of the atom in my view may be God's ultimate test of mankind. Our challenge is clear but awesome. Can we use nuclear technology to fight cancer, improve nutrition, purify blood, provide clean energy and a lot of other reasons, and other uses? Can we do all of that on the peaceful side without using this same technology to destroy God's creation? So pardon me for taking too much time. But I wanted to sort of lay those out.

(Applause)

MR. DIONNE: One of the things, Senator Nunn, I think, at the end he underscored something important, which is the goal of getting rid of nuclear weapons seems terribly abstract. And I think it should actually give us some hope that there are a series of quite practical steps we could actually take if we wanted to start down that road.

I also want to re-identify myself with Senator Nunn. He sort of said I'm the theologian on the panel because I happened to quote scripture this morning in my column. I just want to say, you know, first of all, he is a Methodist and those of you who knew him know Methodism know that Wesleyan theology has created this extraordinary linkage in Methodism between religious commitment and social and political responsibility. Secondly, Vatican II said that the church is the people of God. So we're all theologians.

(Laughter)

MR. DIONNE: However, some of us are more learned than others and that would include Professor Love so it's really great to have you speak next. So I'm re-identifying us as the lay folk, and you are the learned ones.

PROF. LOVE: Can I ask first, the folks in the back, there are seats in the front. So feel

free to come forward if you choose.

MR. DIONNE: It's like a catholic church. No one ever wants to sit in the front seat.

PROF. LOVE: Exactly. Nobody wants to sit in the front seat. But please, you're more than welcome if you'd like a seat, they're available for you.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you.

PROF. LOVE: Most of the very excited build-up to Pope Francis' visit next week, is because Pope Francis is identified with a number of things. People think of him in terms of his interest in people, his connection with people, his connection with the poor, and his care for the planet, and peace. But most people do not think of him in terms of nuclear weapons, and I think that they should. The Holy See has been vigorously engaged in trying to reframe the way we think about nuclear weapons and to put people first and the humanitarian effects of these weapons first, which has really changed the way these are seen.

And Pope Francis is also changed, as we've heard from Bishop Cantú, the church's policy towards nuclear weapons regarding deterrence. Sometimes that's lost in an American audience, particularly American journalists and the lead up to a presidential election. They are often trying to report on Francis in terms of almost like he has a political platform, and these are separate issue areas, you know. Where does he stand on these separate issue areas and how do they track with American politics?

And that's really the wrong way to see him, and it's not how he sees himself, how he sees his own mission. So if we think of the four P's, kind of the letter "P", that have been the hallmarks of Francis' papacy, a concern for people and the poor, concern for planet, and concern for peace. He sees these not as separate tracks or separate portions of a platform, but he sees them as deeply connected. These are all part of a common concern.

He says, it cannot be emphasized enough how everything is connected. To seek only a technical remedy to each problem which comes up is to separate what is in reality interconnected, and to mask the true and deepest problems of the system. So he sees nuclear weapons as deeply connected with these other issues, not just as a standalone, boutique issue to be concerned with on its own. For Pope Francis and the Catholic Church, these are symptoms of a larger problem when we forget who we are, where we come from and how we are connected to one another and the planet.

We are social beings, we are created for communion and community. We are a part of nature created in dignity and in worth, in relationships to each other. When those relationships break down, so does everything else. So global issues from nuclear weapons to poverty to environmental damage, these are symptoms of our breakdown, a

larger breakdown of our relationships with our own dignity, with each other, with nature and with God and instead when we worship the God of self, of technology and market above all else.

So bettering our relationships will help us to better our attention to this basket of issues, these four P's that Pope Francis is raising up. To me, I see Pope Francis as an antidote to the age of the selfie, a humble man in a selfie age and a man who's pointing out constantly how we need each other, how we are all in this together, how we are part of a common family, and we have a common home, and we have to work better together.

So he says that these technical attempts to stovepipe these issues and look at them separately, he says, "these will fail until we -- and this is his quote -- "break with the logic of violence, exploitation, and selfishness. We must break the globalization of indifference and instead globalize solidarity and care. We must overcome indifference."

So this is not only good from a religious or pastoral perspective. There is some real connection here between how you would organize or could reorganize the antinuclear movement, and something perhaps we could talk about more in the Q&A and in our discussion afterwards, but all the old ways of organizing are now breaking down in the new century in the 21st century. And Francis is really offering us ways in an age of decentralized social networks to rethink how we come together as community and how we can be together.

One example of how these issues are deeply connected. We are mourning the loss of one of our colleagues here, this year, and this Professor John Steinbruner from the University of Maryland, and I think I'm probably only on this dais because of John's passing. If probably he was here, he would be up here speaking to you today. And he spent his life talking about these connections between nuclear weapons and global climate change and environmental degradation.

And global climate change is leading many countries to try to develop nuclear energy, including a race in the Middle East, including Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Bahrain, Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Jordan, Egypt, Yemen, countries not necessarily known for political stability, democracy or human rights, that lead to lots of questions about how secure those nuclear materials and technologies, those dual-use technologies that Senator Sam Nunn was describing so ably, how secure they would be and whether or not they would be secure against proliferation for nuclear weapons.

So, really these are absolutely connected, these issues, and Francis is inviting us to look at them as connected and not as standalones. He's also inviting us to put people first in consideration of these issues. He looks at nuclear weapons not as a chess game among powerful states, but as the burden that these weapons place on the poor and on the planet.

The Holy See has not just been attending international meetings on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, they have been leading and helping to organize,

they've been a real force for trying to bring people together around, putting a human face on these issues. Pope Francis says, "We've become indifferent to these large stockpiles of nuclear weapons." How is it that we could be morally indifferent to this moral scandal, and he's trying to poke our consciences, to poke our indifference and get through that.

And he says that we need to remember the human face and his message on the anniversaries of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He's inviting us all to see the face of the hibakusha, the Japanese victims and survivors of the atomic attacks. But he's also inviting us to look at the human face of the people who have been hurt, their health has been hurt in nuclear testing, their health has been hurt as they've been downwind of nuclear sites and also the ways in which the diversion of money to pay for our nuclear arsenals is, in his word, "theft from the poor."

Now, in saying that and connecting that, the way in which the money used for our nuclear arsenals is taking money away from the poor, he's not only, as Bishop Cantú pointed out, following in a long line of popes who have made this connection that our priorities are off and we're spending money on these weapons that we say we'll never use while we're not feeding people who are starving today. That's a misplaced priority. He's not only pointing that out, because he's in this long line of popes who have said similar things, he's pointing that out because he comes from Argentina.

And Argentina was a country that worked to develop a nuclear weapons program that had started along this path towards developing nuclear weapons, and in essence, came to its senses, stopped its nuclear weapons program and turned the corner. And that was very controversial when they were developing this nuclear weapons program because obviously there are many, many poor people in Argentina. So when people were literally not having enough food to eat, to put on their table, some estimate say 30 percent of the population of Argentina is living below the poverty line, in the 1980s and 1970s, they were diverting money towards exploring nuclear weapons.

So this is not only just kind of something on paper for Francis, this is something very much from the heart and from his own personal experience. The last thing I'll say is that Pope Francis has changed the church's teaching on nuclear deterrence, and sometimes it's hard to understand that because the church often doesn't talk about change very comfortably or in a way that can be easily understood by outsiders.

So here, perhaps as a lay person, as an academic, as an educator, I might be in a better position to say, yes, the church policy actually has changed and it is actually a big deal. And this is because the church always wants to say, you know, we are continuing forward the gospel message of unchanging truths. And certainly that, of course, is true. But how that truth is applied or interpreted can change according to the era.

And I want to quote here now Saint John XXIII, when he was talking about Vatican II, probably the most visible change in the last century when we could look and see, well, things have really changed, the priests aren't putting their back to us and now we're speaking in English at the mass and things like that. But Pope John -- now Saint John XXIII said, it is not that anything has changed with Vatican II, okay. It is that we have

begun to understand the gospel better. Those who have lived as long as I have, Saint John XXIII, were unable to compare different cultures and traditions and to know that the moment has come to discern the signs of the times, to seize the opportunity and look far ahead.

This is what Francis is doing when he's saying that nuclear deterrence and the threat of mutually assured destruction cannot be the basis for a secured peace, that now is the time to counter the logic of fear with the logic of solidarity. He is resuscitating that view of the sign of the times, identifying himself as a son of Vatican II, saying we need to be looking at these signs of the times, interpreting the gospel in the light of these times and coming up with answers that make better sense for our age and our century.

I'll close there, but I will say this leaves some huge pastoral questions for 25 percent of the U.S. military that are Catholics to have this policy change away from nuclear deterrence, and that may be something we can talk about in Q&A. But thank you for your time.

MR. DIONNE: I just want to underscore three things Professor Love said on your point about change. We all know that every time the Catholic Church changes its view of something, the statement begins as the church has always taught, comma.

(Laughter)

BISHOP CANTÚ: Of course.

MR. DIONNE: And the second thing is I want to play right into Professor Love's view of journalist because when you said the pope's priorities were the people, the poor, the planet, and peace, my first reaction was, what a wonderful 30-second ad that would make. But I just thought that was a wonderful summary. The last thing is you said "a humble man in the age of the selfie," which is a great line and will probably go viral when someone takes a selfie or him or herself with the Pope and puts it on as the caption.

I'm going to begin by asking a question on this subject that has always befuddled me and maybe it's befuddled others and at least you can help me and perhaps others, which is, it does seem to me that one of the miracles since 1945 is that we didn't have a big nuclear war. I share the church's view of human nature as flawed. One of my favorite lines attributed to Niebuhr, original sin is the only empirically verifiable doctrine of the Christian church. And when you look back on it, it is really extraordinary that after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, we didn't do this. There were moments when we counted to 10, as the senator suggested, or counted to 100, but we didn't go there.

The Cuban missile crisis is, you know, probably a singular example of how we really steered away from catastrophe, which leads one to believe that mutually assured destruction is at some level a theoretically ridiculous doctrine, because as the bishop said, I believe it was, you have to contemplate the use of these weapons and be really

serious about using them if the doctrine is going to work and yet as a practical matter, the doctrine works.

So, I guess I have two questions here. One is given that this system worked, why back away from it, but the second question, which I think is where all of you may go and perhaps particularly Senator Nunn, is that doctrine may have worked better in a essentially bipolar world and that even if you sort of take the view that "mutually assured destruction worked," it may not work for the next 50 years.

Maybe if you can just go down the panel, I have a couple of few other questions and I want to open it to the audience and Father, if you will open the questioning, I'd be grateful.

BISHOP CANTÚ: I would say that I think people realized that leaders and people in general that what Pope Benedict mentioned that with a nuclear war even though it's argued whether the bombings in Japan ended the war, that with more powerful bombs that have been created, that there really is not a winner in a nuclear war, and I think that that was, although it wasn't probably spoken as perhaps as clearly as the church has, it was understood, and so it seems to me that may be part of the reason why after 1945 there was no use of nuclear weapons. But I think you're right, it was a bipolar world. Now we have, as Dr. Love mentioned, a lot of actors, smaller actors with questionable character.

MR. DIONNE: Senator Nunn?

SEN. NUNN: Well, a couple of observations. One is that we did have a bipolar world in those periods and even though Britain and France had nuclear weapons, it was very clear they weren't going to use them without the U.S. being part of it, unless they have an existential threat to their own countries in which case -- it was interesting the French, first time I went NATO, the French nuclear posture, they had mostly short range of weapons. So their nuclear doctrine when you scratch very deep on it was if the Russian Soviets invaded, their weapons were going to -- basically most of them, 70 percent or 80 percent of them were going to fall on Germany. So the French doctrine was basic, if the Soviet's invade, we'd blow up Germany.

Then they, of course, got longer range weapons, but there's a huge difference, point one, between two nations, primarily Soviet Union and United States deterring each other and non-nations, which we now have and growing, having nuclear weapons. So that's kind of point one. That's a big, big difference. How do you deter everybody? I mean deterrence becomes a nightmare.

The second one, I mentioned already, but if we're in a new era with technology and with economics. It used to be that nations thought, and Eisenhower thought this, that we had a monopoly on making nuclear weapons. The Manhattan project was huge; there was no small group of people that could have undertaken the Manhattan project. We're in a different era now; technology is all over the place. And so what may have worked -- and I think it did work during the Cold War -- what may have worked during the Cold

War in my view cannot be projected to work for the next 50 years. I think that's the second thing.

And the third thing is that we basically have to understand that we were professional, we and the Soviets were professional, we were sober about the nuclear Armageddon that faced us if we had any kind of a real nuclear war or if a conventional war escalated up to a nuclear war. And so we had great professionals on both sides, tremendous tribute to our militaries, but we're also very lucky. I think God protected us. We had a number of instances in the *Command and Control* book that Eric just wrote, which point this out. How many times did we come close to nuclear war, and we've come close a couple of times on false warnings. And since the Cold War was over, we've come close. And that's where the hair-trigger approach comes in. So those are all reasons why we are in a different era now than we were.

MR. DIONNE: Professor Love?

PROF. LOVE: I want to come in on that last point and underscore it. It was really luck of the draw, you know, that we didn't end up in a nuclear situation because of how close we've come in many circumstances. And that really, I think, undermines this idea that the nuclear weapons are what made us safe during the Cold War. There are lots of reasons that we didn't have war between the U.S. and Soviet Union, and wider spread war. And I won't bore you with a lot of academic research, but one is that great power was very, very rare. So it wouldn't have been expected anyway.

Through the century, we've seen the increase of the number of democracies who don't fight with one another. We've seen the expansion of trade and economic relations which lessens the possibilities for war. So there've been lots of things that have been lessening the possibility of war. It's not necessarily nuclear weapons that are responsible for that peace, though it includes the establishment of international institutions and some very hard treaties that created verification measures, that created better trust that helped the U.S. and the Soviet Union walk down from these high level numbers of 66,000 nuclear weapons at the height of the Cold War to lesser numbers.

I think all of those were much, much more responsible for the peace that we experienced. And when you realize that the closest we came to war was caused by nuclear weapons. So there is a real selective cherry-picking of pointing to the Cuban missile crisis and saying, 'look how nuclear weapons saved us there' from the brink of nuclear exchange. The whole reason we were engaged in a conflict with the Soviets was over the nuclear weapons. Gulf War I, Gulf War II, absolute historical amnesia, you know, that we entered these wars because of the threat of Saddam Hussein gathering weapons of mass destruction.

So, there is a lot of cherry-picking of data among people who say the nuclear weapons kept us safe, do we really want to get rid of nuclear deterrence, that I would just caution you about that. That's a slogan; it's not necessarily a very historically accurate diagnosis of what has occurred. But what Senator Nunn and Bishop Cantú said that going forward, it's a whole different landscape, that's absolutely correct.

SEN. NUNN: Warren Buffett has a great way of thinking. He's a reinsurance guy and, of course, he's funding us so I'm biased toward what he says, but he says --

MR. DIONNE: An honest man in Washington, this is very admirable.

(Laughter)

SEN. NUNN: He says, it was a pretty good way to think about how we view or at least how I view our mission. He says, if there is a 10 percent chance of a nuclear explosion in a given year and you project that forward for 50 years, over that 50-year period, there is only one half of 1 percent chance statistically of avoidance. But if you can reduce that chance from 10 percent in any given year hypothetically to 1 percent, project that over 50 years, there is a 67.5 percent chance of avoidance. So, we're not talking about guarantees in this business. We're talking about dramatic opportunities for risk reduction. And I think that's our obligation.

MR. DIONNE: When Senator Nunn writes a book called, "Reinsurance as the Key to Disarmament," well, now he's really tied in with Warren Buffett.

(Laughter)

MR. DIONNE: I wanted to ask a historical question to Senator Nunn, and a very specifically Catholic question to Professor Love and Bishop Cantú. The historical question is about Ronald Reagan, and you were in the Congress in those years -- and maybe this is inspired from watching my television set last night and seeing Reagan's Air Force I, for 3 hours, but it's actually something -- I think it's a really interesting historical question, which is Reagan is generally known as the architect of the arms buildup starting in 1981 and to some degree, that's true and yet it always struck me that in some ways the key to ending the Cold War was the moment when President Reagan, if you'll forgive me, joined the peace movement, you know, which is to say that the extraordinary encounter with Gorbachev at Reykjavik and the sense that Reagan had -- there were lot of people on his side of politics, and some people on the other side of politics didn't know that something was different about Gorbachev, something different was happening with the Soviet Union.

And he really went out on a lot of limbs in that period, which to me was historically important because it also really complicated the position of Kremlin hardliners if Ronald Reagan was willing to go here, their arguments internally were going to be less forceful. I'd love you to talk about that Reagan experience, what it looked like to you at the time and what you thought about since.

And then to Bishop Cantú and Professor Love, and both of you underscored this, but it's a real problem, I think, or a challenge to lay Catholics, when you take the teachings of just war, discrimination proportionality and probability of success, nuclear weapons simply cannot possibly pass those tests, period.

It's where the Catholic bishops here ended up in 1983. Yet I think, most of us -- you

know, Catholics are obviously, most of us probably to save ourselves from great distress, don't think about this question day-to-day, but at some level, I don't think most of us realize how deeply at odds with Catholic teaching our assumptions about this are, the policies of our government are. And so I'd love you to talk about that. So if I could have Senator Nunn reflect a bit historically and then both of you help us on the challenge for Catholics in a nuclear age.

SEN. NUNN: Well, I came into the movie, so to speak, when I was 23-years old and I went to Europe on a NATO trip and it happened to be -- I was working with the House Armed Services Committee, been there a short time, and I happened to be there during the Cuban missile crisis. And all the people I was with were 20 years older, they were staff people, Appropriations, Authorization, they were all cleared top-secret, I was too. So we got briefed the whole time. And I saw how close we came to a nuclear war. So that was where I came into the movie.

When Reagan came in office, he came in with a dedicated principle of basically spending whatever it took to build up the United States defenses, because we'd gone through Vietnam. Although the buildup started under President Carter, it was not visible politically that it had started under him. It did start under President Carter in 1978. Reagan greatly accelerated it, poured huge amounts of money into it, built up his credibility, a huge credibility with particularly more conservative elements in the country, but also with conservative Democrats, not just Republican, in terms of being willing to do whatever it took to have a strong America face down the threat from the Soviet Union.

And so I was in his camp on a lot of that, but I wasn't in his camp on the rate of expenditure, because I knew just from experience we couldn't increase the defense budget 15 percent a year without throwing a lot of it in just waste. So I came from the point of view of waste, but not against him because of the buildup, I did think -- we had to strengthen conventional. My obsession was strengthening the conventional side, so we didn't have to rely on the early use of nuclear weapons and on battlefield weapons, which we were relying on. It was the United States at that stage and NATO, and Americans never completely realized this and still don't historically. We were the ones who were going to use nuclear weapons first.

We had a declared policy of first use. If they mobilized tanks, we couldn't stop them conventionally because they had outnumbered tanks, artillery tubes, planes and so forth, they being at Warsaw Pact. So we didn't -- we were going to use nuclear weapons first. And the tactical battlefield nuclear weapons were introduced at the request of our military leaders because we wanted to deter the immobilizing of tanks.

Guess what, history has flipped now. The Russians are now using that reason. They think they're outnumbered, they think they lost their ally, they think this, that and the other. So we're seeing them move more towards that reason. So making a long story

short, I wasn't obsessed with moving away from the nuclear trigger, the hair-trigger with battlefield nuclear weapons, therefore conventional defenses.

So when Reagan wanted to get rid of all nuclear weapons, which he and Gorbachev talked about, I made a speech on the floor of the Senate, saying, that's a wonderful vision, I agree with the vision, but we, first of all, have to do something about the conventional disparities. We can't leave our conventional forces in a situation where we can't defend Berlin, we can't defend the battle line, we can't defend Europe without nuclear weapons, and we're going to get rid of all of them.

So I wasn't tuned in to the Reagan view at that stage, but I have said a number of times since then, particularly with George Schultz, I thought Reagan's view was correct in the long run, but he got the sequence wrong in my view. And that didn't happen, so we won't be able to debate that and prove it, but when he and Gorbachev basically said, nuclear war cannot be won and must not be fought, that was a game changer. Because you had a conservative Republican who had blue-ribbon credentials on the defense field, telling a lot of his constituents as well as a lot of military people out there, forget this business of actually first use -- he didn't -- Reagan didn't talk about first use.

I don't think he completely realized -- most presidents don't -- how quickly the battlefield commanders were going to ask for authority to use those weapons. I don't think any president really fully understood that. But he did understand you couldn't invite a nuclear war, and when he said that it made a big difference. Now, memories are fading, and I think we're going back, if you look at the debates and you see what's happened in the -- completely anti-Russian view here, Russians always give you a good reason to be anti-Russian, but nevertheless, people don't realize, how U.S. and Russia have existential stakes in cooperation as I said a few minutes ago on warning systems.

So we have evolved and Reagan was a breakthrough, but if we don't do something about public opinion and understanding out there, we will revert to the view that was there before. So historically, it's important we recognize what happened and how important it was and if a Democratic president had said exactly what Reagan said, that he'd been cutting the defense budget, it would have been received in a totally different perspective, totally different.

MR. DIONNE: Yeah, that's true. Please, Bishop, on Catholics and what the church teaches, because I think it's a very difficult problem.

BISHOP CANTÚ: Sure. Well, yeah, absolutely. What I would say is that interestingly, I don't know if it's a particularly American phenomenon that we tend to compartmentalize different parts of our lives, and particularly religion. And so when it's expedient for us in our politics, we'll drag it out and say, you know, it belongs in the public square. When it's not expedient to us, we say, leave it at home. And so, I hear that all the time whenever I make statements. The same people who tell me to speak up

on a certain issue tell me to be quiet on other issues.

MR. DIONNE: Funny, that is.

(Laughter)

BISHOP CANTÚ: It's interesting, and so I think we have this ability to whenever we hear statements from our church that go against our politics, we will shelve it. We'll say, oh, that comes from the bishops, what do they know about real life. And you know, they live in the sacristy and so I think we compartmentalize in that sense. My frustration as a pastor and trying to bring the vision of the dignity of the human person, of society, of the common good into the public square is particularly encountering a secularized constituent, that rather than judging their politics through the lens of their faith, judges their faith through the lens of their politics, and I think that's the fundamental difficulty.

MR. DIONNE: Glad you say that -- there is a great C.S. Lewis line that I'm only going to paraphrase where he said, "we do not look to gospel for enlightenment of our politics, we ransack the gospel for support for our own political party." And bless me, Father, for I have sinned. I am sure I have done the same myself, but it is -- I think it's a remarkable problem that we've got. Professor?

PROF. LOVE: I think you're right when you say people don't like to think about these issues and that people compartmentalize their religion with -- thinking about these issues, and I think that's because these issues make people feel helpless and hopeless. And whether it's nuclear weapons, whether it's climate change, the connections between these, they feel that they're bigger than they are, they can't do anything about them, that it's impossible to change. And that ideology of deterrence and that ideology of political realism says the same thing. You know, this is the best you can hope for, a standoff, an armed standoff. That's the best you can do, and people feel helpless and hopeless about that. That is an ideology that is fundamentally at odds with our Christian DNA of hope.

And that's what Pope Francis is trying to get us to do, to reclaim our own agency, the idea that change is possible. We are created in the image and likeness of God, we have an ability to impact these things, not alone, but together, step-by-step, and he's inviting us out of that trap of a feeling of helplessness and hopelessness, that we can't confront these issues or address these issues, because they're bigger than we are and saying, it's not bigger than we are, not bigger than we are when we're working together towards the same goal. And I think that's really where he's trying to light a fire under us, you know.

MR. DIONNE: I think I want to put a poster of Professor Love at my office over the word "hope".

(Laughter)

MR. DIONNE: I think they've already been designed, so it wouldn't be very difficult. Father Drew? Do we have mic or -- yeah, hold on for the mic. We got mics on either sides, so please -- there we go. And if you could identify yourself when you speak.

FR. CHRISTIANSEN: Father Drew Christiansen from Georgetown University. And it's good to have a colleague from the Berkley Center as moderator to recognize me. Quick comment on mobilizing Catholics. There are two places I think we have to work and the first is on seminary education where Catholic social teaching is seldom taught.

And secondly is the expansion or reinstitution of social action offices and dioceses, many of which have been shut because of financial constraints.

So I think enabling Catholics to do things requires those internal changes. The question for the panel is: the nonproliferation treaty review in May collapsed. The NPT has been the primary international instrument for controlling proliferation. But it has been eroding over recent years. Is it reparable? And if not, what are we going to replace it with?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. May I say, Amen, to your first comment by way.

FR. CHRISTIANSEN: Thanks.

MR. DIONNE: But I'll leave it to the panel on the rest. Go ahead.

BISHOP CANTÚ: Well, I appreciate your comment about the mobilization of Catholics and the beginning at the seminaries. And thinking about my own seminary experience, I was -- along with my classmates were always complaining about how long the formation was, nine years. Is it ever going to end?

MR. DIONNE: Kind of like that debate last night.

(Laughter)

BISHOP CANTÚ: That's true. But although, there were some substance in the formation of the nine years.

(Laughter)

BISHOP CANTÚ: But I didn't say that out loud. The experience I had as far as moral theology, the social teachings of the church, there was one professor in our seminary who concentrated on the moral teachings of the church.

And so it sort of depends on what that professor's concentration is. He or she may have a strength or a weakness in the social teachings. But the teachings have certainly been

strengthened over the past 50 years. My training was 25 years ago. So there's a lot there in the pontificate of John Paul, of the last three pontificates. So I'd be happy to share your suggestion with those who take a look at seminary formation.

But -- and even beyond that -- but I agree. I think dealing with my own priest in my dioceses sometimes I wonder if they slept through an entire semester or year of certain topics in seminary. But I'll take your comments to your heart.

MR. DIONNE: Could I just underscore Father Drew's point. I have the great honor and joy of teaching, one of the class I teach at Georgetown is on religion and American politics. And I've had a number of students come up to me and say they really didn't discover Catholic social teaching until they got to Georgetown. And that's, you know, God bless Georgetown for what it does, but that's the problem I think.

And they were very excited when they discovered it. They thought that's a really cool thing about the church. I think its value is not just that it's important that everybody understand that, but an awful lot of people find it an extraordinarily attractive aspect of Roman Catholicism. Anyway, I'm sorry this -- I'm supporting an ad for your position.

Senator Nunn, well, you can talk about seminary formation, but you might want to talk about the second.

PROF. LOVE: NPT.

MR. NUNN: Yeah. No, I'm not -- I don't spell my name correctly to give advice in internal policy. But on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, this regional conflict thing is huge. And we've got to come to grips with that and we've got to come to grips the Non-Proliferation Treaty has been wonderful and it's not replaceable in my view. I think if you start it all over it would take us 20, 30 years to get that, particularly in today's world.

But I think we have to all understand that a world without nuclear weapons is not simply today's world subtracting nuclear weapons. Today's world is extremely troubled and we've got to address these problems. One of the things that's most desperately need right now is communication with the Russians. We've got to deal with the cards that are dealt and Putin is the leader and Putin is the decision maker. And we've got to communicate with him.

I mean to take the position that we are not and that's -- some people in administration are taking that. We should not communicate with him, for instance on Syria, for instance on accidents that could grow out of confrontation over Ukraine -- is to me counterproductive to our own security interest.

We basically -- NATO for instance, the NATO military council with Russia. It was set

up for communications on PNP's time as well as for a crisis. Well guess what, when they invaded Georgia what do we do? We said we're not going to meet. We're NATO, we said we won't meet, we won't talk.

And when they invaded Ukraine the NATO Council didn't meet. Now, how intelligent is that? I mean I think it's what we call in the south d-u-m, dumb. It doesn't make sense. You've got to talk to people in a crisis, particularly when that other country, basically even though it would be at the expense of their own country because we certainly can survive enough to deter or respond.

But we have an existential stake in dealing with Russia. And the two of us together can destroy God's universe or make it uninhabitable. And so we have to communicate. The next opportunity is next week with President Obama and Putin and the U.N. I mean one thing that everybody in this audience can do to an extent is say for goodness sake talk, talk. He is the leader of Russia right now. I mean there are lot of things we don't like about it.

But right now we are poisoning the atmosphere in both our country and Russia. They are doing it more than we are. So that even if a leader decides yeah, we got to meet, we got to talk and so forth, the underlying trust between U.S. and Russian populations has been severely eroded. I have the former foreign minister of Russia is on our board, Igor Ivanov, very constructive guy. He's Lavrov's mentor. And I'll see him in about two weeks. But he has just written an op-ed that he sent me, in the *Moscow News* pleading with Putin and Obama to meet and talk.

Syria is a dangerous place, we all know that. Look at the refugee problem. They need to talk about that. ISIL is of course a threat to Russia as well as the United States. We have so many common interests that we've got to talk. The way I express it is we're in a race between cooperation and catastrophe.

And I think the one thing we can do, we don't have to get into all the details to insist that our leaders at least communicate and not use the isolation of another leader who is on a different wavelength from us, and Putin certainly is, as punishment. Isolation is in my view not punishment, effective punishment, particularly when the country is one that can destroy your own country in the next 45 minutes.

MR. DIONNE: Have you noticed that Senator Nunn talks in book titles, cooperation or catastrophe? That's your next one.

(Laughter)

MR. DIONNE: Professor Love, did you want to take this one?

PROF. LOVE: Yeah, I think the last part is I think this is what Pope Francis is trying to

raise up when he says his plan for peace is dialogue, dialogue, dialogue. There is no person with whom we can't have dialogue, no matter how diametrically opposed your view points are. He's trying to spread that message anywhere he can, he's trying to mirror that with his own actions to show.

Precisely that what you said, in an era of globalization isolation is not an option, you know. And from a religious perspective it's not an option because we're all part of a common human family. So get over it. It's hard, it's difficult. I think often dialogue is undermined, people think, well that's just talk, it's cheap talk.

And what Francis is talking about and what you are talking about is not cheap talk, it's hard. It's hard to sit down with somebody with whom you have very difficult disagreements, it's hard to sit down with people who have blood on their hands, but that's where you make peace. You don't get to sit down with Mahatma Gandhi and Mother Teresa to make peace.

(Laughter)

PROF. LOVE: You sit down with war lords and dictators and people with blood on their hands and you try to hammer something out. It takes courage to do that.

MR. NUNN: And we need military to military discussions right now. I mean we could have another shoot down of an air plane in the Ukrainian area easily, passenger plane, suspicion flights flying all over the place on both sides, no real coordination on it. Syria, another example, Russia is escalating that position in Syria. What does that mean? We got to talk. Military to Military.

The presidents have to bless the military to military. If you scratch very deep, you'd find that the Russian military leaders right now and I know the U.S. military leaders know they need to talk, but they're not doing it, not to any depth.

MR. DIONNE: This gentleman is the next hand I saw right on the aisle there, and then the lady over here. Actually, why don't I take first one and then the other, so you both can come in? We're sort of running out of time. We still got some time left, go ahead.

MR. KIMBALL: Thanks much. I'm Daryl Kimball with the Arms Control Association. Thanks for your comments. I want to ask a question that has us look forward a little bit. And I wanted to ask Professor Love and Bishop Cantú about a couple things you said. Professor Love said, dialogue is key, you know, part of the message. And in the nuclear -- on the nuclear issue today, one of the problems is a lack of dialogue, not just between U.S. and Russia, but amongst some of the nations that your comment was an example.

And Bishop Cantú you talked about at the very beginning your experience in Hiroshima a month ago and how motivating and eye opening it is to see the effects, the human

effects of nuclear weapons.

Next year, the G7 will meet in Hiroshima. President Obama will be in Hiroshima because he's a G7 leader. I went there last month I was reminded by the Japanese foreign ministry officials that the foreign minister of Japan has invited not just the G7 leaders but other world leaders to visit Hiroshima in part to witness and hear about the hibakusha experience, and to see the effects from the nuclear weapons.

Looking forward, what opportunities are there for President Obama, other nuclear armed states and leaders to engage in a dialogue to bridge some of these gaps? I see that as one opportunity. And how do you anticipate the conversation might go over the next few days on these issues as the Pope addresses the Congress, the President, the U.N.?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. And now, lady over here and then you can take them all.

PROF. GALLAGHER: Sure. I'm Nancy Gallagher from the Maryland School of Public Policy and also a longtime colleague of John Steinbruner's. And I want to ask a question that I think he would ask if he was here, which is the relationship about moral complexity and how people think about nuclear weapons?

You've all basically talked about how people have strongly held moral beliefs that sometimes they apply to important public policy issues like moral -- or like nuclear weapons and other times they let their politics trump. And I'm going to suggest that maybe that's not always what happens with nuclear weapons, there's a lot of moral complexity involved. And that for a long time we used the doctrine of mutual assured destruction or the idea that we had the policy of mutually assured destruction as a way of dealing with the moral complexity.

And part of what Professor Love said that was so important is that the church has now stepped away from the idea that deterrence is conditionally acceptable under current circumstances.

But we never actually had the doctrine of mutually assured destruction. For maybe two years total, it was sort of official U.S. policy. But as Senator Nunn said for the vast majority of our history we were prepared to use nuclear weapons first. We talked about mutual assured destruction because that helped with our moral complexity. But that was neither our targeting doctrine nor actually the instructions that were being given to our leadership internally.

The thing that you didn't talk about very much or where I think moral complexity is extremely important today is the issue of Iran. And in John's final years when he had to be very, very careful about what he spent his energy on, I would say that the issue of Iran and nuclear weapons was top of the list. And his idea really was that if you can get people thinking and talking both across religious lines between the United States and

Iran, but also in the United States about how their moral beliefs apply to these really important problems that become highly politicized, you can have a more thoughtful discussion.

So what we found is that when we asked Americans about the Iran situation before the recent time period there was no religious difference between evangelical Christians and Catholics and people who had no religious beliefs in terms of their support for diplomacy versus a more coercive approach to Iran.

After the nuclear deal was done, when we went and asked questions again, very sharp polarization between Republicans and Democrats, on that Republican support dropped way down and evangelicals went from being as supportive of dialogue and diplomacy as everybody else was to being sharply against it.

And so I want each of you to speak to that a little bit. Because each of you said in different ways something that I think gets at the moral complexity involved in this case.

Bishop Cantú, you said something about, you know, dealing with countries with questionable moral character, right? And I think that's part of why so many people are very uncomfortable. Even when they ultimately come around to supporting the nuclear deal, they're still very uncomfortable about it.

And Senator Nunn, you know, you talked about the importance of showing that we're going to have really, really strict enforcement, and the world is united on that. But you didn't talk about the other half of that, which is also providing meaningful reassurance and working with Congress to make sure that the Iranians believe that if they do strictly comply with the terms of the agreement, that they'll actually get the sanctions relief that they've been promised.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. Let me do this, I think we have actually hit the time when we're supposed to end. If somebody -- look into your conscience, if you have a very burning question that must be put on the table, raise your hand which I will include in this last batch.

All right, the gentleman here has a burning question. And then you can take them all.

SPEAKER: It's an extension of the statement that was just made.

MR. DIONNE: Okay. If you can be brief that would be great.

SPEAKER: It's an extension of the question that was just raised. Do we have allies in other major religions in the world?

MR. DIONNE: Wow, thank you. That was perfect. Why don't I go down the line in

reverse order to the way we started, I guess. Or well, let me just do it, it will be geographically easier. Senator Nunn, Professor Love and then the bishop.

MR. NUNN: Well, first question is John would be very proud of your articulation of both the dilemma and the question and the history there. And John was very much a part of the intellectual side of the Nunn-Lugar program way back. He played a valuable role, so we miss him very much.

In terms of the Iran agreement, I think the big question is I think we're buying time. We're buying 10 or 15 years. And 10 or 15 years in today's world is a huge benefit. There are no guarantees what happens after 10 or 15 years, I think without any doubt. And Senator Lugar and I wrote an op-ed to this effect.

If you ask these questions, what does it do to the possibility in the next 10 or 15 years of Iran getting a nuclear weapon, I think it vastly diminishes the prospect that they'll get a nuclear weapon compared to the status quo or doing nothing.

You know, the second question is what are the risks of the agreement, if we go into it? The big risk is as the critics point out, \$100 billion one way or the other is going to be freed up. But the critics' big assumption is if we don't, if we reject the agreement, that \$100 billion is never going to go to Iran, that's just a false assumption.

U.S. can't lead the way of its five years of negotiation, pull out and reject the agreement we helped negotiate and then expect our allies to continue the sanctions. They aren't going to do it. So the sanctions are not going to continue and Iran's going to have relief either way.

The third question, what is the downside of not going forward with the agreement after we've led the way on it? Huge downside of not going forward with it because the next time America tries to mobilize allies for sanctions to avoid war and basically achieve a goal, guess what, we're going to look around and nobody's going to be following us. So the downside risk is huge.

And I think the way I hear the critics out there without naming anyone in particular, they're basically saying the agreement is stupid, it's terrible, it's the worst agreement ever made, it's treasonous, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. But when you say, what is the alternative, you get a blank. What is the alternative?

Do we think everybody is going to salute Uncle Sam and say, hey, yeah, you led us toward the agreement, you negotiated the agreement, now you've rejected it, we're going to get behind you again. That won't happen, it won't happen. So that's my view on that.

I would say on the other question, a very good question, what about other religions? I

think the Catholic Church probably more than any institution in the world without any doubt, more than any institution, can build bridges to the Protestant, to Jewish, to Muslim, but also to orthodox, to the orthodox leaders in Russia which is enormously important.

United States and Russia have to move together. You know, whether you think we ought to move unilaterally or not, politically it's not going to happen. We're going to have to move with Russia. And that requires Russian people to have different views. The Russian leadership, the Orthodox Church, where they were suppressed of course during the whole Cold War, not as much now, not as much now.

And so I think bridges through the pope and the Vatican to the Orthodox Church and to other religions on these questions, of course, I'm sure a lot of others, is enormously important. So I -- that would be my answer to your question. It's enormously important.

And religion for better or worse in recent years, with extremism has been for the worse. It has a huge effect on the world. And we got to make it for the better.

MR. DIONNE: Professor Love?

PROF. LOVE: The question on you know, what opportunities are there with the G7 meeting in Hiroshima and what Obama might do or others, I think there are real opportunities. You know, obviously the President will be leaving office, will be looking for legacy moments. The opportunity to make some unilateral reductions is there.

The Obama administration across a number of different issue areas has said, let's think in the frame of gift baskets. When we get together, what gift are you going to bring to your host? And of course, gifts have to be reciprocated. So what other gifts are you going to bring? So it's a very wonderful and ingenious way to think about bundling a series of things and encouraging others to meet that benchmark. So I think we might see something like that.

A key thing would be what happens with the nuclear security summits that the administration started and that are not scheduled to be continued after 2016. Those are a real landmark towards what Senator Nunn mentioned, of trying to safeguard fissile material across a variety of use areas, which really needs to be done. And I hope that that is continued. So that's a real opportunity going forward.

In terms of relations with other religions, the Iran deal and moral complexity, I think that John's work in having us work with the Iranians and have these delegations with the Iranians, which we've done at Catholic University, we've had a series of Abrahamic dialogues with Cardinal McCarrick and others, is so key.

And that's where you get to build relationships. And that's what Pope Francis is talking

about. Peace is about building relationships. And if we don't do that hard work of building relationships, we're in a very fragile and precarious world. We need to build relationships with the Iranians, we need to build deeper relationships with the Russians, we need to build relationships across religious communities. And that's something all of us can do, not just governments that can make us have a much more open attitude towards different agreements and towards reaching progress.

MR. DIONNE: Bishop?

BISHOP CANTÚ: Thank you. Thinking about my visit to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, you can't go there and not ponder the deep questions of what it means to be human. And so I think leaders will do that. And I think that the media will force them to ponder those questions of possible destruction of nations, of civilization, of humanity.

So thank you Dr. Love for your suggestions. I think that there's some tremendous possibilities there. The last two questions I want to join together with regard to do we have any allies in other religions?

And the example of Dr. Steinbruner who was able to broker really a landmark dialogue of the Catholic bishops in the U.S. with the theological leaders in Iran. And Dr. Kalaki (phonetic) from our office went with my predecessor Bishop Pates to Iran to have a theological dialogue on nuclear proliferation.

And there was an agreement. And an agreement signed theologically that this is immoral and we cannot stand theologically behind the proliferation of nuclear weapons. And in a theocracy, that's significant.

Now, how do you get from that theory in theology to policy? I'll leave that -- that's beyond my pay grade in politics. But I think that's a significant, significant step. And so we do have some tremendous allies.

And so we as the church, as the Catholic Church, we will continue to build those bridges. I mean, going back to our title, the pontiff, that's where the word comes from, is a bridge builder. So hopefully, we will continue to build those bridges.

MR. DIONNE: I want to thank our panel. And before I turn it back for a very final word from Professor Powers, I actually found a way to smuggle a prayer into here.

Now, Saint John XXIII -- I still can't get used to that, it's so cool. Saint John XXIII, at the end of *Pacem in Terris*, wrote this. He said, "Let us then pray with all forever for this peace which our Divine Redeemer came to bring to us. May He banish from the souls of men whatever might endanger peace. May He transform all men into witnesses of truth, justice and brotherly love. May He illumine with his light the minds of rulers so that besides caring for the proper material welfare of their peoples, they may also

guarantee them the fairest gift of peace."

I thank our panel for trying to be witnesses to truth, justice and love. Thank you. And Professor Powers.

(Applause)

MR. POWERS: I told you this was going to be terrific panel. And I think I was right about that. So please join me once again in thanking Bishop Cantú, Dr. Love, Senator Nunn and Mr. Dionne for being with us this morning. And thank all of you for joining us.

(Applause)

* * * * *