7. Public debate, role and legitimacy of policy: The public needs to know the depth of the seriousness of the debate. Although it is hard to engage the public in slow elimination, they do support comprehensive efforts as is evidenced in the public support for the eradication of landmines. Conrad Wynn said Canadian opinion has an appetite for ethical decisions but not anti-Americanism.

Caitlinn Fisher, Stimson Center, Washington, DC, articulated the need to devise creative solutions each as new arrangements on transparency and methods of engaging the UK and France in the debates. She emphasized that a theological and moral debate should take place and the need for strong political will and leadership.

Engaging retired, respected military similar to the recent statements by retired American military and civilian leaders organized by Senator Cranston was seen as a tool for legitimacy. Alyn Ware, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, said public opinion favours the establishment of a Nuclear Weapons Convention, even though governments do not, and "there is more support for such a convention than for the elimination of nuclear weapons." (Ottawa roundtable)

8. No First Uses: Even though the agenda is full and opinion diverse, the "no first use" discussion is seen by many as a useful vehicle to open up debate within NATO. For the upcoming NATO review, Ambassador Tom Graham stated, "NATO should downplay the significance of nuclear weapons and commit to no-first-use policy...emerging documents should not contain language reflecting the status of nuclear weapons as the most important weapon that NATO possesses, that it is essential to peace or that it is the ultimate guarantee to NATO's security.... These steps would strengthen the the NPT and reduce the risk of proliferation." (Ottawa roundtable)

The current language of NATO maintains political status of nuclear weapons, particularly the right of first-use. This political value of nuclear arms must be reduced. It was also stated that a global no-first use should be put in the existing context to include proliferators in Asia (India, Pakistan, Korea). David Hagland expressed another view, "Why rock the boat when NATO is adapting well to a new security landscape/doctrine?" If the anti-game of no first use is the abolition of nuclear weapons, there is no proof there is correlation between the two. If in the end no-first use is neither here nor there, why spend political capital on the issue?"

9. Dangers - Accidents; Command and Control; Russia: The situation in Russia is very serious and the greatest nuclear threat. Russia is now seen to be a failing state. Russia is almost in a state of forced disarmament with poor maintenance over aging weapons, limited command and control over unemployed scientists and lacking the security of political leadership by someone like Gorbachev.

Tariq Rauf, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, California, gave a riveting presentation on the vast potential of nuclear anarchy in Russia (with strong disagreement from Igor Sutyagin, Moscow). Rauf outlined the potential for leakage, possible accidents and the human proliferation of unemployed Russian scientists going to China, Taiwan, India and Pakistan. Repeatedly stated was the importance of a commitment that nuclear arms will not be used to deter the use of chemical and biological weapons.