

The 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace

Opening Ceremony

August 8 (Sat), 2009 13:30 – 15:00
Nagasaki Brick Hall (Main Hall)

Opening Remarks: **Tomihisa Taue**

Vice President of Mayors for Peace

Mayor of Nagasaki City

Tadatoshi Akiba

President of Mayors for Peace

Mayor of Hiroshima

Greetings:

H.E. Rev. Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann

President of the 63rd United Nations General Assembly

Genjiro Kaneko

Governor of Nagasaki Prefecture

Message:

H.E. Mr. Ban Ki-moon

Secretary-General of the United Nations

Delivered by Mayor Taue of Nagasaki City

Keynote Speech: **“Creating an Integrated Vision for Nuclear Abolition”**

Bruce Gagnon

Coordinator

Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space

MC: Tomihisa Taue, Vice President of Mayors for Peace;

Mayor of Nagasaki City

Hello everyone. Mayors for Peace is a conference of mayors who are determined to protect citizens of the world from nuclear weapons. My name is Tomihisa Taue, I serve as Vice President of Mayors for Peace. I shall be serving as Master of Ceremony, as we are hosting this conference. So, ladies and gentlemen, we would now like to begin the 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace.

Opening Remarks: Mayor Taue

I would like to welcome participants from overseas as well as from Japan. Thank you very much for coming all the way to Nagasaki. I would also like to express my thanks to our citizens who have come to this hall in spite of very hot weather.

Since the United States first succeeded in the production of atomic bombs in July 1945, nuclear development has led to greater destructive power, extended range, and increased arsenals. Recently, we have seen more countries coming to possess nuclear weapons, and history tells us that the danger for humanity has increased with the world's nuclear arsenal.

Under such circumstances, President Obama made a speech in Prague, Czech Republic, where he clearly declared to seek "a world without nuclear weapons". That speech by President Obama changed the atmosphere. Expectations for the abolition of nuclear weapons have risen. Of course, President Obama can't do it himself. Many others will have to be involved, and we all must show our determination to put an end to the nuclear threat.

The 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace in Nagasaki, held under the theme of "NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION IS IN OUR HAND! –Let's get the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol adopted in 2010 –" will be the first and largest conference of cities and municipalities seeking the abolition of nuclear weapons since the Prague speech by President Obama. Through inter-city solidarity, we need to take leadership in raising awareness of the importance of abolishing nuclear weapons and make this conference held at the A-bombed city of Nagasaki an historic event.

In Nagasaki, citizens have started collecting signatures asking President Obama to visit Nagasaki so he can see the horror of the atomic bombings with his own eyes and listen

directly to the survivors' voices. This would greatly raise awareness about the abolition of nuclear weapons. At this hall, we are asking everyone to sign such a petition to strengthen our invitation to President Obama and get him to Nagasaki. In this way we can send a strong message to the world. I hope that you will join us in signing the petition to support the President Obama's speech in Prague and invite world leaders to visit Nagasaki.

I hope that you will work with us to make this 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace in Nagasaki a successful one. As the mayor of the host city, I will do my best to ensure a productive and successful General Conference over the next three days. Thank you for your cooperation.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to introduce to you the guests of honor, the executive officials of Mayors for Peace and some people who have made a major contribution to the success of Mayors for Peace.

First, let me introduce His Excellency Mr. Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann. As President of the 63rd UN General Assembly, he pointed out that the abolition of nuclear weapons is the only way to prevent proliferation. He has come all the way to Nagasaki to support our efforts. This is the first time in 16 years that the incumbent president of the UN General Assembly has visited Nagasaki. The last visit by the President was in 1993, by His Excellency Mr. Stoyan Ganev. Thank you very much Your Excellency for coming to Nagasaki.

Next is the Governor of Nagasaki Prefecture, Mr. Genjiro Kaneko. As governor, he cooperated with Nagasaki City to host the symposium during the UN Disarmament Week. I will invite Mr. d'Escoto and Mr. Kaneko to deliver their addresses a little later.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to introduce to you the organizations, individuals, and cities that have contributed to Mayors for Peace.

Madam Miho Cibot of the Association Française des Communes, Départements et Régions pour la Paix (AFCDRP), or the French association of cities, departments and regions for peace, is the wife of Mr. Michel Cibot, General Manager of Malakoff City. She is a well-known poet. Using French, she is conveying the horror of atomic bombs

in graphic terms.

Mr. Bruce Gagnon, Coordinator of the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space will deliver the keynote address.

Next, I will introduce the executive officials of Mayors for Peace.

From Hannover, Germany, Lord Mayor Stephan Weil. From 1987, the city of Hannover has served us as an executive official and vice president. Hannover is one of the oldest members. In Germany, Hannover has been the leader of our anti-nuclear activities. Thank you very much for your long years of contributions to Mayors for Peace.

Next is Mr. Michel Cibot, General Manager of Malakoff in France. From 1995, the city of Malakoff has served as an executive official and vice president, and as I have already introduced, Madam Miho Cibot is the wife of Mr. Michel Cibot. They are connecting anti-nuclear activities in France with Japan. This is the 10th visit for them to Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Next is Mr. Sean Patrick Morris, Principal Policy and Research Officer of Manchester City in the United Kingdom. Since 2001, the city of Manchester has served as an executive official and vice president. Manchester took leadership in the anti-nuclear movement during the Cold War. Manchester was the first city to declare itself a Nuclear Free Local Authority. That was the beginning of the nuclear free local authorities movement, and now 1,500 local authorities in Japan have also declared themselves nuclear free.

Next is Ms. Susanna Agostini, Councilor from Florence, Italy. Since 2005, the city of Florence has served as an executive official and vice president. The most recent Executive Conference of Mayors for Peace took place in Florence. I was impressed with the history and stately patina of the city that was the cradle of the Renaissance. She is a city councilor, and a trusted advisor to the mayor and her people.

Next is Mr. Donald Plusquellic, from the City of Akron, in the United States. Since 2005, Akron has been the executive city and vice president. He was the former president of the US Conference of Mayors. The city joined us quite recently but has

given tremendous support to Mayors for Peace.

Next, from the City of Ypres, Belgium, Mayor Luc Dehaene. It was quite recent that Ypres became an executive city in 2007, only two years ago. But they have contributed greatly to Mayors for Peace. As you are aware, the International Secretariat for the 2020 Vision Campaign Association is in the City of Ypres, and Mayor Dehaene is the one who has made that courageous decision. In the city office, there is a monument to Mayors for Peace. They are active and positive in giving their support for our activities.

Next, from Biograd na Moru, Croatia, Mayor Ivan Knez. Last year in 2008, the city of Biograd na Moru became an executive city. In the 1990s during the conflict in Croatia, Biograd na Moru became a battlefield for several years. There is a strong wish and hope for peace there. They were very much impressed by the paper cranes presented by Hiroshima City. Mayor Ivan Knez erected a copper crane monument on their coast that is over four meters tall.

From the City of Granollers, Spain, Mayor Josep Mayoral i Antigas. Granollers joined Mayors for Peace in 2005, contributing a great deal to the expansion of our organization. They became an executive city last year, and we are looking forward to working with them.

Now from the Arab world, from the City of Halabja, Kurdistan, Iraq, Mayor Khder Kareem. Halabja became an executive city in 2008 and is the leader of our member cities in Iraq. In this General Conference, it is our pleasure to have many participant cities from Iraq. In March 1988, under the Hussein administration, chemical weapons were used in Halabja on the border between Iraq and Iran. Instantly, as many as 5,000 people were killed in the tragedy of Halabja. We should never forget that incident. Just like Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Halabja lost many of its residents, and has been active in building peace.

Lastly, from the City of Waitakere, New Zealand, Mayor Robert Harvey. Waitakere has been an executive city since 2008. With Maori, Polynesians, and people from the Pacific islands, there are more than 100 different cultures in Waitakere. Their voices are reflected in the peace policy of the city. We have heard different voices from them and we are expecting to hear many voices from the Pacific region. Thank you very

much.

Now, then, may I now call upon President of Mayors for Peace, Mayor Akiba of Hiroshima City, please.

Opening Remarks: Tadatoshi Akiba, President of Mayors for Peace;
Mayor of Hiroshima

Good afternoon everyone. I am Akiba from Hiroshima. I serve as President of Mayors for Peace. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to participants who have traveled a long distance from abroad. Now I shall be speaking in English.

Fellow Mayors for Peace, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace. This conference takes place once every four years and is the forum in which we share our hopes for the future and confirm our collective commitment to our goals and objectives.

As most of you know, this is the first time that this conference has been held exclusively in Nagasaki, and I want to begin by thanking Mayor Taue, the Nagasaki city staff and the citizens of Nagasaki who have devoted so much time and effort to this most important Mayors for Peace event. I am extremely grateful to them for taking on this significant burden and for doing such a fine job.

In addition to the City of Nagasaki, I would like to specifically mention a few names with thanks. First, George Regan is chairman of the Association of Nuclear Free Local Authorities, one of our most important organizational allies in the United Kingdom. Mr. Regan. And Tom Cochran is executive director of the US Conference of Mayors, our greatest source of support in the United States. The USCM has passed five powerful resolutions supporting our campaign, and we are profoundly grateful for the leading role they have played. Tom, are you here? Please stand to be recognized. Thank you very much. Also with us today is one of Japan's most respected anti-nuclear activists, the creator of the Peace Depot, Mr. Hiromichi Umebayashi. He will be here later on and I shall be introducing him then.

Thanks for being here today, especially when all cities have been hit hard by the global economic crisis. I would like to express my appreciation to all the mayors and city representatives who are even more committed to the cause of peace under these difficult

circumstances. I believe that in the long run, our efforts to abolish nuclear weapons will improve city economies. Because money spent on weapons and war will be converted to real people's needs. For this reason alone, we would like to focus on the abolition of nuclear weapons now, especially this year. As a matter of fact, this is a critical year for Mayors for Peace, and for that matter for the world, for the abolition of nuclear weapons, for peace and for the future of our species on this planet. As you will see later today when we present our Action Plan, we are focusing our efforts quite intensely on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty or NPT Review Conference that will take place in May 2010. At that conference, the international community will make a fateful decision. Will we take a convincing step toward total nuclear disarmament, or will we allow nuclear weapons to spin out of control?

Luckily, President Obama has opened the door to a nuclear-weapon-free world. By speaking out, he and other high-ranking government officials and former government officials in the UK, US, Germany, and other nations have made it acceptable to imagine and even work toward a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Last May in New York, I along with several others here today, attended the Third Preparatory Committee Meeting for the NPT Review Conference of 2010. There, I witnessed first-hand the tremendous change in the disarmament climate largely attributed to President Obama. One after another, national representatives rose to quote some part of his Prague speech and to declare that their country, too, wanted nothing more than a nuclear-weapon-free world. It was as if the entire world had suddenly heard the voices of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki *hibakusha*. This change in climate inspired me to launch what we are calling the "Obamajority campaign". The term "Obamajority" refers to the overwhelming majority of people and nations on this planet that want to be liberated from the threat of nuclear annihilation. The word is also meant to commit ourselves to do more than what we are doing now or even what President Obama will do so that together we can make our dream come true. Some people are reluctant to put a proper name in front of the majority, but it is there for practical reasons.

The United States is the nuclear superpower. Without the commitment and cooperation of the President of that country, we cannot possibly reach our goal, a nuclear-weapon-free world. And there are many people and organizations everywhere trying to discourage or unabashedly opposing President Obama. The question is

whether we want to encourage them or encourage President Obama. The answer is obvious. Largely because of the Obama effect, I came away from the Preparatory Committee Meeting last May quite hopeful, but keenly aware that a great deal of work needs to be done. My understanding is that all parties to the NPT will be working hard to avoid a repetition of the failure we saw at the Review Conference in 2005.

We have recently seen the US and Russia agree to a small reduction in warheads, with promises of more to come. President Obama has promised to host a major conference on nuclear disarmament in March 2010, and we certainly hope the momentum generated there will lead to a disarmament agreement at the NPT Review Conference in May that will convince all nations that the international community, including the nuclear-weapon states, is determined to rid the planet of this threat to our survival.

However, the forces working against such an agreement remain extremely strong. Powerful forces within the nuclear-armed states, including India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea, are doing everything in their power to slow down and stop the momentum toward disarmament. Similar forces exist in countries that do not yet have nuclear weapons but are working secretly to obtain them. Even here in Japan, some are pushing hard to maintain or even to enhance the so-called nuclear umbrella. Others are openly advocating that Japan should possess nuclear weapons of its own.

And here is where the majority comes in. According to a public opinion survey conducted last year in 21 countries including seven nuclear-armed states, close to 80% of the people in these countries support a treaty banning nuclear weapons. This shows that those who want to eliminate nuclear weapons are the majority. In fact, we are the overwhelming majority.

However, wanting something is not enough. We must start walking toward that goal. And there are those experts who can show how we can get there. That is why, after consulting with those experts, relying on the common sense of the majority of people, and on behalf of Mayors for Peace, I introduced the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol at UN Headquarters in Geneva in April 2008. It proposes the following scenario in diplomatically acceptable language and format. First, an immediate halt to all efforts to acquire or deploy nuclear weapons by all countries, including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has so recently conducted defiant nuclear tests; an immediate start of multilateral negotiations in good faith with the goal of concluding a

nuclear weapons convention by 2015; and finally, elimination of all nuclear weapons by 2020.

It is straight forward, logical, practical, technically feasible, legally effective, morally solid, and simple as well as short. It fits on one page. I would like to ask you to read the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol once again to be assured of its worthiness. It is the only document on the table that conceivably stops the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As I have mentioned in the Peace Declaration, we, the citizens of the world, are working together as the majority voice of the world.

The US Conference of Mayors resolution adopted at the 77th Annual Meeting urges President Obama to announce at the NPT Review Conference the initiation of negotiations to reach an agreement to abolish nuclear weapons by 2020. The Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol together with the announcement by President Obama would be the most natural flow anybody can expect. Then we would be in business. And let me point out in passing by quoting what is known as Occam's razor: "The simplest answer is usually the correct answer". Let me repeat. All nuclear weapons can easily be made permanently inoperable by 2020. We do not lack the money, the facilities or the methods required. We lack only the political will. And we will be doing everything in our power to promote its acceptance at the Review Conference next May.

That is why this General Conference is devoted to the theme of making the NPT Review Conference next May a success. I know that at the end of the three days, we, Mayors for Peace, will have a much clearer view of what each of us needs to do from now until May next year. I assure you that I, Mayor Taue, and the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki will be doing everything we can to make the Review Conference a success. We want as many *hibakusha* as possible to welcome and live a nuclear-weapon-free world. We want our children and their children to live in a nuclear-weapon-free world. We owe that much to our future generations. It is the will of the Obamajority.

We, cities, can and must demand it of our national governments. We have the power, we have the responsibility, and we are the Obamajority. Together, we can abolish nuclear weapons. Yes, we can. Thank you very much.

Mayor Taue

Thank you very much. Now, we would like to receive greetings from the guests of honor. I invite His Excellency Father Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann, President of the United Nations General Assembly to deliver his remarks.

Greetings: H.E. Rev. Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann

President of the 63rd United Nations General Assembly

The Honorable Governor Genjiro Kaneko, Honorable Mayor Taue, Honorable Mayors for Peace, blessed survivors, distinguished guests, brothers and sisters all, it is truly an honor for me to be with you this afternoon, and to participate in the 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace.

I want to thank Mayor Taue and Mayor Akiba especially for extending the invitation that brings me here today, and to congratulate them and all their collaborators – nearly 3,000 cities and many millions of citizens around the world – for their tireless leadership in campaigning for a world free of nuclear weapons.

I believe, we have arrived at a propitious moment, recognized as such by heads of state and government across the world and in nearly every political camp who have declared that now is the time to commit ourselves to eliminating nuclear weapons once and for all.

I also believe that we have arrived at this moment of hope largely through the tireless and inspiring work of Mayors for Peace and their many like-minded collaborators around the globe.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to share my own reflections on where we have arrived in the arduous, but unavoidable quest to guarantee a world free of nuclear weapons.

To assess where we are at now, it is important to know where we have been. So I think we should begin with a quick look at history. In the mid-to-late 1960s, it was becoming clear that a new, comprehensive approach to nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament was needed that would simultaneously curtail the accelerating nuclear arms race among the leading “nuclear-haves” and the rapidly growing number of those aspiring to become nuclear powers.

It was also recognized that if we were to have any possibility of persuading more countries not to exercise the nuclear option, it would be necessary to address the issues most important to the nuclear “have-nots”, namely that they not be denied the benefits of access to nuclear energy and other peaceful applications of nuclear technology, and that nuclear-weapon states not derive any exclusive benefits from the permissions they were given to continue nuclear tests and development.

The solution was a proposed new “grand bargain” that took the form of a global Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or NPT. The NPT was first signed in London, Moscow, and Washington on July 1, 1968, and entered into force on March 5, 1970.

In essence, its terms were relatively simple and went as follows: the number of nuclear powers would be frozen at five; all other state parties to the Treaty would commit to dismantle or otherwise not pursue their own nuclear weapons development program.

Each nuclear-weapon state party to the Treaty also agreed not to transfer, and the non-nuclear states agreed not to accept nuclear weapons and their related materials, knowledge, and technologies. The non-nuclear state parties agreed in addition, to accept safeguards under the International Atomic Energy Agency “for the exclusive purpose of verification of the fulfillment of its obligations” under the Treaty.

Furthermore, in return for agreeing not to pursue nuclear weapons capabilities of their own, the non-nuclear states received commitments under the NPT not to be denied their “inalienable right” to “develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.”

Nuclear-weapon states were enjoined to cooperate with other parties to the treaty, in contributing “to the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.” And the Treaty committed nuclear-weapon states to agree that any “technological by-products” derived from the development of nuclear explosive devices should be made available for peaceful purposes to all parties.

Finally, Article VI of the NPT contained what seemed to be a ringing declaration that “Each of the Parties undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective

measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date, and to nuclear disarmament and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”

The grand bargain of the NPT has provided the central institutional framework for global cooperation on nuclear arms control and disarmament for nearly four decades now. During the last ten years, largely owing to political deadlock in the US Senate, that framework has been nearly moribund, but the activism of civil society and a growing unease among political elites around the globe, helped preserve and then revitalize public demands for “Global Zero,” or complete and final abolition of nuclear weapons.

This movement is so powerful and broad-based that the Democratic and Republican candidates in the year 2008 US national elections both declared that it would be their intention to make elimination of nuclear weapons the explicit policy of the US Government. On April 5 of this year, the winner of that election, President Barack Obama, fulfilled that commitment by declaring in a speech delivered in Prague and I quote:

“I state clearly and with conviction America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons.”

That much-anticipated statement followed similar statements by leaders of several other nuclear powers, but coming from the new US President it clearly helps to revive flagging institutions and processes. Within weeks, the long moribund UN Conference on Disarmament had achieved its first work plan in several years. The US and Russian negotiators had agreed on an ambitious bilateral nuclear-weapons reductions target and an aggressive negotiating schedule that called for an agreement to be reached by the end of the year. Support for the Comprehensive nuclear Test Ban Treaty and of the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty revived like desert flowers after an unexpected rain.

The government of Japan, I am pleased to note, made a welcome bid for leadership in this cause when Foreign Minister Hirofumi Nakasone announced his “11 Benchmarks for Global Nuclear Disarmament” in an important speech on April 27. I hope that it is not improper for me to express my personal wish that the government of Japan continue to follow the direction indicated by Foreign Minister Nakasone, asserting Japan’s moral authority and leadership on this issue.

The rise of public demand, and now political support, for “Global Zero” is not the end of the story, but only, possibly, the beginning. But a door has opened, and we all have a profound obligation to explore its possibilities and exploit the options it presents for achieving nuclear disarmament.

How shall we proceed? At the risk of sounding petulant, I must raise two important concerns about the path we are on:

The first relates to credibility: it is unclear to what extent the new commitment to Global Zero espoused not only by President Obama, but also by many of his colleagues in the nuclear club, represents something truly new. Merely committing to Global Zero is nothing new; that promise was a core element of the grand bargain of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

If experience is any guide, merely returning to the NPT-centered approach to nuclear disarmament, even with a strong emphasis on the importance of nuclear weapon abolition as an “ultimate” end, will not lead states down the path to nuclear disarmament.

The second problem is one of legitimacy. The NPT is patently discriminatory. Not only did it legitimize a world divided between nuclear “haves” and “have-nots”, but it also established, or rather reconfirmed, the practice of allowing a small group of states to interpret and enforce the rules, without themselves being subject to those same rules. The safeguards and international inspection regimes of the NPT, do not apply to the nuclear powers today in the same way that they apply to the non-nuclear powers; and the more onerous monitoring and inspection regimes proposed under the Model Additional Protocol apply primarily to the nuclear “have-nots.”

Any new approach to Global Zero based on the NPT must address these deficiencies of credibility and legitimacy or risk being portrayed, accurately in my opinion, as old wine in new bottles.

In order to address these fundamental questions of credibility and legitimacy, I want to propose four important lines of action that can help demonstrate convincingly that the world has indeed committed itself to complete and final elimination of nuclear

weapons:

First, it is vitally important to set an early date for achieving disarmament, along with a clear realistic timetable, and to work hard and be seen to work hard to achieve it. I strongly support the date proposed by Mayors for Peace. The year 2020 will be the 75th anniversary of the terrible destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and also the 50th anniversary of the NPT. An American president once set an ambitious goal of placing a man on the moon within a decade, and this year we have celebrated the 40th anniversary of that human achievement. Eleven years is not too little to demonstrate real commitment and real progress, even if full achievement of the end goal may prove to be somewhat beyond our reach in just one decade.

Second, it is essential that we begin work on the large new problems that call for attention once we take seriously the goal of achieving complete elimination of nuclear weapons, not for a brief moment, but forever. In an important essay in this direction, researchers, George Perkovich and James Acton, have noted that the main questions associated with disarming below minimal thresholds to zero, and establishing an effective international regime in support of global abolition have never seriously even been asked by the foreign policy and nuclear weapons establishments. This work needs to begin at once, in a setting that guarantees transparency and inclusiveness for all interested parties, which should include all 192 member states of the United Nations plus the observers.

Third, all nuclear weapons “haves,” including those outside the Non-Proliferation Treaty regime, should begin to build credibility and enhance the legitimacy of the international non-proliferation regime by placing their own enrichment and weapons programs under international monitoring and inspection regimes. This step is indispensable if we are going to manage nuclear rivalries and persuade countries that are not yet quite convinced that the whole international community is, in fact, prepared to accept a peaceful nuclear energy program, but not a weapons program.

Finally, to achieve legitimacy and enhance effectiveness, the whole process needs to be brought into the United Nations system, where it truly belongs. It is possible, and highly desirable, to have private efforts, independent scientific inquiry, and other non-United Nations initiatives, but there should be a strong presumption that the findings of all such efforts should be made available to all nation-states through the UN

agencies, and the United Nations organizations should be strengthened to be able to engage as a peer with any governmental agency.

I am pleased to join Mayors for Peace in your extraordinary campaign to bring a profound sense of moral responsibility, hope, commitment, common sense, reason and the power of many hundreds of thousands of collaborators all over the world. Together we can show that a better world is indeed possible. Thank you.

Mayor Taue

Thank you very much for your greatly informative explication, Your Excellency. May I now call upon Mr. Genjiro Kaneko, the Governor of Nagasaki Prefecture to say a few words of greeting?

Greetings: Genjiro Kaneko, Governor of Nagasaki Prefecture

Thank you very much for your kind introduction.

With the 64th A-bombing anniversary coming tomorrow, on behalf of the people of Nagasaki Prefecture, it gives me a great privilege to congratulate and welcome your visit to Nagasaki for the occasion of the 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace with high level of attendance from home and abroad. My thanks especially go to His Excellency Mr. d'Escoto Brockmann, President of the United Nations General Assembly for coming all the way to the A-Bombed City of Nagasaki.

To all the members of Mayors for Peace, I would like to pay my highest esteem to your endeavors for the realization of permanent peace in the world. Your activities are so deep and broad in seeking the total abolition of nuclear weapons, protecting the global environment indispensable for human life, and solving the issues of human rights, famine, and poverty through close inter-city coordination.

On August 9, 64 years ago, this beautiful city of Nagasaki was turned into rubble in a split second by one A-bomb. Over the past 64 years, the town has resuscitated again into a beautiful peace town, but the sorrow of the bereaved, those who have lost their beloved families and friends, is too deep to be healed even today. The elderly *hibakusha* are still suffering from the aftereffects of radiation. I believe it is the responsibility of the entire Prefecture of Nagasaki to communicate the tragedy caused by the A-bomb to the next generations, and appeal to the world for the total abolition of

nuclear weapons.

Nagasaki Prefecture designated August 9 as the date of citizens' prayer, through which we pray for the repose of the souls of A-bomb victims and coordinate our wishes to realize the abolition of nuclear weapons and perpetual peace in the world. We also designate the same day as a day for school children to come to school during the summer vacation to instill in the young generation the peace loving spirit of Nagasaki through various peace education programs.

When we look at the international community, there is momentum emerging, as represented by US President Obama's speech in April, for a world without nuclear weapons. On the other hand, we still have large nuclear threats in front of us such as the underground nuclear test by the DPRK in May.

It is a MUST for all of us to arouse international voices in search for the success at the NPT Review Conference to be held in New York in May next year, and to strengthen the international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime. I believe that it is quite opportune that all of you gathered here for the 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace in Nagasaki to build an inter-city relationship to create a world free from nuclear weapons. We, the citizens of Nagasaki Prefecture, are committed to cooperating with you to make our best efforts to create a peaceful world without nuclear weapons.

Lastly, I offer my best wishes for a productive and fruitful conference and for accomplishing your planned objectives. Wishing you good health and furtherance of your cities, I conclude my address. Thank you very much.

Mayor Taue

Thank you very much, Governor Kaneko, for joining us despite your busy schedule. We have received a message from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon. I would like to read it for you.

Message: H.E. Mr. Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations Delivered by Mayor Taue

I am pleased to send greetings to the 7th General Conference of Mayors for Peace.

I salute Mayor Akiba of Hiroshima and Mayor Taue of Nagasaki as well as their predecessors for collectively advancing this valuable initiative over more than a quarter of a century.

Thanks to Mayors for Peace, millions of people around the world have been informed about the catastrophic effects of the 1945 nuclear attacks. You have also raised public awareness about the dangers that cities, in particular, would face if these destructive weapons were ever used again.

I am grateful for your advocacy because I share your vision of a world free of nuclear weapons. While we remain far from this goal, that is no reason to despair. As outlined in the five-point plan I issued last year, there are practical and realistic steps the international community can take to make this vision a reality.

Global awareness of the need for progress in nuclear disarmament is greater than it has been in many years. This support is broad-based. To build on this momentum, next month's observance of the International Day of Peace will seek to mobilize the world to advance the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda.

I am encouraged by the commitment shown by many world leaders, and by your own efforts to promote a global ban on nuclear weapons by 2020. A world without nuclear weapons may be distant, but it is no longer just a dream. I look forward to continuing to work with governments and global citizens to realize this shared vision. Please accept my best wishes for a successful conference.

The United Nations Secretary-General
Ban Ki-moon

Mayor Taue

Thank you very much. We have received many messages but because of the time constraint, I will put them up on the message board in the hallway of the auditorium. Please take a look at them at your leisure.

Now ladies and gentlemen, allow me to introduce to you our keynote speaker. He is a well known peace activist from the State of Maine in the United States, Mr. Bruce Gagnon. In 1992, he was a co-founder of the Global Network Against Weapons and

Nuclear Power in Space. He is currently the coordinator of this network. He has helped us understand how space is utilized for the warfare. To stop the militarization of space, he has been delivering speeches and is a popular personality on community TV in the State of Maine. Today he is going to deliver a speech entitled of “Creating an Integrated Vision for Nuclear Abolition”. Mr. Gagnon, you have the floor, please.

Keynote Speech: “Creating an Integrated Vision for Nuclear Abolition”

Bruce Gagnon, Coordinator

Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space

Hello. It is good to be with you all today.

Before I get started, I would like to say a word of thanks. As I travel and I speak about the difficulties of the age that we live in today, people often ask me where I get my hope, what keeps me going. And I tell them that the thing that gives me the greatest hope is everywhere I go I see wonderful people doing wonderful work. And here today, to see leaders from all over the world, from cities all over the world, is one more time that I feel great hope. I thank all of you very much.

I am very honored to have been invited by Mayor Akiba and Mayors for Peace to share my thoughts about the important subject of nuclear abolition at this solemn time when we remember the nuclear bombings of the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States 64 years ago. Nuclear disarmament remains the fundamental issue of our time.

Let me first say a few words about my own personal history and the organization I work for. I grew up in a military family and lived in various places around the world. In 1971, being a young conservative like my father, I too joined the United States Air Force and was stationed at a base in California that was an airlift base for the war in Vietnam. Soldiers would come from all over the country to board the planes to go to the war. When the huge transport jets returned, they carried the wounded soldiers and the body bags of those troops who had been killed. As a result, there were frequently anti-war protests outside of my base. Although they were often very small, they caused the GIs like myself on our base to endlessly debate the war, and this is the time that I became a peace activist.

Some of you may remember the date June 12, 1982, a historic day. On that day,

almost a million people demonstrated outside the United Nations in New York City, calling for nuclear abolition. People came from all over the world for the UN Special Session on Disarmament that was called to deal with the continued use of violence in international affairs and with the growing nuclear arms race.

I did not attend the June 12 march, but I did watch the rally on public television from my home in Orlando, Florida. After the rally was over, the TV coverage switched to a conference where Lieutenant General Daniel Graham was speaking. At the time General Graham was President Ronald Reagan's head of the Strategic Defense Initiative, or "Star Wars." During a question and answer session following Graham's speech, someone asked him: "General, they say there are almost a million people in New York City today, demonstrating for disarmament. Aren't you worried about that?" Without missing a beat, General Graham responded: "No, I think it is great. They are out there protesting against ICBMs, and we are moving into space. They do not have a clue. Let them keep doing what they are doing."

Imagine my surprise at hearing this. What was he talking about? Moving into space? I knew very little about this. It was then that I began working to help prevent the arms race from moving into the heavens.

The following year, just as the nuclear freeze campaign was taking off all over the United States, I became the state coordinator of the Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice, where I helped to build a statewide movement opposing all nuclear weapons. I also began working hard to learn about, and to share with the public, as much as I could about General Graham's Star Wars plans.

In 1984, I made my first trip to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. While in Nagasaki, I was asked to speak at a memorial service to commemorate the Koreans in Hiroshima and Nagasaki who were killed on August 6 and 9. I was told that only in more recent years have the Koreans who were killed, and the Korean *hibakusha*, been remembered. During those days, I was to hear the stories of many *hibakusha* who further turned my world upside down.

When I returned to Florida, I was determined to share the things I had learned with as many people as possible. I wrote an opinion piece for my local newspaper, but it was rejected on the grounds that I could not prove that the stories I shared from the

hibakusha were true.

This only made me more determined, and the following year in early August, I arranged for several *hibakusha* to tour our state of Florida. Their visit ended with a major protest on August 9 at a weapons factory that manufactured the Tomahawk cruise missile. Thirteen of us were arrested that day for attempting to walk onto the factory grounds carrying a letter calling for the conversion of the facility to peaceful production.

I believed then, and I believe now, that it would dishonor the memory and sacrifices of the *hibakusha* if we did not do everything possible to expand their campaign to abolish nuclear weapons and war.

Those of us living in Florida at that time could quickly understand the plans for space warfare, as the Kennedy Space Center and NASA, the space agency, are based in the center of the state, not far from where I was living at that time. I began organizing people to go to the space center for protests whenever military satellites were launched, when Trident nuclear missiles were test-fired from there, or when NASA launched space missions carrying highly-toxic Plutonium 238 on-board.

It was during this time that much of what the so-called “civilian” NASA space program was actually doing, we learned it was actually “dual use”, meaning virtually every mission served two masters. Civilian space programs are routinely used to test space weapons technologies.

By 1992, the Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice had become so heavily involved in the space issue in Florida that we began looking around for more allies. We had earlier discovered an organization, called Citizens for Peace in Space, in the state of Colorado, where the US Space Command was headquartered. This relationship led to a creation of the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space that I coordinate today.

As we organized the Global Network, we learned about the US space warfare bases in England, Greenland, Norway, Australia and in other parts of the world. Local peace groups in those countries quickly became part of our movement, and today we have 150 affiliated organizations around the planet.

In the years that followed, we began collecting and sharing the US Space Command's detailed plans for space. "Master of Space" is the logo of the 50th Space Wing at the headquarters building at the Space Command in Colorado.

In an important planning document, called "Vision for 2020" published in 1997 during the presidency of Bill Clinton, this Space Command states:

"Although unlikely to be challenged by a global peer competitor, the United States will continue to be challenged regionally. The globalization of the world economy will also continue, with a widening between 'haves' and 'have-nots'...space superiority is emerging as an essential element of battlefield success and future warfare."

Furthermore, the Space Command calls for the US "control and domination" of space. And they say, "Control of Space is the ability to assure access to space, freedom of operations within the space medium", and most importantly, they say, "an ability to deny others the use of space."

Each branch of the military today, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, now has its own space command. Another important document, this time written by the Air Force Space Command, gives us a better idea of what the Pentagon has in mind for space, called the "Strategic Master Plan: Fiscal Year 2006 and Beyond" it states:

"the ability to gain space superiority (the ability to exploit space while selectively disallowing it to adversaries) is critically important...To date, we have enjoyed *de facto* space superiority, but adversaries have shown that they have taken notice...To fully develop and exploit potential CS (counter-space)...some US policies and international treaties may need to be reviewed and modified."

When the Space Command talks about "exploiting space", it does not only mean using it as a weapons platform. Scientists have discovered precious mineral resources on the moon, Mars, and asteroids. One of the jobs of the Space Command, in the years ahead will be to build a military highway to these bodies so that aerospace corporations can control them for mining operations. One reason so many nations, including Japan, are so interested in establishing bases on the moon is because helium-3 has been discovered there. Scientists believe the resource could be used to fuel fusion reactors back on Earth, making the profits of the oil corporations pale in comparison. This new race to the planets could be another source of conflict here on Earth, unless the world begins

now to insist on peaceful, cooperative space exploration.

Let us now return to the Space Command and further define some of the terms it uses. “Full spectrum dominance” means that the US military will control all war fighting at every level of conflict. The Army will control the ground; the Navy will control the oceans; the Air Force will control the air, and the Space Command will control space.

But there is just one problem. If the US can do this, so could some other countries. Thus, the Space Command says, it must deny other countries access to space. It must be the “Master of Space.” And to carry out this denial mission, the Space Command has said, it must have weapons in space that would be able to take out a competitor nation’s space assets, meaning their satellites.

We now know that military satellites are what controls war on the ground today. When the Pentagon launched the initial attack in the “shock and awe” invasion of Iraq in 2003, 70 % of the weapons that were used were directed to their targets by space satellites.

The Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, or drones as they are often called, that are killing many civilians in Afghanistan and Pakistan today, are actually flown by pilots sitting at computer terminals at military bases inside the United States. In real time, split second time, the pilots can watch the ground in Afghanistan from cameras mounted on the drones and order them to fire their deadly missiles using satellite technology.

The idea that no competitor nation will be allowed to have access to space during conflict is of course a very provocative one to Russia, China and even the European Union. The European Union has responded to this fact by creating their own military satellite navigation and targeting system, called Galileo.

Another important point that must be mentioned is the cost of Star Wars. Not only does the militarization of space make life on Earth less secure today, because it fuels a new arms race, but it is also extremely expensive. The aerospace industry has boasted that the Star Wars will be the largest industrial project in the history of the planet Earth. No matter how hard the United States government tries, it cannot afford to pay for this new arms race in space, all by itself. This is where the allies come into the equation.

One of the Pentagon’s jobs today is to persuade Japan, South Korea, Australia, England,

Germany, India and other nations to become a part of the program to put the expensive space warfare system in the place. That of course means that many social and environmental needs will be neglected or ignored completely.

So today we see the United States expanding PAC3 and THAAD missile defense programs throughout the world, particularly in the Asian Pacific region. We see the Pentagon pushing for “missile defense” deployments in Poland and the Czech Republic against the will of the people in those nations. We see Star Wars radar facilities being expanded and upgraded in England, Australia, Germany, Greenland, Norway, and in other places around the world for the purpose of communicating with new generations of military satellites that will help direct this program of “full spectrum dominance.”

In the US, we see space technology weapons programs under development, like laser weapon systems, new generations of war fighting satellites, cyber warfare systems, and military space planes, and even hives of miniature robotic Unmanned Aerial Vehicles. This is just the tip of the iceberg.

Let me talk about just one of these programs to illustrate how space technology “advancements” are a danger to hopes for global nuclear disarmament.

General James Cartwright, the Vice Chairman of the Pentagon’s Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently concluded that conventionally-armed bombers are “too slow and too intrusive” for many “global strike missions.” General Cartwright pushes for a “prompt global strike” weapon, which would be ultra-fast and fitted with a conventional warhead. The General says that the military needs “hypersonic” weapons that would travel through space to take out targets on the other side of the planet.

For the past several years the US Space Command has annually been computer war-gaming such an attack. Set in the year 2016, the Pentagon launches the military space plane that takes off like an airplane, flies through space, and then unleashes a devastating first-strike attack on China’s nuclear forces all within one hour. China then attempts to launch a retaliatory strike with its tens of nuclear missiles capable of hitting the west coast of the continental United States. But US “missile defense” systems, like those parked nearby on Naval Aegis destroyers, in Japan, South Korea, and possibly even Taiwan, help take out China’s crippled nuclear response. Missile defense, sold to the public as a defensive system, is really designed by the Pentagon to

be the shield after the first-strike sword has lunged into the heart of China's nuclear arsenal.

Imagine, if you would, how the leaders inside China view this computer war game. The technologies are now being developed to destroy the firewall between conventional and nuclear weapons. Space technology thus becomes the enabler of first-strike military doctrine. Any hopes for serious nuclear abolition negotiations with China are irreparably harmed by the militarization and weaponization of space.

Some, when they hear about the Space Command plans like Vision for 2020 or the 2016 computer war games against China, say that these developments are just theoretical, that the Global Network makes too much out of nothing. But there is much more to consider.

Just after the 9-11 attacks in New York, the Strategic Command, at Omaha, Nebraska in the mid-western United States, began undergoing a complete overhaul in its role and mission. For years, the famous Strategic Air Command (SAC) was the bomber and nuclear missile command for the Pentagon, charged with providing "nuclear deterrence." Now though, the Strategic Command, or StratCom as it is popularly called, has been charged with new, more aggressive missions. Tim Rinne, the State Coordinator of Nebraskans for Peace has watched the quick evolution of StratCom and describes it this way:

"Those so-called 'Missile Defense' installations proposed for Poland and the Czech Republic – that's StratCom. StratCom coordinated the shutdown in February 2008 of a falling US spy satellite with a 'Missile Defense' interceptor launched from an Aegis cruiser in the Pacific Ocean. Those CIA Predator drones flying over Pakistani airspace are flown with the aid of StratCom's space assets, with intelligence supplied by StratCom spy satellites. Those ECHELON National Security Agency listening stations in Misawa, Japan; Pine Gap, Australia and Waihopai, New Zealand – that are eavesdropping on your phone calls and emails – are all part of StratCom's network. The recent clash between a US spy ship and Chinese naval defenses in the South China Sea is linked to StratCom's mission as well. And StratCom's presence is also felt in the Asian-Pacific where it is responsible for launching a preemptive nuclear or conventional attack against North Korea and the military encirclement of China."

The entire US military is now tied together using space technology. StratCom maintains that all warfare on the Earth today is “net-centric.” With military satellites in place, the US can see virtually everything on the planet and can target virtually any place on the Earth.

One finds oneself asking the question why? Why, when we already have a maddening nuclear arms race, is the US pushing the militarization and weaponization of space?

President Obama’s new National Security Advisor, General James Jones, was the former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO. In 2006, General Jones told the media:

“NATO is developing a plan to safeguard oil and gas fields in the Caspian Sea region...Our strategic goal is to expand to Eastern Europe and Africa.”

Who is the US competitor in Africa? The Pentagon maintains that it is China, largely due to the fierce international competition for dwindling supplies of oil, natural gas, coal, uranium, and other resources around the world.

In April 2009, Army General Walter Sharp, the commander of US Forces Korea, told members of the United States Senate Armed Services Committee in Washington that the US-South Korean alliance was “a linchpin for stability in Northeast Asia.”

The US now has 30 ground-based interceptor missiles deployed in South Korea. Many peace activists there, and here in Japan, strongly believe that the ultimate target of these systems is not North Korea, but China and Russia.

The current US military transformation underway in South Korea and Japan is indeed a key element in this regional offensive strategy to contain China, while justifying the military expansion as containment of a “hostile and aggressive” North Korea. I believe North Korea’s recent nuclear test and missile tests have been a desperate reaction from an insecure nation worried about the US military strategy of “full spectrum dominance.” While North Korea’s tests were wrong, and only helped to justify “Missile Defense” deployments in response, it must also be remembered that the US launched a nuclear ICBM from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California toward the Pacific on June 29. This might be a good time for the peace movement to begin talking about the reductions of all strategic delivery vehicles and a missile test ban.

The Russians have expressed interest in these kinds of negotiations.

Japanese Self-Defense Forces are now integrated into the military strategy of the United States, which puts Japan into the middle of a growing conflict zone in the region. Japan is now in a delicate position, because if it follows the US space dominance strategy, it will become a full partner in the dangerous and provocative plan to contain China and Russia. The consequences could be harsh, as Japan would economically pay a costly price. It would be wiser for Japan to remain a neutral, peace-loving nation in the region.

China maintains that deployment of “Missile Defense” systems in the Asia-Pacific region by the United States and its allies is a threat to hopes for nuclear disarmament. US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates’ comments were quite revealing last April when he said, “We are converting more navy ships to have ballistic missile defense that will help against China.”

Living in Bath, Maine, as I do today, I have a special perspective on this US-China naval competition. In my town, the Navy builds the Aegis destroyer that is outfitted with missile defense systems and is being deployed in the Asian-Pacific region. The two Republican senators from my state maintain that more Pentagon funds for Aegis shipbuilding are needed, because China, they say, is undertaking a “massive military build-up,” in order to push the US out of the Asian-Pacific.

Last June, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute released its annual figures on global military spending for the year 2008. Not surprisingly, the United States was in first place. It spent 607 billion dollars, accounting for about 42% of the world total. China in second place was far behind at 85 billion a year. Russia was in fifth place at 59 billion, while Japan came in seventh at 46 billion. In fact, seven of the top ten global spenders on military in the year 2008 were US allies. It is one thing that the United States is massively building up its military, but why are so many other countries around the world following the same path? Why is Japan now talking about ending its commitment to honor Article 9 of its Constitution, and change from “forever renouncing war” to the possibility of “preemptive offensive attack?”

Why is virtually every country in the world expanding its military at the very time that everyone agrees that we must put the nuclear genie back into the bottle?

We all know that fossil fuels are a declining natural resource on our fragile Mother Earth. Many experts now say we have reached the peak of oil availability, and are now quickly heading down the hill toward scarcity, at the very time that global demand for oil is growing.

Renowned author Noam Chomsky says US foreign policy is now all about controlling most of the world's oil supply, as a "lever of world domination." One way to keep Europe, China, India, and other emerging markets depended on the US and in sync with its policies is to maintain control of the oil supply that they are relying on. Even as the US economy is collapsing, the Pentagon appears to be saying, whoever controls the keys to the world's economic engine still remains in charge.

China, for example, imports up to 80% of its oil through the Malacca Straits. If any competitor nation was able to militarily control that transit route, and choke off China's oil supply, its economy could be held hostage. Many thus wonder if the current doubling of the US military presence in the Asian-Pacific is really due to North Korea's nuclear program, or is it actually a part of a larger military strategy to ensure US control?

In his book called *The Grand Chessboard*, former US National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brezinski wrote:

"For America, the chief geopolitical prize is Eurasia...and America's global primacy is directly dependent on how long and how effectively its preponderance on the Eurasian continent is sustained...the primary interest", he said, "is to gain Geostrategic depth through political influence in Afghanistan...and to benefit eventually from any pipeline construction linking Central Asia with the Arabian Sea."

It should be remembered that Brezinski was a chief foreign policy advisor to President Obama during his recent presidential campaign.

Russia has the world's largest deposits of natural gas and significant supplies of oil. The US has recently built military bases in Romania and Bulgaria and will soon be adding more in Albania. NATO has been expanding eastward into Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, right on Russia's border. Georgia and Ukraine are next on the list to

become members of what is quickly becoming a global NATO military alliance.

The NATO Treaty's Article 5 is quite clear that if one NATO member country is attacked, it is the responsibility, the obligation, of all NATO members to join in defense of that country. That means that if Georgia, which the US is now promoting for full membership in the alliance, got into another hot conflict with neighboring Russia, NATO would be called upon to go to war with Russia.

Much to his credit, President Obama has called for a "reset" of relations between the US and Russia, in hopes that there will be an opportunity to negotiate significant reductions in the arsenals of these two leading nuclear powers.

Former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev delivered the opening address at the "Overcoming Nuclear Dangers" conference in Rome on April 16, 2009. He noted:

"The world is now going through a global crisis, which is an unprecedented challenge to international politics... We have to admit that nothing fundamentally new has been achieved in the past decade and a half. The pace of nuclear arms reductions has slowed... The quantities of nuclear weapons held by Russia and the United States still far exceed the arsenals of all other nuclear powers taken together, thus making it more difficult to bring them into the process of nuclear disarmament."

Gorbachev continued,

"In the final analysis, the nuclear danger can only be removed by abolishing nuclear weapons. But could one regard as realistic the prospect of one country retaining the quantities of conventional weapons that exceed the combined arsenals of practically all other nations – the prospect of one country achieving absolute global superiority?... Unless we address the need to demilitarize international relations, reduce military budgets, put an end to the creation of new kinds of weapons and prevent weaponization of outer space, all talk about a nuclear-weapon-free world will be just inconsequential rhetoric."

I must turn to Mr. Gorbachev for one more important point here. In a very recent interview with a German newspaper, he commented that Western Germany, the US and other powers had pledged after Germany's reunification in 1990 that, "NATO would not move a centimeter to the east." This broken promise had led to Russia's

disillusionment with relations with the West, Gorbachev said.

China is not sitting still as these US military moves are made on the grand chessboard. In 2007, they destroyed one of their own defunct satellites with a ballistic missile as a way to show the world that they had “anti-satellite” weapons capability. This contributed to the growing problem of space debris that is now dangerously orbiting the Earth and, if worsened, could one day make it virtually impossible for any nation to launch a rocket into space, due to the minefield of space junk surrounding the planet.

Russia and China have created the Shanghai Cooperation Organization that is gathering neighbors in the region into an economic and military alliance to counter NATO’s expanding presence in their “backyard.” They are increasing their military spending and each putting more emphasis on their own space technology developments. But much to their credit, they have also been calling for negotiations. In the middle of June, following another meeting of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization that was held in Russia, the two nuclear powers issued a statement saying that they will once again attempt to draft a treaty on the prevention of the deployment of weapons in outer space at the United Nations.

For many years, Russia and China have introduced resolutions at the UN, calling for negotiations on a new treaty that would ban weapons in space. All countries of the world have supported the resolution with the exception of the US, Israel and Micronesia. This was true during the Clinton presidency as well as during the reign of George W. Bush. It will be crucial for President Obama, if he truly hopes to reset relations with Moscow, to seriously enter into negotiations for a global ban on weapons in space.

Just prior to the recent Moscow nuclear weapons negotiations between the US and Russia, President Obama’s senior director for Russian affairs on the National Security Council told the media, “We don’t need the Russians... We are not going to reassure, give or trade anything with the Russians regarding NATO expansion or missile defense.”

Based on the tentative agreement that has come out of the US-Russia summit on July 6, it appears that “very modest” changes at best can be expected in the near term when it comes to the nuclear arsenals of the two powers.

Global Network's New York City board member, a woman by the name of Alice Slater, long a tireless worker for nuclear abolition, has written:

“It would be tragic if cooperation once again failed because of the hegemonic US drive to dominate and control the earth from space. In a sense, we have now come full circle to the time of the Reagan-Gorbachev 1986 summit in Reikjavik, when negotiations for the total abolition of nuclear weapons collapsed because Reagan wouldn't give up US plans for a Strategic Defense Initiative to dominate space.”

Slater continues:

“Clinton similarly rejected opportunities to take up Putin's proposal to cut our nuclear arsenals to 1,000 warheads. After Russia's ratification of START II and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 2000, Putin called for new talks to reduce long-range missiles from 3,500 to 1,500 or even 1,000. This forward-looking proposal was accompanied by Putin's stern caveat that all Russian offers would be off the table if the US proceeded to build a National Missile Defense (NMD) in violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

Astoundingly, US diplomatic 'talking points' leaked by Russia to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists revealed that Clinton was telling Russia that it had nothing to fear from NMD as long as Russia kept 2,500 weapons at launch-on-warning, hair-trigger alert. Rejecting Putin's offer to cut to 1,000 warheads, the US assured Russia that with 2,500 warheads it could overcome a NMD shield and deliver an 'annihilating counterattack!' If the Clinton administration had instead embraced Putin's plan, the US and Russia would have been able to call all nuclear-weapon states to the table – even those with arsenals in the hundreds or fewer – to negotiate a treaty to ban the bomb.”

This is what the world wants today. It wants an end to the nuclear nightmare, it wants a halt to endless war for control of the world's finite resources, it wants the cities of the planet removed from nuclear targeting lists, it wants its hard-earned tax monies to be used for healthcare, education, green jobs, and dealing with the coming harsh realities of global climate change. Most of all, the people of the world want an end to the enormous hypocrisy that exists today.

The world clearly hears the US and its allies lecturing Iran and North Korea about the evils of nuclear weapons, and then cringes when it listens to the threats of preemptive

attack against those two nations if they do not halt their nuclear weapons development programs. But in fairness, one must reflect on the American congressional decision to go forward with the US-India nuclear program that will assist that nation in ultimately building more nuclear weapons – even as India refuses to sign the NPT.

In a recent college graduation ceremony speech, environmentalist and author, Paul Hawken, told the students:

“You join a multitude of caring people. No one knows how many groups and organizations are working on the most salient issues of our day, climate change, poverty, deforestation, peace, water, hunger, conservation, human rights, and more. This is the largest movement the world has ever seen.”

This Hawken-described reality should give us all hope and courage. Nuclear disarmament must be attained in our lifetimes, or human life might not continue on our planet.

The people of Japan have valiantly taken the leadership to keep the issue of nuclear abolition before the world’s eyes and hearts for the past 64 years. Mayor Akiba and Mayors for Peace have come forward with the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol that offers a positive direction to the international community at the very time that the NPT is on the verge of collapse. Mayor Akiba asks this central question: “Do we abolish nuclear weapons or allow them to spread uncontrolled?”

How do we then proceed at this historic juncture? How can we ensure success at the UN’s 2010 NPT Review Conference in New York City?

Nuclear weapons, the world’s deadliest scourge, must be the leading edge of a global demilitarization. In order to capture the hearts and minds of the people of the planet, we must show the deadly connections between nuclear abolition and their important concerns. We must put human security and environmental sustainability at the center of global conflict resolution.

Our call for general and complete disarmament must include a universal call to end not only nuclear weapons but also nuclear power. We must call for the conversion of the global military machine to peaceful production. This would give us the ability to energize the sinking global economy with green jobs.

We must call for an end to corporate domination of our political systems all across the planet. We must support real democracy by returning power and economic control to our local communities.

In my country, we once had another economic and political institution that had a lock on the government and our people. We eventually had a civil war, where brother fought against brother, to end the overwhelming power of slavery. Many people felt then, like many people feel today about nuclear weapons, that change was not possible.

One of the great leaders of the movement to abolish slavery was a black man and escaped slave by the name of Frederick Douglass. Douglass was known for his great speaking skills. He once declared that, "I would unite with anybody to do right." As we attempt to build a successful movement to demilitarize our planet, we must extend ourselves and be willing to work with people and groups we have never worked with before. And we can only do that by making the important connections and links between issues that we all care about.

Sadly, we are back in a period of great political maneuvering where disarmament negotiations are one more tactic used by countries to stay in control. Let's face the facts: No one has so far been able to successfully manage the problem of nuclear weapons and the current global military buildup. The public is losing confidence in leaders and government. It is as if the people of the planet are captives on a sinking ship, and they are stuck in the lower decks with no way out. They feel powerless about the things that they most care about.

We must make a unified global demand. We should urge the people all over the world to take to the streets in protest against nuclear weapons and for conversion of the global war system prior to the 2010 NPT Review Conference in New York. It would seem that our local governments and local elected officials are closest to the people and could play a crucial role in helping to bring people together at this critical time. Who knows better than the mayors of the world what a waste it is to build and sustain the nuclear arms race? Who can more effectively describe the urgent needs of our local communities than the mayors of the world? Why couldn't Mayors for Peace call for such a weekend of events that would unite the planet in opposition to nuclear weapons and speak out for human development and environmental sustainability?

We must also talk about the connections between nuclear weapons and the offensive nature of so-called “Missile Defense.”

Until we overcome the legacy of past wars, like the Korean War that still continues after 58 years, misunderstanding and miscalculations will continue. We must recognize that growing military alliances and expansion of conventional forces will negate our wishes for nuclear abolition. We must respect and keep the UN Charter that outlaws preemptive war and calls for peaceful resolution of all conflicts.

The membership of the Global Network is ready to work with each of you on this important agenda. Maybe if we do these things, change will come at last to the world. We have no other choice. Let us say together: No More Hiroshima, No More Nagasaki, No More *hibakusha*. Never again. Thank you very much.

Mayor Taue

Thank you very much, Mr. Gagnon. Thank you indeed for your encouragement and information. There are so many things that we did not know; we have learned a lot from you. We hope that we will be able to deepen our liaison and communication with NGOs, as Mayor Akiba said, the Peace Depot is another NGO, with which we are having very close communication.

I think Mr. Gagnon is already gone but thank you very much. Please give one more round of applause to Mr. Gagnon. Thank you very much.

Now ladies and gentlemen, the A-bombed city of Nagasaki, is also famous as a tourist destination. As a port town, we have fostered unique cultures through our long exchange with other countries. Japanese culture is thoroughly mixed with Western and Asian cultures here in Nagasaki. So you will be able to enjoy the diversity of cultures here in Nagasaki.

I believe that coexistence of different ideas and living with diversity are fundamentals for peace. Mr. Tatsuichiro Akizuki, one of the leaders of peace activities in Nagasaki, called for solidarity among peace groups under the broad cause when those groups were at odds with each other over their differences in ideas or methods for peace. I think his words were a message that whenever we have differences, we should try to think about

our objectives and attempt to overcome small differences. We should try to accept diversity and look at our objectives and our common goal far ahead, instead of arguing and fighting over the small differences.

I think we, Mayors for Peace, share this spirit as a group working in solidarity toward common objectives while respecting our diversity. In this regard, the existence of Mayors for Peace itself embodies a form of peace.

I believe that our culture and tradition are a reflection of the culture of peace. Now lets proceed to the arts and performances showing a part of the diverse cultures in Nagasaki. I will turn the mike over to a different MC. Thank you very much for your support.