



公開シンポジウム報告  
「理性の声、若者の声：  
変わるか、アメリカの核兵器認識、そして日本は」

高原 孝生

2007年12月14日（金）  
明治学院大学 横浜キャンパス  
9号館 922 教室

<プログラム PROGRAM>

13:30-14:15 イントロダクション Introduction

二発の原爆、二万個の核兵器 *Two Bombs, Twenty Thousand Weapons*

高原 孝生（明治学院大学教授） *Prof. Takao Takahara (Professor, Meiji Gakuin Univ.)*

映画 『ヒロシマ・母たちの祈り』 *Movie: Hiroshima- A Mother's Prayer*

14:15-15:20 第一部 なぜ今、核兵器について考えるのか *Why Bother About Nuclear Weapons Today?*

<講演> 詩人の声：今日のアメリカと核兵器 *A Poet's Point of View: US Policy and Nuclear Weapons Today*

民主主義の世の中で政治家たちは私たちを代表しているか？

ディビッド・クリーガー（核時代平和財団代表） *Dr. David Krieger (President, NAPF)*

（休憩 10 分）質疑応答（Recess 10 min.）Questions and Answers

15:20-16:40 第二部 若者は、私たちは、何をしているのか *What Is the Role of the Youth?*

<講演> カリフォルニア大学生のハンスト行動：彼らはなぜ動いたのか

*Student Nuclear Abolition Activism at the University of California*

ニック・ロビンソン（核時代平和財団プログラム担当）

*Mr. Nick Robinson (Program Associate, NAPF)*

<討論> 中村 桂子（NPO 法人ピースデポ事務局長） *Ms. Keiko Nakamura (Secretary-General, Peace Depot)*

質疑応答 *Questions and Answers*

会場を 8 号館 821 教室に移し

16:45-18:00 ディスカッション（この時間は通訳がつきません）

*Colloquium with UC Students: What New Thoughts?*

12月14日(金) 公開シンポジウム「理性の声、若者の声：変わるか、アメリカの核兵器認識、そして日本は」が、9号館922教室を使い、国際学部の「文化交渉史」と「文化人類学」の二つの授業に重ねる形で、上のようなプログラムに従って開催された。

2007年1月に保守系の論調で知られる『ウォールストリートジャーナル』紙に、「核のない世界を」と題した米国政府の元高官や元上院議員4名の連名寄稿が掲載され、話題を呼んだ。8月の原爆忌前後には、全米TVネットワークで初めて、被爆者の惨状が映った映像をそのまま伝える証言ドキュメンタリーが放映され、また2007年には、翌年の大統領選挙をめざす有力候補者たちが、これも例年とは異なって「核軍縮」を目標として口にするようになった。

そうした変化の兆しかとも思える個別の動きの一つとして5月には、核兵器を研究開発する研究所との関係を絶つことを大学に要求して、カリフォルニア大学生が理事会に向けてハンガーストライキを敢行した。その間近にいたカリフォルニア州サンタバーバラの「核軍縮平和財団」から理事長と学生スタッフの二人のゲスト、そして日本のNGOからも討論者を招き、明学生のみでなく、戸塚キャンパスで学ぶカリフォルニア大学からの留学生たちを巻き込んで行われたのが、この公開シンポジウムだった。最後のセッションまで時間をオーバーして、熱のこもったやりとりが続いた。

核大国アメリカに、変化が起きているのか。銃社会と言われる暴力の文化にも変化は及んでいるのだろうか。ここでは、クリーガー理事長の用意した講演用ペーパーと、帰米後に学生スタッフがまとめた文章を収録する。

## **A POET'S POINT OF VIEW: UNITED STATES POLICY AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS TODAY**

**David Krieger**

As an American citizen and a citizen of the planet, it pains me to witness US policy and its largely negative influence in the world today. The US has become an imperial power, and as all imperial powers have done throughout history, relies upon its military might to control its empire. But the US empire is different from past empires. It does not require its territories to be directly linked to the US as vassal states. It only requires them to do as they are told. It offers rewards for those states that follow orders, and threatens punishments for those who fail to do so.

The US empire is far flung. Its presence covers the globe. The US is surely the only country in human history to have organized military commands that span the globe and extend into outer space. If full US military expenditures are counted, they may exceed \$750 billion annually (Department of Defense budget, current wars, debt on past wars, nuclear expenditures in the Department of Energy budget, Department of Veterans Affairs budget, etc.). These expenditures are greater than comparable expenditures in the rest of the



world combined.

The US maintains military bases throughout the world, and its navy, including its nuclear-armed Trident submarines, is present in all the world's oceans. Its nuclear missiles can strike anywhere on Earth in a matter of minutes, and it is now moving toward adding conventional warheads to some of its intercontinental ballistic missiles, so that they will be more usable than nuclear weapons. The US controls the world's sea lanes and the air lanes, and it seeks to dominate outer space – what it refers to as the new “high frontier” – from which it could further enhance its domination of our planet.

In recent years, under the George W. Bush administration, the US has been disdainful of international law. It withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in order to pursue missile defenses and space weaponization. It failed to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It “unsigned” the Rome Statute for the International Criminal Court (ICC), and has coerced more than 100 countries around the world to co-sign bilateral agreements with the US, in which they commit themselves not to turn any US citizen over to the Court. It has failed to support the Kyoto Accords on Climate Change. And, perhaps most egregiously, the US attacked Iraq without the sanction of the United Nations, thus violating the United Nations Charter and committing aggressive war; and in its “war on terrorism,” the US has held detainees without rights, and committed a pattern of abuse and torture.

Never has world opinion held the US in lower esteem. The US may be able to bend other states to its will, but it does so these days with power rather than respect. Once the US was viewed as a model of democracy. Today it has become a model of arrogance. It forces its will on others not by persuasion and projects for the common good, but by economic inducements and threats of force. The US is losing its democracy at home and its respect abroad.

The US seems to have learned only the wrong lessons from its tragic failure four decades ago in Vietnam. Thus, it cancelled conscription (“the draft”), a system which took at least some military inductees from all classes of society, and replaced it with an all volunteer military. This created, in effect, an economic draft, in which recruits are enticed by monetary rewards for joining or re-enlisting in the military. The US military has become a force made up largely of the poor. Ironically, the US military is now supplemented by highly paid mercenaries, such as those provided by Blackwater, the notorious security firm. The current war against Iraq, in addition to killing over a million Iraqis, is destroying the US military itself by stretching it so thin that its readiness for dealing with any real need for defense is close to zero.

Within the US, politicians, with rare exceptions, have not been brave or bold in opposing America's descent into militarism and bullyism. They have demonstrated that they know how to collaborate in the starting of wars, including illegal wars such as the war in Iraq, but they don't seem to have the conscience or

courage to stop them. They know how to supinely support the unleashing of “shock and awe,” but they know very little about creating peace and a healthy planet for all the world’s inhabitants.

Politicians generally serve economic interests. They are all too frequently willing tools of power and profit. They are often inhibited in challenging militarism. In a culture in which corporate media rarely questions government action, it is difficult for citizens to obtain a dissenting view on US militarism. But in a context of multiple public justifications for war, one after another of which have proven to be blatant lies, a higher level of critical thinking and discernment is desperately needed.

How should an American citizen, or a friend of America, respond to the rapid descent under the current administration of cherished American ideals of democracy and decency? This is a time of sadness, even despair, but also a time that demands something more from US citizens and from the friends of America. There is a saying in the United States related to preventing drunk driving: “*Friends don’t let friends drive drunk.*” America’s friends, within and outside the country, must step forward and take away the keys in order to prevent the United States from continuing to drive drunk, in this case drunk with the arrogance of power.

I believe there is an important place in our world now for the insights and perspectives of poets, particularly poets who are in touch with conscience. During the Vietnam War, I wrote a poem entitled, “In Truth, We are Bombing Ourselves.” It began with these lines: “Snails speak louder to truth/ than our politicians speak to conscience/ and the voices of frogs are clearer yet than poets.” In our world today, including in the US, there is a craving for truth, clarity and hope. Poets, perhaps more than politicians, can help guide us toward these longings, and in the process help us to regain our decency, our honor, our dignity and our respect.

I have found that poetry has been an important vehicle for attempting to make sense of the madness of our world. It has helped me to articulate the dangerous reality that exists beneath the banal surface of television blather, official justifications and horrendous crimes of state. I would like to share with you two of many poems I have written against the Iraq War, before moving on to consider US nuclear policy.

## **TO AN IRAQI CHILD**

*for Ali Ismail Abbas*

So you wanted to be a doctor?

It was not likely that your dreams  
would have come true anyway.



We didn't intend for our bombs to find you.

They are smart bombs, but they didn't know  
that you wanted to be a doctor.

They didn't know anything about you  
and they know nothing of love.

They cannot be trusted with dreams.

They only know how to find their targets  
and explode in fulfillment.

They are gray metal casings with violent hearts,  
doing only what they were created to do.

It isn't their fault that they found you.

Perhaps you were not meant to be a doctor.

### **WORSE THAN THE WAR**

Worse than the war, the endless, senseless war,  
Worse than the lies leading to the war,

Worse than the countless deaths and injuries,  
Worse than hiding the coffins and not attending funerals,

Worse than the flouting of international law,  
Worse than the torture at Abu Ghraib prison,

Worse than the corruption of young soldiers,  
Worse than undermining our collective sense of decency,

Worse than the arrogance, smugness and swagger,  
Worse than our loss of credibility in the world,

Worse than the loss of our liberties,

Worse than learning nothing from the past,

Worse than destroying the future,

Worse than the incredible stupidity of it all,

Worse than all of these,

As if they were not enough for one war or country or lifetime,

Is the silence, the resounding silence of good Americans.

The Iraq War is an illegal and immoral war, reflecting US double standards. During the first Gulf War in 1991, the US-led coalition attacked Iraq and drove the Iraqis out of Kuwait. The reason for the attack was that Iraq had committed aggression and was occupying Kuwait. In the Iraq War initiated in 2003, the US invaded Iraq without the authorization of the UN Security Council. Thus, in this case, the US was the aggressor nation. Recently it was reported that over 1,200,000 Iraqis have died as a result of this war and occupation. This means that for every American soldier to die in Iraq, 300 Iraqis, nearly all civilians, have been killed.

The initial justification that US leaders gave for invading Iraq – among many subsequently given – was that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. But no weapons of mass destruction could be found in Iraq, just as the UN inspectors said. Some commentators have noted the irony that although nuclear weapons could not be found in Iraq, thousands can be found throughout the US, and US nuclear weapons can be found throughout the world.

The US approach to foreign policy has been based upon double standards, generally to “the resounding silence of good Americans.” It is arrogant, don’t you think, to have one set of standards for oneself and one’s friends and another set of standards for those one deems as enemies or evil? Double standards are a significant element of US nuclear policy.

## **US Nuclear Policy**

In recent years, the United States has not played a constructive role on issues of nuclear disarmament. Rather, it has demonstrated by its policies its intention to rely upon nuclear weapons for the indefinite future. I would characterize US nuclear policy as unstable, unreliable and, ultimately, as reckless, provocative and dangerous for itself and humanity. I will discuss below some of the principal elements of US nuclear policy.



**Double Standards.** The US has upheld one standard for its friends and allies, and another standard for its perceived enemies. Thus, the US seeks to promote nuclear trade with India, despite the fact that India never joined the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and developed and tested nuclear weapons. The US has been willing to bend its own laws and pressure the international Nuclear Suppliers Group to support its agreement with India. In the same vein, the US has not complained about Israeli nuclear weapons and has continued to annually give billions of dollars of military support to Israel. At the same time, the US attacked Iraq for supposedly having a nuclear weapons program and is threatening Iran with attack for the same unsubstantiated reasons (Iran claims to be enriching uranium only for its legal nuclear energy program). The Bush administration is currently seeking to replace every weapon in its nuclear arsenal with a new thermonuclear warhead, the so-called Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW). Such double standards are not sustainable, and are widely recognized as such in the international community.

**Extended Deterrence.** The United States seeks not only to deter a nuclear attack against its own territory, but also an attack against its allies. Thus, the US provides nuclear assurances to its NATO allies as well as to its allies in East Asia, including Japan, South Korea and Taiwan. These countries are considered to reside under the US nuclear umbrella. One of the goals of US nuclear policy is to provide assurance to its allies. In the 2001 *Nuclear Posture Review*, it states, “US nuclear forces will continue to provide assurance to security partners, particularly in the presence of known or suspected threats of nuclear, biological, or chemical attacks or in the event of surprising military developments.”

**Ambiguous Messages.** The US has not given clear messages about when it may use nuclear weapons. As indicated above, even “surprising military developments” can be viewed as a provocation for the threat or use of US nuclear forces. The 2001 *Nuclear Posture Review*, for example, also states, “Nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack...”

**Threat of Preventive Use.** In a 2005 draft document, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations*, the US expressed a willingness to use nuclear weapons against an enemy “intending to use WMD” against the US or allied military forces, or in the case of an “imminent attack from adversary biological weapons...”

**High Alert Status.** The US and Russia continue to keep some 3,500 nuclear weapons on high alert status, ready to be fired within moments of an order to do so. This creates a dangerous situation in which these weapons could be launched by accident.

**Preventing Proliferation by force.** The US demonstrated its willingness to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons by force when it attacked Iraq in 2003. It has threatened to use force to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons to Iran.

**Launch on Warning.** The US continues to employ a policy of launching its nuclear weapons on warning of attack. This increases the chance of launching in response to a false warning, and thus initiating a nuclear attack.

**Alliance Sharing.** US nuclear weapons are currently shared with six US allies in Europe – Belgium, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Turkey and the UK. Some 350 US nuclear weapons are currently thought to be deployed in Europe in cooperative agreements with these countries that would leave the weapons in the hands of the European countries in the event of hostilities. The US is the only country in the world to deploy nuclear weapons on foreign soil.

**Negative Leadership.** There are two main directions in which leadership can be applied on nuclear weapons issues. One direction is toward ending reliance on nuclear weapons and eliminating them; the other direction is toward sustaining these weapons for the indefinite future. The United States has chosen the latter course. It has blocked progress toward nuclear disarmament in the United Nations General Assembly, the Commission, and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conferences on nuclear disarmament, despite its obligation under the NPT to engage in “good faith” negotiations for nuclear disarmament. In the area of nuclear policy, the US has shown negative leadership. It has been an obstacle rather than a beacon in moving toward achieving a nuclear weapons free world.

When looked at in overview, and when taking the first letters of each of the elements of US nuclear policy described above, they spell *Death Plan*. While I don’t think that US nuclear policy is consciously meant to be a *Death Plan*, I do think that it is currently charting a course that will result in nuclear proliferation, potential nuclear terrorism, increased nuclear threats and the eventual use of these weapons.

Above all countries, the United States should be leading the way toward a world free of nuclear weapons. Not only does it have special responsibilities as the country that first created nuclear weapons and first used them, but it is also the country that would benefit most in terms of its own security from the elimination of all nuclear weapons in the world.

### **A Bipartisan Plea for US Leadership for Nuclear Disarmament**

There are some signs that the foreign policy elites of the US are recognizing the advantages to a serious commitment to nuclear disarmament. On January 4, 2007, four former high-level officials joined together in publishing a *Wall Street Journal* article calling for US leadership for a world free of nuclear weapons. The four officials included two former Secretaries of State, Henry Kissinger and George Shultz; a former Secretary of Defense, William Perry; and a former chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Sam Nunn. Kissinger and Shultz served in Republican administrations, while Perry served in a Democratic administration





and Nunn was a Democratic Senator. Sixteen other former US foreign and defense policy officials also endorsed the view represented in the statement of the four former officials.

The authors stated: “Nuclear weapons today present tremendous dangers, but also an historic opportunity. US leadership will be required to take the world to the next stage – to a solid consensus for reversing reliance on nuclear weapons globally as a vital contribution to preventing their proliferation into potentially dangerous hands, and ultimately ending them as a threat to the world.”

The authors expressed their belief in the importance of nuclear deterrence during the Cold War, but its decreasing relevance in a post Cold War world. They, in fact, found that Soviet-American mutually assured deterrence is “obsolete.”

The four prominent former US officials reviewed current nuclear dangers and called for US leadership to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons. In essence, the argument leading them to this position was based on the following premises:

1. Reliance on nuclear weapons for deterrence “is becoming increasingly hazardous and decreasingly effective.”
2. Terrorist groups are outside the bounds of deterrence strategy.
3. We are entering a new nuclear era that “will be more precarious, disorienting and costly than was Cold War deterrence.”
4. Attempting to replicate Cold War strategies of deterrence will dramatically increase the risk that nuclear weapons will be used.
5. New nuclear weapons states lack the safeguarding and control experiences learned by the US and USSR during the Cold War.
6. The nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty envisions the elimination of all nuclear weapons.
7. Non-nuclear weapons states have grown increasingly skeptical of the sincerity of the nuclear weapons states to fulfill their Non-Proliferation Treaty obligations to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.
8. There exists an historic opportunity to eliminate nuclear weapons in the world.
9. To realize this opportunity, bold vision and action are needed.
10. The US must take the lead and must convince the leaders of the other nuclear weapons states to turn the goal of nuclear weapons abolition into a joint effort.

In other words, the bipartisan group found that it was in the self-interest of the US to lead the way toward a world without nuclear weapons. They are not a group of men likely to encourage US leadership for altruistic reasons or humanitarian concerns. They were hardened Cold Warriors, willing to risk humanity’s

future during the Cold War nuclear arms race, even if it meant blowing up the world, including the United States, for what they perceived as America's security.

The group outlined a number of steps that need to be taken to lay the groundwork for a world free of nuclear threat. They specifically called for the following:

- de-alerting nuclear arsenals;
- reducing the size of nuclear arsenals;
- eliminating tactical nuclear weapons;
- achieving Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and encouraging other key states to also ratify the Treaty;
- securing nuclear weapons and weapons-usable materials everywhere in the world; and
- reducing proliferation risks by halting production of fissile materials for weapons, ceasing to use enriched uranium in civil commerce and removing weapons-usable uranium from research reactors.

In June 2007, Sam Nunn, one of the authors of the bipartisan plea, made an important speech to the Council on Foreign Relations. It was entitled, "The Mountaintop: A World Free of Nuclear Weapons." He argued that "the accelerating spread of nuclear weapons, nuclear know-how and nuclear material has brought us to a nuclear tipping point. The world is heading in a very dangerous direction." He further stated that the dangers of nuclear terrorism, nuclear proliferation and accidental nuclear war can only be prevented through cooperation with Russia and China. He reiterated the call for US leadership "to take the world to the next stage." He likened achieving nuclear abolition to reaching the top of a mountain, and set forth steps to be taken to ascend the mountain.

Nunn quoted Ronald Reagan, who said, "We now have a weapon that can destroy the world – why don't we recognize that threat more clearly and then come together with one aim in mind: How safely, sanely, and quickly can we rid the world of this threat to our civilization and our existence?"

It is late in the day, but the question continues to hang in the air before us. Nunn's answer was this: "If we want our children and grandchildren to ever see the mountaintop, our generation must begin to answer this question."

But just beginning to answer the question is not enough. Unless we approach this problem of abolishing nuclear weapons as an urgent priority, the mountaintop will recede from view, as it becomes shrouded in the fog of hedging our bets with work on new nuclear warheads, missile defenses, space weaponization, and resistance to further cuts in our nuclear arsenal.



While the statement of the former officials has attracted some attention in the US, including from presidential candidates, it has not sparked a full-scale debate among the US foreign policy elite. However, a direct assault on the Kissinger group position was set forth in a November 19, 2007 opinion article in the *Wall Street Journal* written by two former high-level officials in Democratic administrations, former Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and former CIA Director John Deutch. They stated: “Nuclear weapons are not empty symbols; they play an important deterrent role, and cannot be eliminated. Foreign policy must be based on this reality; and the U.S. should work with other nations on those achievable objectives that lower the risks of the spread of nuclear weapons capability and the possibility of nuclear weapons use.” In other words, they favor preventing proliferation of nuclear weapons and their use by others, but they oppose even envisioning a world free of nuclear weapons.

The commitment of at least some of the former officials in the Kissinger group to their own statement was also drawn into question in November 2007 when it was revealed that both Kissinger and Shultz are supporting continued research on the so-called Reliable Replacement Warhead. In a letter to Republican Senators Jon Kyl and Pete Domenici, Kissinger wrote, “I believe that research and design of the RRW should continue and that the infrastructure to support our current program should be urgently strengthened.” Enclosed with Kissinger’s letter was one from Shultz and nuclear scientist Sidney Drell, who stated, “research work on new RRW designs should certainly go ahead.” They continued, “Such work would make possible the decision to implement the construction phase of the program were that to be desired at some future time.”

On the issue of nuclear disarmament, the public in the US seems to be ahead of both the foreign policy elites and most political leaders. This was borne out in a poll developed by WorldPublicOpinion.org in conjunction with the Center for International Security Studies at the University of Maryland (CISSM). In November 2007, they released national polling results of Americans and Russians on nuclear disarmament issues. The poll found that 73 percent of Americans and 63 percent of Russians favored the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons. Eighty-eight percent of Americans and 65 percent of Russians support the US-Russian Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT) to reduce nuclear arsenals to 2,200 or less by the year 2012. Majorities in both countries would like to reach these goals even sooner and would support reductions to 400 weapons on each side. Ninety-two percent of Americans and 65 percent of Russians believe that an international body, such as the United Nations, should monitor and verify compliance with these reductions. In general, these numbers demonstrate that the US public strongly favors steps to achieve nuclear disarmament.

### **Presidential Candidates**

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation has been tracking the statements of the US presidential candidates on nuclear policy. The Foundation asked the candidates to fill in a short questionnaire, but only Edwards, Gravel, Kucinich and Richardson have provided substantive responses. These responses, along with quotes

from statements on nuclear policy issues by all major party candidates, can be found at [www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org).

Among the candidates for the US presidency, the strongest statements for ridding the world of nuclear weapons have come from John Edwards, Dennis Kucinich and Barack Obama.

Edwards has stated: “What we have to do, what America needs to do and what I will do as president of the United States is to lead a long-term international effort to rid the world of nuclear weapons.” He also agreed with the statement by the Kissinger group “...that we should aspire to a nuclear-free world.”

Kucinich has stated, “I think that we have to get rid of nuclear weapons. The idea that somehow by having nuclear weapons you make the world a safer place is essentially insane.” He has further stated, “I think that the United States must lead the way for nuclear abolition,” and has introduced legislation to do so. Kucinich also talks about “rejecting war as an instrument of policy.”

Obama has called for the US to “lead the international effort to deemphasize the role of nuclear weapons around the world. He has stated that as President he would say, “America seeks a world in which there are no nuclear weapons.”

Bill Richardson has said, “The United States must be a leader on disarmament.” He has also said, “The United States should not be the first to use nuclear weapons in any future conflict.”

Hilary Clinton, the current Democratic frontrunner, has referred to the statement by the Kissinger group:

“As President, I will work to implement the sensible near-term steps Secretaries Shultz, Kissinger, Perry and Senator Nunn described: increasing nuclear warning time, reducing the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch; substantially reducing nuclear arsenals in all states that possess them; working with the Senate to build bipartisan support for approving the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; providing the highest possible standards of security for nuclear stockpiles worldwide to keep them out of terrorist hands; controlling the spread of uranium enrichment, including by offering countries assured nuclear fuel supplies so they will not need their own enrichment plants; ending production of nuclear materials for weapons and removing potential bomb uranium from civil commerce and from vulnerable sites around the world; and redoubling our efforts to resolve the regional conflicts that fuel nuclear weapons ambitions.”

In discussing the possibility of Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon, most of the presidential candidates have stated that all options must remain on the table. The notable exceptions to this perspective were voiced



by Dennis Kucinich, Mike Gravel, Barack Obama and Ron Paul.

## **Conclusion**

In the United States, we have lived too long and too complacently with the bomb. We should not take much hope from the perspectives of men like Henry Kissinger and his colleagues – they can be counted on to put profit, power and self-interest ahead of the common good. Nor do we have any reason to expect that the next president of the US will work to rid the world of nuclear weapons on his or her own accord – unless the citizens of the US make this issue their priority and assure that they elect a candidate who makes it his or her priority.

Our best hope lies in the common sense and good sense of the people. The issue of nuclear weapons abolition remains urgent, but it will not occur until the people succeed in making their voices heard. If we fail, we will continue the unmistakable drift toward catastrophe – a catastrophe that with just a modicum of imagination should be fully preventable. But should the ultimate catastrophe come to pass, I offer this as an epitaph for what might be said about humanity:

“They had their moments of greatness, but they lacked sufficient imagination, or at least their leaders did, to meet the ultimate challenge of the Nuclear Age.”

Our world needs poets now far more than political leaders who are stuck in old ways of thinking and who have led us to the nuclear precipice. Instead of marching over the cliff like lemmings, we need to take some deep breaths and step back from this sharp edge of insanity. We need poets to help us see our essential decency and the beauty of the world that is our home. Our planetary home is worth defending from the nuclear weapons threats that endanger us all.

I urge you to be brave and bold in building peace and a world free of nuclear weapons. I hope that you will be among the one-hearted, who walk the path of peace.

## **THE ONE-HEARTED**

The one-hearted walk a lonely trail.  
They hold the dream of peace between  
the moon's eclipse and the rising sun.

They set down their weapons, carrying  
instead the spirits of their ancestors,

a collection of smooth stones.

At night, they make fires, and watch  
the smoke rise into the starlit sky.

They are warriors of hope, navigating  
oceans and crossing continents.

Their message is simple: Now  
is the time for peace. It always has been.

---

David Krieger is the President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation ([www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org)).

## **Processing Our History, Maintaining Critical Space: Reflections of a Young Nuclear Abolitionist on a Recent Trip to Japan**

**Nicholas Robinson**

In December 2007, I was invited to Japan by faculty at Meiji Gakuin University to speak about student nuclear abolition activism in the United States, and more specifically at the University of California (UC), the institution from which I recently graduated. My lectures focused on the University of California's historical and pivotal role in the development of nuclear weapons for the United States government, student resistance to the UC's management of nuclear weapons laboratories, and issues of privatization of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex and greater military industrial complex. My trip began in Tokyo, where I had the opportunity to speak on two separate occasions, first during a symposium on nuclear weapons issues organized by the Institute for International Studies at the Meiji Gakuin University campus in the nearby city of Yokohama. As my first audience was made up primarily of young University students, without extensive knowledge of nuclear weapons issues or much experience in student activism, I tried to focus my first talk on the basic narrative of UC management of nuclear weapons laboratories and student resistance to the continuation of lab management. So as to elucidate the substance of my lectures and to contextualize the primary purpose of my trip, I'll briefly recount that narrative.

The UC has managed the two primary nuclear weapons laboratories in the U.S. since the labs' inception in 1945



(LANL) and 1952 (LLNL), through contracts with the United States Department of Energy. The atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were built through The Manhattan Project by a team of UC scientists, led by UC Berkeley physicist, J. Robert Oppenheimer, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). Every nuclear weapon which has ever been built by the United States was developed by UC-employed scientists at LANL in New Mexico, and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) in California. LLNL was established with the specific mission of developing the hydrogen bomb. The perpetual management of the nuclear labs by the UC Regents, the governing body of the University, has faced resistance among UC students and faculty for decades.

The faculty and many students in Japan were interested in the state of the nuclear abolition movement among students in the United States, and while I could not offer them much in terms of a cohesively organized, widespread, student nuclear abolition movement throughout the country, there does exist a growing network of young nuclear abolition activists, known as the Think Outside the Bomb network, which convenes through a series of conferences organized through the Youth Empowerment Initiative at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Regarding the issue of student nuclear abolition activism, I was happy to speak about the technically informed and focused abolition movement at the University of California, which has historically focused on the UC's direct structural connection to the U.S. nuclear weapons complex. This movement has additionally derived the support of several local non-profit organizations including, for the last five years, the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's UC-Nuclear Free program.

In the spring of 2007, students and their supporters at UC Santa Barbara convinced the UCSB Associated Students Legislative Council to unanimously vote to establish a committee known as the Student Department of Energy Lab Oversight Committee (DOELOC). The primary purpose of the committee is to inform the UC student body, faculty, and surrounding community about the UC-managed nuclear labs through research and investigation and to give students an institutionalized means for overseeing the activities of the nuclear labs to which their University's name is attached. Students involved in the DOELOC intend to facilitate its official establishment on other UC campuses in the near future.

In an attempt to pressure the UC Regents to sever the University's ties with the nuclear weapons laboratories, the UC student movement for severance with the labs organized a non-violent direct action in May 2007. The action involved hundreds of UC students and community members, at least 40 of whom underwent varying levels of fast, ranging from liquid only to total abstention from all sustenance besides water, for nine days. While I was a UC student at the time, and despite my shared desire for nuclear abolition and UC-nuclear lab severance with those who did take part in that action, I chose not to fast. However, my proximity to and support of those who were involved proffered me much insight into that action in particular, as well as the opportunity to become further involved in the UC student nuclear abolition movement in general.

At Meiji Gakuin's Tokyo campus, I had the opportunity to speak to an older, more technically informed audience made up of scholars, NGO representatives and older University students. Within that context, I was able to speak to the phenomenon of privatization sweeping through the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, the U.S. military, Academia, and other traditionally public spheres. After six decades of sole UC management, the U.S. Department of Energy revoked the UC's status as sole manager of the nuclear labs, and put the labs up for bid. The University of California subsequently partnered with Bechtel, Washington Group International, and BWX Technologies, major firms already engaged in the most extensive operations throughout the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, and won the new contracts for the management of LANL and LLNL. Lab management now falls under the auspices of two limited liability corporations with even less transparency and even more immense lobbying power than the labs experienced under UC's sole management. These new contracts are indicative of the further monopolization of the nuclear production chain, from enrichment, to design and infrastructure construction, to production, to waste disposal.

The privatization of the laboratories is part of a greater phenomenon of military privatization occurring under the Bush Administration. This development is worrisome as privatization of conventional and nuclear military production and operations creates a greater structural imperative for war, the expansion of military and nuclear activities, and the testing and use of conventional military and nuclear products, as these firms, like any other corporations, have imperatives of profit and growth to fulfill. During the question and answer period following my talk in Tokyo, I was asked by an audience member to clarify what I meant by "privatization of national laboratories," as he professed that such a phenomenon in Japan would be "unheard of." Furthermore, I was told later by my translator that he had a difficult time translating the concept, since the actual linguistic structure of the concept appeared to be a contradiction in terms. I didn't have many answers for them besides the basics of government contracting and corporate subcontracting, as I'm similarly dismayed by the contradiction inherent to the concept of "privatized, national laboratories." But I could offer them one point: As more governments adopt the neo-liberal economic prescriptions coming out of Washington, Japan not excluded, privatization may be coming to a public institution near you. Throughout my tour of Tokyo, Kyoto, Hiroshima, and Yokohama in Japan, I had the opportunity to speak with many people, young and old, regarding these issues.

I also met many Japanese peace activists throughout my travels working on a wide variety of important campaigns, all interwoven with the common threads of nuclear abolition and demilitarization. Several organizations and many individuals are working to strengthen and promote Article Nine of the Japanese Constitution -- through which the Japanese government has officially renounced war as a tool of foreign policy -- and extend its spirit and legal framework abroad. Additionally, there is a thriving movement against the continuing occupation by the United States military, through its maintenance of several military bases stationed on the Japanese archipelago. Demilitarization activists are working to prevent the expansion of these bases through non-violent direct action, focusing their attention especially on the controversial base on the island of Okinawa. I was truly inspired by the dedication and bravery of those who shared their stories and struggles with





me, and I found rejuvenation and strength in the existence of a global network of individuals all working for a very different world.

Nevertheless, as an American, I found it personally difficult to travel through a country almost entirely destroyed through American firebombings and atomic bombings of Japanese cities during World War II, killing hundreds of thousands of civilians, not to mention the continuing occupation by the United States in the form of ever-expanding military bases. I spoke to many young Japanese citizens who shared with me their experiences of the same sense of responsibility and remorse when traveling throughout China and Korea, countries which were exploited and ravaged by Imperial Japan. I recently encountered the same phenomenon when traveling throughout South America and befriending young German citizens carrying the weight of their country's history on their shoulders. In a world that seems closer together and smaller every day, young people are finding it necessary to acknowledge the unpleasant history of their homelands, both as a means of healing as well as disassociating themselves, as individuals, from those horrible legacies.

Indeed I find it difficult to go anywhere in the world today without the reputation of the current and past foreign actions of my country's government, no matter what their contextual justification may be, hanging over my head, despite my own personal disassociation with many facets of that government as my legitimate representative. While I was welcomed with open arms throughout my travels in Japan, most especially by those individuals who lived through the bombings and subsequent occupation, and are most aware of the current imperialist exploits of the U.S. government, I always felt like I ought to apologize even for that which I'm not personally responsible. I never did offer an apology on behalf of the U.S. government, as I'm not its delegate, but I hope that through my words and actions, my counterparts across the Pacific were reassured that there exists a movement in my country that parallels their own, and that the actions of the U.S. government less and less represent the will of its people. Throughout the rest of this piece, I recount some of my experiences traveling through Japan as a young abolitionist. I offer a critique based on my own conception of the problems, to which Japan is no stranger, which urgently confront my generation and the very existence of our world.

Kyoto, Japan, the country's center of religious worship and cultural history, allows one to witness first-hand the all-too-familiar struggle that plagues the world's centers of cultural heritage: the maintenance of indigenous tradition and culture in the face of corporate globalization. The spires of its many temples and shrines rise majestically above the city, sharing the skyline with apartment complexes and department stores, and drawing throngs of eager worshipers and international tourists at their foundations. Especially throughout the blooming of the cherry blossoms in the spring and the kaleidoscopic withering of the maple trees in autumn, the afternoon crush threatens to exceed the capacity of the anachronistically narrow, cobble-stoned alleyways between the sites. Yet it serves as a boon to the many local sweet and craft shops fortunate enough to have staked out a location close to the various site exits so as to justify the annual rent appreciation. Unlike the relics of ancient cultures throughout the Western world, which increasingly unabashedly share their plazas with the golden

arches and feature a Starbucks or two within sight, Kyoto continues to struggle to maintain its local authenticity and historical heritage even as its intensively-branded center expands outward. Kyoto was one of the largest population centers in Japan to be mostly spared the U.S. B-29 fire bombings during World War II, which killed and maimed hundreds of thousands of Japanese civilians and almost wholly destroyed the infrastructure of most Japanese Imperial cities -- subsequently reconstructed under occupation by the allied powers, and primarily by the United States. As money poured into the reconstruction projects in post-war Japan, the introduction of the Capitalist market system and Western lifestyle by the United States and Western Europe allowed for the type of development of the new Japanese economy to largely parallel the corporate structure of Western business. Kyoto's visible perseverance in maintaining ancient cultural traditions and infrastructure is therefore an increasingly unique and important phenomenon both throughout the country and around the globe in the face of destructive warfare and increasingly pervasive corporate globalization.

Kyoto has also lent its moniker to the first, albeit relatively modest, international treaty on reducing global carbon emissions in the form of the Kyoto Protocol, negotiated in Kyoto in 1997 but not coming into force until early in 2005 following ratification by Russia. However, without the support and participation of the United States, responsible for more than 25% of overall carbon emissions, the treaty will not suffice to significantly alter the course of global warming. Given the United States' superpower geopolitical status and highly disproportionate consumption rates, any sweeping international initiative regarding any global issue, from global warming to the disarmament of nuclear weapons, requires multilateral cooperation and benevolent leadership by the U.S. government. Unfortunately, the United States' rogue history of arrogance and unilateralism -- displayed most prominently through gunship diplomacy and the usurping of various international treaties and UN resolutions on test bans, environmental preservation, nuclear disarmament, and demilitarization -- has resulted in a lack of overall human progress toward a more just and peaceful society.

The eco-systemic finitude of the Japanese archipelago has its share of environmental woes, from over-fishing in its surrounding waters to the noxious air quality over Tokyo throughout the last century. But in a way microcosmically representative of the entire globe, the obvious finitude of Japan's ecosystem has not prevented the corporate globalization model based on limitless quantitative economic growth from being allowed to continue practically unabated, just as it is around the world. And in response to its historical air pollution crisis and ever-increasing need for domestic power generation to fuel its growth, Japan relies on nuclear energy for over 30% of its energy production, presenting the seismically active and heavily populated island nation another pressing set of problems. Japan's nuclear plants have experienced fires, reactor failures, spillage and leaks of radioactive materials into the environment, as well as the same exorbitant investment costs in reactors and enrichment facilities and the same lack of any safe means of permanent nuclear waste disposal that plagues the entire world. Despite the sustained existence of the same disastrous issues that the global nuclear energy industry and affected communities have always faced, many industry officials around the world continue to speak of a nuclear renaissance and tout nuclear energy as a clean solution to global warming despite its



catastrophic history of environmental contamination.

The irony was not lost on me as I took advantage of the high-powered electric Shinkansen (bullet-train) on which I sped across the country, peering out the window across rice fields, farming towns, industrial cities, and a picturesque mountain landscape, on my way from Kyoto to Hiroshima, the site of the world's first glimpse of the nuclear age. On first face, the Shinkansen appears as a beacon of mass transit technology in a chaotic sea of carbon-spewing automobiles, allowing commuters to speed across long distances safely and efficiently, decreasing street traffic congestion, with a carbon output far below that of aircraft or car travel. In its current manifestation in Japan, however, the technology is largely dependent on centralized sources of high-yield energy output; and when proponents abroad sell the idea of high-speed rail and point to Japan's Shinkansen as a model, the idea is often coupled with the derivation of power through nuclear energy, all under the guise of fabricating a greener infrastructure with a smaller carbon footprint. Certainly, mass transit need not be tied to nuclear energy, and the Shinkansen is a modern engineering marvel for human transportation. But as high-speed, mass transit technologies require such massive flows of electricity, interested parties should be wary of the de facto partnership made conceptually between the technologies in some promotional literature as well as the actual overlapping interests of companies like Mitsubishi and Hitachi. Both of these corporations are primarily responsible throughout Japan and in some areas abroad for the design, construction, and maintenance of both nuclear reactors and high-speed rail infrastructure. High-speed mass transit technology should be part of a solution to global warming, but nuclear power never has been, and never will be.

Upon exiting the Shinkansen terminal in Hiroshima, I was immediately received and whisked away by my hosts through the busy streets of Hiroshima. On first face, the modern, bustling façade of the city is little different from the rest of the urban centers throughout Japan. It at first appeared that without some knowledge of the historical significance attached to the city, the unique and horrific history of the area would be hidden in a familiar sea of corporate billboards, busy salary-men shuffling silently through the streets on their way to work, and stylish young mall denizens ogling designer jeans in the windows of Western branded shops. Hiroshima hosts the growth of the same corporatized veneer spreading throughout the world through the vehicle of globalization, promoting the fetishization of a young, branded, bourgeois aesthetic and a culture of consumerism as the foundations of a new global youth culture premised upon immediate gratification and a skewed conception of civilized progress—a vision completely divorced from the physical limits of our Earth's ecosystem. The same linear conception of progress as continuous growth, completely divorced from the reality of eco-systemic finitude, coupled with an anthropocentric value system promoting a vision of endless human mastery over the environment, allowed the world to be catapulted into the Nuclear Age and has helped sustain it throughout the decades.

During my stay in this incredible city, however, I would come to learn that Hiroshima will never allow its citizens or the rest of the world to forget the city's terrible history as the site of the world's first human

experiment with atomic weaponry. For in the wake of atomic terror, a new consciousness of peace and actual societal progress based on truth, compassion, and liberty from oppression was formulated, and a highly unique and increasingly rare public space was created and enshrined in the center of a city so that its citizens could hand down the city's history and knowledge through the generations. Even after the last of the Hibakusha has passed on, the world will never be allowed to forget what happened on August 6th, 1945 at 8:15am in the city of Hiroshima, Japan, because the city's very infrastructure is devoted to spreading its message of peace and hope that a different world, without the threat of nuclear weapons and all that they signify, can and must be realized.

I spent my first hours in Hiroshima guest lecturing on nuclear weapons issues and youth activism in the United States to a peace and international studies class at Shudo University. I was assisted by a young translator involved with Hiroshima's "Never Again" campaign, which helps to empower young people to spread Hiroshima's message of peace and disarmament. In my experience, Japanese university students are in many ways very similar to their counterparts across the Pacific Ocean. A few are interested in politics and change of the status quo, but unfortunately, most can barely wait to leave campus, grab some KFC or a mocha latte, and go to the mall. In Japan, I encountered many of the same impediments to social change I encounter in the United States. Certainly, many young citizens of advanced industrialized countries are simply not aware of certain issues or have been denied the tools of critical systemic analysis required to piece together the geopolitical history necessary for an informed understanding of current events and issues. Even if they are aware of local institutions' ties to warfare, the existence of military bases, or the practices of various military contractors with operations in their communities, they are unsure of what to do with that knowledge or whether they even should be doing anything at all. After all, critical systemic analysis of global issues and events can be downright depressing, and there is an entire world of opportunities for distraction for middle and upper class urban youth within advanced industrialized countries who have a bit of cash in their pockets.

Just as in cities around the world, and in the metropolises of Tokyo and Yokohama, where I had spoken at both campuses of Meiji Gakuin University, Hiroshima's downtown district keeps plenty on offer for the distraction of Japanese youth. They are similarly bombarded with glossy ads from every direction, which beg them to sink comfortably into the contrived bourgeois lifestyles depicted in storefronts and on the sides of buildings. In a country that is 98% Japanese, the ads often glorify the images of tall, blonde, Caucasian women in glamorous drab, seductively urging young shoppers to the various brands' closest outlet stores. The almost kilometer-long downtown district of Hiroshima consists of an intensively branded strip of multinational outlets as well as Pachinko centers serving the lucrative and ever-growing gambling phenomenon across the country.

The existence of these sensorially and emotionally stimulating centers of consumerism throughout the cities of advanced industrialized countries fills a void present in urban youth, which I would argue, is largely rooted in disempowerment. I often encounter young people who, while they may not possess a critical systemic understanding of global issues and events, know at some intuitive level that something is very wrong in their



world. And I often meet knowledgeable, studious, young people who care deeply about the state of the world and the precariousness of our future. They understand that the confluence of a plethora of ecological disasters, disease, mass migration, war, exploitation, and the production and existence of many thousands of nuclear weapons in the world shrouds our generation in insecurity about our own future and the future of our Earth. But they are hopeless about change; they feel powerless. Or the situation is just too big to worry about when compared to the slew of personal difficulties one faces each day in just trying to survive. They have to work, go to school, care for sick or elderly family, and still have some fun somewhere in between. That leaves little time for changing the world. So for many, it's so much easier to forget about it all and follow the simple advice given by President Bush to scared Americans within days of the attacks on September 11, 2001: go about business as usual and go shopping.

But as corporate-driven globalization attempts to convince the world that it is just carrying out the inevitable, linear path of historical progress and that it is so much more convenient, cooler, and more fun to just go with it, there exists a dedicated, growing counter-movement for peace and justice, also globalized, working for a very different world. As one of the fulcrums of the global peace movement, Hiroshima draws thousands of tourists every year to an increasingly rare, central public space preserved for the critical reflection, intellectual expansion, and emotional expression of global citizens maintaining hope for a world free from nuclear weapons and imperialist war. Mere blocks away from the bustling downtown district, the Peace Park offers an expansive memorialization of the U.S. atomic bombing on August 6th, 1945. That bombing was followed by the Soviet invasion of Manchuria on August 8th, 1945, and a second U.S. atomic bombing of Nagasaki on August 9th, 1945.

Various monuments dedicated to victims of the atom bomb are erected throughout the tranquil park, including a memorial for the incinerated children who were not in school that day because they were commissioned by the Japanese military to build fire breaks. There is a memorial dedicated to the Korean slaves, approximately ten percent of those killed by the atomic bomb, who were incinerated while toiling in the factories of the Japanese imperial military. And there is, of course, the memorial for Sadako, a young, female survivor of the atomic bombing who, like many other survivors, contracted radiation-induced leukemia shortly afterwards. She believed, according to an old Japanese tale, that if she could fold one thousand paper cranes, that her wish for peace would come true. She died of her radiation-induced sickness before she could finish her project. But her story lives on, and children around the world still fold paper cranes in her memory and as symbols of hope for a world without wars and bombs.

Each day throughout my stay in Hiroshima, I stood for a while and meditated in the area of the preserved A-bomb memorial dome, one of the few buildings near the hypocenter not completely obliterated by the atomic fireball unleashed across the city. That daily ritual during my stay in Hiroshima kept me centered and the space provided in memorial of the bombing offered me something that is less and less allowed for in urban centers

throughout the world: a safe space to just feel. As the A-bomb dome and the peace park are in the center of the city, Hiroshima's citizens cannot go a day without a reminder of their city's history. But the preservation of the dome, its surrounding, reflective space, and the museum have helped the city to heal and empower itself as a center for change and anti-war activism. Current events and issues seen through the eyes of a citizen of Hiroshima must pass through the filter of its own history, proclaimed truthfully, and bestowing upon the successive generations the responsibility for its preservation.

Only by way of an accurate internalization of our history can we hope to understand our contemporary world and its processes. Our historical knowledge allows us to sift through the rhetoric of elites and build a systemic understanding of our world that informs our interpretations of events and determines our reactions to them. The expansive and open public space in the middle of the city provides Hiroshima's citizens and its visitors something which everyday is disappearing throughout the urban centers on Earth: a safe, public space, without distraction, where occupants are actually encouraged and trusted to come together and feel and think critically, and where one's anger, outrage, and sadness at the fact that human beings could commit such horrific acts against each other are allowed to seep out and be psychologically processed through acknowledgement and comfort from the very infrastructure of the city. Through that processing and recognition, people are allowed to heal, giving their spirits renewed determination to focus on action for systemic change.

*Nicholas Robinson is the Program Associate at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. He graduated from the University of California, Santa Barbara in Spring 2007.*