

Statement for the First Meeting of States Parties to the TPNW: June 21, 2022:

By: *Japan Council against A and H Bombs (Gensuikyo)*

On the occasion of the First Meeting of State Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), we express our deep respect to all the governments, international organizations and civil society organizations that have contributed to the adoption and entry into force of the TPNW. We wish you every success in this meeting.

As everyone is deeply concerned, the world is facing the war launched in violation of the UN Charter and the danger of actual use of nuclear weapons. We hope that this meeting, having established the norm and rule of the total prohibition of nuclear weapons, will send a strong message that there should never be the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

At the same time, we know that in spite of backlashes, the abolition of nuclear weapons represents the major direction of the world. The ratification of the TPNW by 61 countries, the signing by 86 countries, the overwhelming support of the resolution on the TPNW at the UN General Assembly, and even more overwhelming support shown by the outcome of every opinion poll thus far conducted are all eloquent evidence of it.

The current war in Ukraine is making it clear that the argument of the nuclear weapon states and nuclear reliant states leaders, such as “nuclear weapons deter war” or they “guarantee security”, is not only groundless, but the cause to escalate confrontation by force against force and by nukes against nukes, bringing the whole humanity on the brink of annihilation.

The movement against A and H bombs in Japan, the first country to have suffered the atomic bombing in history, has called for a total ban on nuclear weapons, uncovering with the Hibakusha the truth of the hellish damage caused to people under the mushroom cloud, and facing off against the rosy myth that “the bombs saved countless lives of young people.” This effort is in common with the TPNW’s position to save the task of abolition of nuclear weapons from the narrow viewpoint of “national security” of nuclear powers and establish it as a task to ensure global security by focusing on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons.

The policy to “maintain nuclear deterrence as long as nuclear weapons exist” or to rely on nuclear weapons in

(Continued next column)

(From last column) **Statement for the First Meeting** the name of “nuclear sharing” or “extended deterrence” can no longer hold water ethically or logically. What the world has agreed upon is to negotiate nuclear disarmament and complete it, not to maintain these weapons.

We hope that this meeting will call on the governments that have not yet joined in the Treaty, including nuclear weapon states and nuclear-dependent states as well as their people, to support, sign and ratify the Treaty without delay. Each additional accession to the Treaty, no matter how large or small, will strengthen its normative force as well as people's confidence in a nuclear-weapon-free world.

In addition, we need to remind the P5 and other nuclear powers that irrespective of their differences of opinion on the TPNW and whether it be bilateral or multi-lateral, they have an obligation to pursue and conclude negotiations on measures to eliminate their nuclear arsenals without delay. They should admit that the TPNW is reinforcing the NPT in advancing both nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and examine seriously the possibility to cooperate with and join in it.

As to the role of the civil society movements, we welcome that the entire process of the TPNW is proceeding in close cooperation between governments, international organizations and civil society movements.

As said above, our movement traces its origin back to the suffering of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and to the suffering from the US H-bomb test at the Bikini Atoll, the Pacific in 1954. And since the very start, we have set a ban on A and H bombs to be our goal to run nationwide campaign in cooperation with people all over the world.

We collected millions of signatures calling for the start of negotiations for a ban treaty and presented them to every past NPT Review Conference, in our belief that the key to achieve this goal lies in both the process of negotiations and agreements between national governments and the decision made by the sovereign people in each country.

This time, towards this meeting, we have collected signatures to urge the Japanese government to sign and ratify the TPNW. We are also asking local assemblies across Japan to adopt resolutions calling for Japan’s accession to the Treaty. As of June 3, the number of collected signatures is 1,092,112, and the number of local assemblies which adopted their resolutions is 632.

(Continued page 2)

(From page 1) **Statement for the First Meeting**

At the core of this effort is our determination shared by the Hibakusha that the tragedy of Hiroshima or Nagasaki must never be repeated anywhere on earth, as well as our activities to make known to the people inhumanity wrought by the A-bombing. We hope that this meeting will keep its attention to the activities of civil society organizations and reinforce assistance for the Hibakusha and nuclear test victims as well as their efforts to spread their testimonies around the world.

Nuclear tragedy in the Marshall Islands

By: Sally Clark; May 25, 2022

We were innocent 21-year-olds entering an organization called the Peace Corps in 1969. We came from all over the United States, some wanting to dodge the draft, but most of us were embracing a desire to help others. We were thrilled looking out the window of Micronesia Air plane peering down at a beautiful atoll, a thin necklace of green trees and white sandy beaches, floating on the vastness of the Pacific Ocean. As we approached for landing, we buzzed first over the runway to clear all the trucks, pigs, cars, chickens, and people off the landing area. Then we landed, on the rough runway, the pilot forcing the plane into reverse to come to a stop, much to our relief, at the end of the concrete road in Majuro, looking across at the Pacific Ocean.

We stepped off the plane and into an extremely humid hot environment, where we received greetings by the Marshallese placing leis over our heads, so many leis that they were eventually stacked all the way to our chins. Young, naive Americans, we knew little about the area, other than, perhaps, fleeting thoughts that we might find the remains of Amelia Earhart or artefacts from her plane there.

Our naiveté began to diminish when we were told the Atomic Energy Commission was coming to check out the health of the children and adults and of course to give out candy and show a dated movie. We asked questions and learned about the nuclear test over Bikini and the fallout coming down over a neighbouring island, whose residents thought it was snow. We were told that the Marshallese ran outside, allowing the fallout to land on their skin, with some children putting it to their eyes. Luckily many residents sensed danger and ran to the ocean, saving themselves from a future road of at least some fallout ailments.

As we spent more time in the islands, little by little more detailed stories emerged—of still births, high cancer rates, and other radiation-related health issues. Islanders had been moved from Bikini before nuclear tests were conducted; some of the explosions were so great that one of the small islands simply vaporized, leaving a deep cavern. Many Marshallese had to endure being relocated from their blessed atoll to Kili, an island in the middle of the ocean with no lagoon.

Over the years, more and more people spoke out about such atrocities and such disregard for the Marshallese, who were actually called “savages” by a US paper in the 50’s. My heart wept as I learned more information about the scope of nuclear testing in the Marshalls.

(Continued next column)

(From last column) **Nuclear tragedy**

Between 1946 and 1958, the Marshall Islands region was the site of the testing of nuclear weapons equivalent to the explosive power of 1.6 Hiroshima bombs every day for 12 years—67 in all at the Bikini and Enewetak atolls—a fact that is impossible for me to comprehend.

A resolution is now in front of the Congress asking the United States to prioritize nuclear justice in its negotiations with the Marshall Islands on an extended Compact of Free Association between the countries. The resolution recognizes that the United States nuclear testing program and radioactive waste disposal, including not just contaminated debris from the Marshalls but also material transported from the Nevada Test Site, caused irreparable material and intangible harm to the people of the Marshall Islands.

We believe this harm continues to this day. Within this resolution is a call for an apology for what the United States did to the Marshallese and to raise awareness about the need for more action to undo this harm. US Rep. Katie Porter of California and senators Mazie Hirono of Hawaii and Edward Markey of Massachusetts are spearheading this effort, which would formally apologize for the US nuclear legacy in the Marshall Islands and raise public awareness of the issue. Please write or call your representatives and senators, asking them to support House Joint Resolution 73 and Senate Joint Resolution 40.

What happened in the islands is simply incomprehensible to me. The toll on the Marshallese and the environment is impossible for me to grasp. And I have another nagging thought: Why as Peace Corps volunteers were we not warned about the radioactive fallout and the social issues we were being dropped into? Of course, there’s the implication that we were being used as pawns to smooth the relationship between the Marshall Islands and the United States and to continue to have the islanders as our friends for strategic reasons.

Who makes these decisions to drop bombs on such beautiful, pristine islands? Who sends 20-year-olds into a potentially radioactive area without warning them? When can we as a human race honor peoples around the world and get out of building weapons and gaining lands for strategic reasons? Please stop. I’m sad and weep and write letters asking for an apology. So sad. Where is our soul?

Sally Clark served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Marshall Islands in Majuro from 1969 to 1971. She then became a high school teacher and the coordinator of global education in her district in Newark, California. Since retirement, she has been a practicing psychologist focused on developmental issues in adults and children.

Our Mission

The Boundary Peace Initiative represents people of diverse backgrounds officially brought together in 2002 because of our mutual concern for the rise in world conflict. Our mandate is to participate in multilateral non-violent conflict resolution in support of global human rights, ecological and environmental sustainability and international law through education, sharing of information, dialogue and activism locally and globally. We encourage and seek your participation in our mutual work for true peace based on social justice, equality, accountability, integrity, honour, respect, etc in order to build a better world today and future generations.

BPI web site: www.boundarypeaceinitiative.org
For info contact Laura at (250) 444-0524 or (250) 442-0434 or email: L4peace@telus.net.

UN Days International Days

- Aug. 9:** International Day of Worlds' Indigenous Peoples
- Aug. 12:** International Youth Day
- Aug. 19:** World Humanitarian Day
- Aug. 21:** International Day of Remembrance and Tribute to the Victims of Terrorism
- Aug. 22:** International Day Commemorating the Victims of Acts of Violence Based on Religion and Belief
- Aug. 23:** International Day for the Remembrance of the Slave Trade and its Abolition
- Aug. 29:** International Day Against Nuclear Tests
- Aug. 30:** International Day of Victims of Enforced Disappearances

Not listed as UN Days the following are established days of global commemoration to honour the victims of the first use of nuclear weapons in conflict, the victims of nuclear testing and recently added the victims of nuclear power plant accidents:

- Aug. 6:** Hiroshima Day
- Aug. 9:** Nagasaki Day

Time to move away from insular interests for security solutions

By: Peter Langille: from the *Hill Times* on July 11, 2022.
{*Dr. Peter Langille specializes in peace research, conflict resolution, and initiatives to improve UN peace operations.*}

Insecurity is spreading. Another hot war in the Ukraine, a climate emergency, another Cold War and nuclear arms race, another long war just announced, 100 million people displaced by conflict and climate change, vast inequality and precarious conditions everywhere.

Our new global neighbourhood looks rough and risky.

Whatever happened to security, "the state of being free from danger or threat"?

(Continued next column)

(From last column)Time to move away

It's easy to see that global challenges require global solutions. Yet global governance, like global security, remains largely undeveloped. The United Nations is the closest representation to date, but it also depends on the multilateral co-operation of 193 diverse member states, with a wide array of governments who often have competitive and conflicting interests.

Maintaining "international peace and security" is the primary responsibility of the UN Security Council. Its five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) remain divided and unwilling to support or fund a more effective UN. Despite its limits, the UN works surprisingly well on numerous crucial issues, although it's still not equipped for its first priority: "saving succeeding generations."

Sovereign states are assumed to be the principal actors in security, with a monopoly over coercive capacity on their territory. In a competitive system, with no higher authority, countries try to counter security challenges by arming up. Yet when competitors notice and respond similarly, it often prompts an arms race. This action-reaction response tends to spiral out of control into a security dilemma of increased threat and risk.

Even in the nuclear era, an old Roman dictum—*si vis pacem, parabellum*, "if you want peace, prepare for war"—continues to guide official thinking and policy. As a result, "national security" focuses primarily on preparation for war, with systems largely designed to cause the insecurity of other people and/or their death and destruction.

And, how well has that worked? Wars over the past 77 years have been largely unwinnable, even for the most powerful, despite their massive efforts and expense.

To play its part, Canada announced a 70 per cent increase in military spending, with major acquisition programs for 88 F-35 fighter-bombers and 15 new surface combatant frigates, which combine to an overall cost of approximately \$500-billion. Although neither are appropriate for monitoring, patrol, and control of Canadian airspace and waters, or any role in UN peace operations, both are advanced war-fighting systems primarily designed to penetrate the air and sea defence of a great power.

Wars over the past 77 years have been largely unwinnable, even for the most powerful, despite their massive efforts and expense.

Prevention of war was once a priority of successive Canadian governments, but not now. Here, the enthusiasm for militarism and more preparation for war reflects the quiet official shift away from an influential role in the UN to a subordinate role in the Western military alliance, NATO. As official Ottawa is increasingly devoid of independent security analysis, it relies on Washington, D.C., and NATO to set its "security" agenda, irrespective of serious costs and consequences.

Governments also continue to support a system of mutually-assured destruction and a nuclear "balance of terror" to maintain deterrence. If that threat system fails—and the probabilities of failure increase over time—the survivors may have a few dark years of a nuclear winter. Well, so much for being free from danger or threat.

In 1961, then-U.S. president Dwight Eisenhower's farewell address warned of another security problem: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."

(Continued page 4)

WHAT'S UP?

August 9th: Nagasaki Day @ 6 pm in Gyro Park, Grand Forks. Donations gratefully accepted.

August 6th: Hiroshima Day @ 6 pm at Doukhobor Discovery Center, Castlegar, B.C.

Peace Symbol Contest 2022 sponsored by Regina Peace Council & Regina Peace Quest: Create peace symbol on any surface, take a photo and send to makingpeace100@gmail.com before Aug. 31st. Winners of peace related gifts to be announced on Sept. 21st, International Day of Peace (More details on BPI website).

White folks don't want peace; they want quiet. The price you pay for peace is justice. Until there is justice, there will be no peace or quiet.

Reverend Jesse Jackson

All people of the world have an equal right to the privileges of this world.

Leo Tolstoy

Voice your opinion to the Prime Minister and all MPs. Free postage: {Name of MP}, Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0A6
Go to the Government of Canada website for MP contact information at <http://www.canada.gc.ca>

The BPI welcomes your input. Articles may not be common consensus of members. To submit articles contact Laura at **250-444-0524 or 250-442-0434** or email L4peace@telus.net.

The BPI is an affiliate of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Peace Pledge Union, Stop Ecocide Canada, Abolition 2000 & CNANW and works with local and global peace, social justice and environmental groups.

(From page 3) **Time to move away from insular interests**

But a president's speech wasn't enough to stem the appeal. The military-industrial complex expanded in the Cold War, with globalization, the war on terror and huge annual investment. Now, it sets the security agenda by harmonizing interests to ensure access, influence and overwhelming political, economic and military power.

The wider consequences are serious yet seldom considered. For one, the cost of preparing for more war at US\$2-trillion annually is now dwarfed by the damage caused, with the Global Peace Index reporting the economic impact of violence at US\$14.96-trillion annually, even before the Ukraine war. That's a yearly burden of nearly US\$2,000 on everyone, everywhere.

In turn, social security declines as higher military spending leaves less for health care, education, and poverty reduction. Precarious economic conditions are also spreading, giving rise to extremes that generate further insecurity, with new risks of race, class and civil conflict, even war.

Environmental security also suffers. Aside from wasting resources, violent conflicts shift political priorities and spending back to "business as usual."

The latest security confrontation is rooted in geopolitics. It's driven by interests, profits, and fears, yet rationalized as defending values like freedom and democracy from an imminent threat.

The United States plans to remain dominant and to continue leading the unipolar rules-based system established after the Second World War. Competitive rising powers, especially China and Russia, are to be deterred (or defeated) from establishing regional spheres of influence.

Officials in the Biden administration already informed UN staff that they're not interested in a UN-centred order. Instead, the NATO military alliance—effectively the multilateral extension of the military-industrial complex—is the West's new preference.

China and Russia also call for a multipolar system, with rules grounded in international law and the UN Charter. Both interpret a multipolar world as one in which major powers exercise privileged rights within their own sphere of interests. Neither appreciate a foreign military presence near their borders. When challenged, they've made it clear they will respond aggressively. Both also claim to be developing democracy and improving human rights, albeit on their terms as independent sovereign states.

War between great powers is not inevitable, although the current trajectory makes it far more likely. The ongoing proxy war with Russia has increased the wider enthusiasm and preparations for more.

Security really isn't all that complex. One doesn't need more than common sense to see problems and contradictions in the prevailing approaches and systems of security. Combined, these encouraged what's now a heavily militarized, dysfunctional war-prone system.

Earlier attempts to moderate this system with concepts such as "collective," "co-operative," "common" and "human" security helped, but were soon forgotten as government priorities and funding remain focused on national security.

It may be discomfoting, but the future, if there is to be one, will depend on far deeper co-operation. So, new thinking and a new approach are now crucial. There is a clear need for an independent, inclusive review of global security for people and the planet. And, in elevating the focus to global security, there is a better chance to restore the golden rule: "do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

It may be discomfoting, but the future, if there is to be one, will depend on far deeper co-operation. Security can no longer be acquired at the expense of others or through more weapons for more war. Our position in the nuclear era is similar to that of two people in a canoe; if one tips, both tip. With mutual vulnerability, security will have to be shared. And, what's done to advance security cannot continue to be based on short-term political, economic, and military expediency, or on profits for a few. To be effective, security will have to be enduring and attuned to wider needs and long-term consequences.

Sustainable common security is just common sense.