

## Mayors' Statement

*Convenor: Aaron Tovish, Mayors for Peace*

*Speakers: Mayor Tadotoshi Akiba, City of Hiroshima, Japan; Mayor Luc Dehaene, City of Ypres, France;*

Three topics:

- No NWS willing to rule out attacking cities – moral bankruptcy of MAD (Akiba)
- UN Disarmament Decade – DD for ND (Luc Dehaene)
- 2020 Protocol – short intro: urge them to come to Wednesday session (VanK?)

## THE CENTRALITY OF CITIES

Almost exactly five years ago, here in the Palais, I addressed you as I am doing today. I announced that Mayors for Peace would be launching an emergency campaign to ban nuclear weapons. During these five years the membership of Mayors for Peace has more than quadrupled. In January we proudly declared 2020 Mayors for the 2020 Vision. Today we have more than 2200 city members, with two or three cities joining us every day, and we are entering the third phase of our campaign. My colleagues will describe how we foresee the lead-up to the 2010 Review Conference and the decade beyond. I am here to assure you that we have not lost sight of, or enthusiasm for, our objective of a nuclear-weapon-free world by the year 2020. I invite you to attend the [tomorrow's][today's] lunchtime session, *2010- 2020: from Survival to Success* to hear and discuss our plans in greater detail.

Mr. Chairman,

Today I am asking this body to perform the God-like act of creating time. Unless you give us the time we need, we will be unable to tackle the Earth-threatening environmental issues and other serious problems that confront us. You have the power. In fact, it is your obligation to give us this time. That is the intention of the international community as set forth in the NPT and confirmed by the Advisory Opinion the ICJ handed down in 1996, which clearly stipulates that all governments are “under obligation to pursue in good faith negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspect under strict and effective international control.” Without nuclear disarmament soon, we will have no time to solve our real problems.

The two most serious immediate threats to human evolution are environmental degradation and weapons of mass destruction. Our collective need to curb human capacity for violence and destructive effects on our ecosystem demands a rapid and decisive shift away from selfish, competitive struggles for dominance toward mutual, cooperative problem solving. And yet, the only phenomenon more obvious than this pressing need is the utter inability of national governments to respond with anything that even resembles a solution to these problems. Mayors for Peace is growing because cities are drawn into the vacuum created by failure at the national level to accept reality.

Hiroshima, responding to the most reliable scientific recommendations we have received, is committed to reducing our CO2 emissions by 70% by 2050. We are doing this because it is necessary, regardless of national-level irresponsibility, and we are not alone. Around

the world, cities are working to reduce emissions far beyond national requirements. They do this at great risk to their local economies because their residents want to do what is right.

Unfortunately, the public remains largely unaware of the danger of nuclear weapons. For example, most are unaware that certain nuclear-weapon states are developing tactical nuclear weapons designed not for deterrence but for combat use. They are unaware that Arab League foreign ministers declared on March 8 that if Israel admits to having a nuclear weapon, the Arab states will drop out of the NPT and make weapons of their own. They are unaware that a low-level smuggler in Russia was recently found to be carrying highly enriched uranium. They are unaware that the NPT is on the brink of collapse and nuclear weapons are poised to spread swiftly throughout the world.

National governments certainly must be aware of the nuclear threat, but you act as if you have all the time in the world. Perhaps national leaders are high and mighty enough to assume they will survive any catastrophe that may occur. We mayors, however, live down in the valley with our people, where facts and reality play a more powerful role in decision-making.

On October 31st, 2007, United Cities and Local Governments, representing cities throughout the world, took up the Mayors for Peace rallying cry. Declaring with us that "Cities Are Not Targets!" they expressed full support for our Campaign. This year, according to the UN Population Fund, the majority of humanity now resides in cities. Therefore, I can say with complete conviction that our message to you today is spoken on behalf of the majority of humanity. No governmental delegation here can rightfully make such a claim, so I respectfully ask that you heed our message.

In June 2006, the US Conference of Mayors, representing 1139 American cities, called on the United States and Russia to renounce their Cold War policies of Mutually Assured Destruction. The threat of inflicting grossly indiscriminate and disproportionate casualties among noncombatant populations has never been morally or legally acceptable, but with the end of the Cold War and the emergence of a global terrorist threat, such a policy is utterly futile and foolhardy. At our urging, the US Conference of Mayors wrote to the Ambassadors of Russia and China asking them to openly declare that they would never again target US cities. They simultaneously asked the US Government to provide such assurances to Russian and Chinese cities. The cities of the world have lived far too long with the Sword of Damocles hanging over our heads. We demand its removal.

In January 2007, delegations of US mayors visited the embassies of Russia and China in Washington. They were received with all due courtesy; China took the opportunity to reiterate its policy of no first use, but could offer no assurances regarding retaliatory strikes. The US State Department met with the mayors but, when it came to targeting, the officials deferred to the Defense Department, which, for its part, refused to even meet with mayors, saying that all discussion of targeting policy is top secret. When the mayors tried to clarify that we were not trying to determine what was targeted, just what was NOT targeted, the officials were not moved.

In October 2006, I wrote to the Heads of Government of the nine states thought to possess nuclear arms, asking them to explicitly rule out the targeting of cities and to

ensure that their armed forces were rigorously trained to disobey any order to use a nuclear weapon in lethal proximity to cities. Only one country had the courtesy to replied: the United Kingdom, perhaps because in July 2006 an international delegation of mayors had already begun a dialog with the UK Foreign Ministry on this subject.

At that meeting, the first reply we were given was that British forces are de-alerted and de-targeted, so not to worry. While we approve of de-alerting and de-targeting, those policies do not address our central concern: should the occasion ever arise to re-alert and target the missiles, could we be assured in advance that cities would not be among the potential targets. The disconcerting reply we got to this was that cities would not be targeted “as such.” By this logic major transportation junctions or fuel depots can be targeted “as such” and if cities happen to be in the vicinity of such junctions and depots – as they invariable are – well tough luck for the city.

In the ensuing correspondence, we encountered the assertion that whatever the targeting policy was, we could rest assured it was “in conformity with international humanitarian law.” Well, that was clearly not good enough. As the International Court of Justice made abundantly clear, nuclear weapons are by their very nature indiscriminate; thus everyone has good reason to feel threatened by them unless explicitly and convincingly assured to the contrary. Threatening to commit an illegal act is itself illegal, all the more so when mass destruction is at play.

In the end, the British Government’s response was that any discussion of what is not targeted would diminish the deterrent value of the nuclear weapons. So, rather than diminish a dangerous and obsolete deterrence policy, Britain would place itself on the wrong side of international law and in the morally reprehensible position of threatening what I have called “civicide” -- the obliteration of civic life and the endangerment of civilization itself.

In 2004 the US Conference of Mayors declared: “Weapons of mass destruction have no place in a civilized world.” Why is it that national governments are unable to arrive at the same obvious conclusion?

I do not mean to single out Britain. The US declined any discussion of targeting policy based, no doubt, on similar delusions of deterrence; it could well be that, in their silence, Beijing, Delhi, Islamabad, Moscow, Pyongyang, and Tel Aviv share this delusion. They all apparently consider the threat to annihilate whole cities to be acceptable and even necessary. We do not.

We [have just heard][will soon hear] from IPPNW about the catastrophic impact of a limited nuclear war. Only at the national level can there be such abstract assertions about one hundred cities being completely incinerated in a nuclear exchange in the Asian Subcontinent. We cities are the ‘firewood’ that has been unwittingly gathered by our civilizations for the great nuclear firestorms. In a world of cities, nuclear weapons endanger everyone, at least indirectly through catastrophic climate change. Why is it so difficult for national governments to come to grips with this reality and free us all from this threat?

The Rand Corporation did a study for US Homeland Security on catastrophic terrorism. In choosing a city for destruction, the study picked Long Beach, California, the US megaport. What it found after ‘gaming’ the scenario 20 days out from the explosion was that in 20 days we would not even begin to get a handle on the GLOBAL ramifications of such an attack. The massive economic and social problems would continue to spread and intensify. The productivity of the US economy would sharply decline, drawing the entire world with it into economic turmoil and a deep depression.

The Rand study confirmed what Mayor Itoh of Nagasaki said at the 2004 PrepCom. “Civilization and nuclear weapons cannot co-exist indefinitely.” So why, when we know how high the stakes are, do we continue to gamble?! Why should cities and the whole world economy [continue to] be held hostage to this madness even one day longer?

We are preparing for the UN Disarmament Decade as if our lives depend on it. I challenge each one of you to strive in good faith to match our sense of urgency and purpose. You know as well as I do that Unless strong, substantive moves toward disarmament are made in the next two years, nuclear weapons will spread throughout the world. The decision is upon you. Will you act in good faith to eliminate these heinous and totally unnecessary threats to our survival, or will you allow them to spread, most certainly to be used? If you do not move effectively to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world by 2020, you will be partially responsible for the nuclear catastrophe I have no doubt will befall us before that date. I urge you not to underestimate the gravity and urgency of this decision.

#### TOWARD A DECISIVE DECADE FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

It is my role to describe for you the third phase of the 2020 Vision Campaign. We want to convey this information to you because phase three [which] will be centered on the NPT review process. At this session, in 2009, and at the NPT Review Conference, we and many other NGOs will be urging you to think and act boldly. In particular, Mayors for Peace, through its 2020 Vision Campaign, will be challenging you to think in terms of the next TWO review cycles, all the way through to 2020. That year will be the 50th anniversary of the NPT, the 75th anniversary of the atomic bombings, and a fitting moment to proclaim that the promise of the Treaty has at long last been fulfilled.

Occasionally, the difficult work of disarmament gets an unexpected boost. On the strength of initiative the UN Ambassador of Sierra Leone, who rallied the Non-Aligned Movement behind the concept of an International Decade for Disarmament, 2010-2020, the 61st UN General Assembly called for preparations to begin. Many Western countries were skeptical. The previous three Disarmament Decades had been notable mainly for their lack of results. Why repeat this sorry story?

For Mayors for Peace, the answer is simple: success is possible if we all begin preparing NOW. To that end, we have translated the 2020 Vision into a ‘2020 Protocol’, which we have named the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol. The [next speaker] will provide more detail on that document, which has been made available to you here. Suffice it to say now that this Protocol, if adopted during the review process, would ensure optimal conditions for actual nuclear disarmament from 2010 to 2020.

Today, five years after we took up our goal, 2020 no longer seems so distant. Indeed, looking back over the way the last five years have been shamefully squandered, many are tempted to believe that our 2020 deadline is too tight. But we refuse to meekly accept the same criminal neglect for another 2 or 12 years. Given the risks described by Mayor Akiba, we need to move immediately.

The process of working together to reinforce positive trends is the essence of Good Faith. Here we remind every State – including the non-nuclear-weapon States Parties to the NPT and nuclear-armed States not parties to the NPT – that they are under the legal obligation identified by the International Court of Justice to strive in good faith toward “measures leading to nuclear disarmament in ALL its aspects under strict and effective international control.”

There is, of course, a proposal already in existence that comprehensively addresses all aspects of nuclear disarmament. I refer to the model Nuclear Weapons Convention circulated by Costa Rica and Malaysia at the first Preparatory Committee meeting in Vienna. How many States Parties have given this document the close attention it deserves? How many have shared their views on it with the international community? How many have suggested revisions to make it acceptable to all? I hereby ask those that have not taken such steps to explain how they can claim a good-faith approach to their Article VI obligations.

The Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol features the Nuclear Weapons Convention as one of TWO ways parties could fulfill their obligations. The other is a Framework Agreement, in which all the elements that need to be in place at the commencement of a nuclear-weapon-free world would be identified early on and a plan would be developed to systematically and progressively address each element such that the necessary agreements are reached and actions are taken.

Above all, the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol challenges you to make a genuine commitment to the results that emerge from the 2010 Review Conference. In 2005, we witnessed a disturbing phenomenon. A major player – I refer of course to the United States, but it could be another country next time – sought to dismiss the hard-fought and carefully crafted results of 2000 and even 1995. Unless the results achieved in this review cycle are immunized against that kind of backtracking, what is the point of this whole exercise? The Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol, as a legally binding instrument on a par with the NPT itself, would leave no room for doubt about the lasting value of its acceptance.

Mayors for Peace looks forward to working closely with governments to ensure the 2010 Review Conference gets results that represent a convincing, irreversible step toward nuclear disarmament. Nothing less is acceptable because nothing less will spare us and future generations from the pain and suffering that will surely follow if we fail.

If we succeed, we will have set in motion a decisive decade for nuclear disarmament. With this happier prospect in mind, [W]e hope that next year in the UNDC all governments will contribute constructively to elaborating an ambitious agenda for the International Decade for Disarmament.

## THE HIROSHIMA-NAGASAKI PROTOCOL AND THE MAYORS' APPEAL

It is my privilege to introduce to this august body our 'modest' proposal for fulfilling the promise of the NPT by the year 2020: the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol. While Mayors for Peace takes full responsibility for the specific form in which I will now present it to you; we wish stress the fact that many groups and individuals provided invaluable advice. Let me also state clearly that we do not expect this to be the last word on the matter. It is you governments who must give the Protocol its final form.

[Tomorrow][After this session], there will be a lunchtime meeting in the Assembly Hall, sponsored by the Mexican Delegation and co-organized by Mayors for Peace and the Middle Powers Initiative. We encourage you to attend that session for a lively and thorough discussion of this and other important proposals.

The basic thrust of the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol is a commitment to negotiations on ALL aspects of nuclear disarmament such that an overarching approach to achieving and maintaining a nuclear-weapon-free world can be crafted to gain the enthusiastic support of all key players and world opinion. The Protocol is framed as a direct complement to the NPT, but by virtue of being a separate agreement, the Protocol is open to States that are not parties to the NPT.

A novel feature of the Protocol is that it identifies two fundamental aspects of nuclear disarmament—the realm of policy and the realm of arsenals. The policy aspect covers primarily the acquisition of weapon systems and threats to use the weapons already acquired. We refer to 'arsenals' in the classic sense of both the arms themselves and the means of their production and deployment. The Protocol identifies two distinct target dates for successfully achieving consensus and results on these two aspects of nuclear disarmament: 2015 and 2020, respectively.

Article I of the Protocol requires immediate action: all acquisition activity is to cease immediately and all threats to use nuclear weapons, including preparations to carry out such threats, must also stop. These bold measures would provide convincing evidence of good faith, establishing a firm basis for nuclear-armed states to approach the long and complex negotiations ahead. The 2015 target date allows for the codification of this state of non-acquisition and non-threat in legally binding and verified form.

Article I also stipulates what could be called a 'clampdown' on nuclear weapons and weapons-usable nuclear materials. This involves physically removing weapons from delivery vehicles and arranging for safe and secure storage, so it would not be realistic to demand that it occur immediately. The Protocol calls for this to be done "at the earliest possible date." It does not involve the physical destruction of weapons or material, however, so it should be achievable well before 2015. The objective of the clampdown is to radically reduce the danger of mistaken or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons by state actors or otherwise.

By 2015, the remaining task will be to physically dispose of the arsenals. The policy of non-acquisition will ensure at least that the problem is not continuing to grow. The non-threat policy will underscore the inutility of the remnants. Mayors for Peace selected

2020 for its Vision five years ago because experts could show that the existing dismantlement facilities were capable of completing the entire job by or even before that date. Since dismantlement has – to the credit of some nuclear-weapon states – continued, the 2020 target date is still valid. We see no reason to afford the disarmament process any more time than absolutely necessary.

The Protocol's preamble points out, first and foremost, that the discriminatory nature of the NPT was never meant to be permanent. Article I would end the active discrimination inherent in further acquisition and threats. Article II would eliminate the inequality that has, for decades, allowed the nuclear-weapon states to exploit their discriminatory advantages. Highlighting discrimination is meant to serve two purposes:

1. to assure those whose patience has been wearing thin that an end to their second class status is [is] in sight, and
2. to impress upon those who have become accustomed to enjoying the privileges of discrimination that those days are over.

The Protocol is missing one important element: conditions for entry into force. Here we would only counsel that, keeping good faith and the urgency of the problem in mind, States should be prepared to display maximum flexibility on this challenging issue.

Over the coming twelve months, mayors around the world will be signing on to a Cities' Appeal that will ask you to take up the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol in the review process. In line with our original vision of a Nuclear Weapons Convention being negotiated by 2010, we call for all negotiations envisioned in the Protocol to be complete by the 65th UN General Assembly. This schedule is tight, but given the global threat underscored by Mayor Akiba, is it not worth an all-out effort? We think so, and by this time next year, you will see just how intensely mayors and citizens worldwide share that assessment.

Thank you very much.