

Building Global Solidarity Toward Nuclear Abolition

Daisaku Ikeda
President
Soka Gakkai International (SGI)

September 8, 2009

If nuclear weapons epitomize the forces that would divide and destroy the world, they can only be overcome by the solidarity of ordinary citizens, which transforms hope into the energy to create a new era.

Albert Einstein (1879–1955), one of the greatest physicists of the 20th century, considered one thing the gravest mistake of his life: and that was having written to U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt (1882–1945), informing him of the risk that the Nazis would develop an atomic weapon and urging him to respond quickly to this threat.

In 1929, Einstein had declared: “I would absolutely refuse any direct or indirect war service ... regardless of the reasons for the cause of a war.” [1] His pacifist sentiments were overwhelmed, however, by the weight of military logic. What finally persuaded him, some 10 years later, to respond affirmatively to a fellow scientist’s suggestion that he write to Roosevelt was a deep sense of fear and anxiety at the consequences for the world if an atomic weapon were to fall into the hands of the Nazis. More than anyone, he understood the potential destructiveness of nuclear weapons, and such an outcome was for him unthinkable.

The factors that originally compelled Einstein to write this letter were rendered irrelevant when the defeat of Nazi Germany removed the motivation for atomic weapons development by the Allies. Einstein’s relief was short-lived, however, as atomic bombs were soon used against the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan.

Shocked and horrified, for the remaining decade of his life Einstein continued to urge the international community to abolish nuclear weapons.

In 1947, he wrote, in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly*: “Since the completion of the first atomic bomb nothing has been accomplished to make the world more safe from war, while much has been done to increase the destructiveness of war.” [2] This article was written a year after negotiations on the Baruch Plan—a proposal for international control of atomic energy—had collapsed at the United Nations, and Britain and the Soviet Union had launched their nuclear weapons programs. Three times in this article Einstein repeated his outraged warning.

For me personally, 1947 was the year I met my mentor in life, second Soka Gakkai president Josei Toda (1900–58). Arrested for his resistance to the Japanese militarist government during World War II, Toda held fast to his beliefs through two years in prison, emerging after the war to spearhead a people’s movement for peace.

As early as October 1949, he warned: “If an atomic war were to occur, the only path facing the peoples of the world would be one of total destruction.” [3] This was immediately after the Soviet Union had announced that it had tested its first nuclear weapon, following in the footsteps of the United States.

Sixty years have passed since the world entered the era of nuclear confrontation, but no fundamental measures have been taken in response to Einstein’s warning. On the contrary, the situation is becoming ever more dangerous.

Even though the threat of global nuclear war has diminished since the end of the Cold War, the number of states with nuclear arms has nearly doubled since the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) entered into force in 1970. There are still some 25,000 nuclear warheads in existence in the world. At the same time, there is rising fear that the spread of nuclear weapons technologies and materials through the black market will unleash the nightmare of nuclear terrorism.

In his speech delivered in Prague, Czech Republic, in April of this year, U.S. President Barack Obama noted the moral responsibility of the United States as the only country to have actually used a nuclear weapon, and expressed his resolve to realize a world without nuclear weapons.

President Obama met with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in April and again in July, at which time they agreed on the broad outlines of a nuclear disarmament treaty to replace the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I), which expires in December.

A joint statement expressing a commitment to “creating the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons” [4] was issued at the

G8 Summit in L'Aquila, Italy. Meanwhile, a special meeting of the UN Security Council on nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament will take place on September 24 during the General Assembly. These developments illustrate progress in new directions, positive new initiatives to break the existing deadlock.

In the end, will these initiatives create new currents truly capable of transforming the era? The five-year Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons scheduled for May 2010 will be crucial.

The last review conference, in 2005, produced no meaningful results, stalemated by a clash between those states advocating that priority be given to disarmament and those advocating priority consideration of nonproliferation. There are now signs of compromise in an effort to avoid a repeat of this failure, such as the decision made this year at the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva to begin negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT).

This change in mood, however welcome, is not in itself enough to dispel the dark clouds of the nuclear age. We must face the essential reality, which transcends political or military interests: the degree to which the existence of nuclear arms destabilizes the world and threatens humankind.

Here I would like to direct attention to the words of the British historian Arnold J. Toynbee (1889–1975). In his *A Study of History*, he addressed the nuclear weapons issue as “a challenge which we cannot evade,” [5] urging all people to respond.

In 1972–73, Toynbee and I met and conducted a dialogue, which was later published in English under the title *Choose Life*. One of his remarks that made a deep impression on me was his statement that a “self-imposed veto” [6] on the possession of nuclear weapons must be adopted by the world’s governments.

Elsewhere, Toynbee described the effort to respond to that challenge as follows:

The emotional resistance to this revolutionary break with ingrained habits and to this painful renunciation of familiar institutions will have to be overcome by self-education; in the Atomic Age it cannot be broken with force. The Gordian Knot has to be untied by patient fingers instead of being cut by the sword. [7]

To date, humankind has managed to avoid the catastrophe of full-scale nuclear war. Yet today we face a growing array of destabilizing elements, and here I would like to urge the leaders of all states that either possess nuclear weapons themselves or whose national security is reliant on the nuclear weapons of other states to ask themselves these questions:

Are nuclear weapons really necessary? Why do we need to keep them?

What justifies our own stockpiles of nuclear weapons when we make an issue out of other states’ possession of them?

Does humanity really have no choice but to live under the threat of nuclear weapons?

Learning the lessons

Next I would like to delve into some lessons of history that might shine a light on these questions, with Toynbee’s concept of “self-education” as the key.

Here I would first like to revisit the dilemmas and doubts that assailed scientists as they worked on the development of the first nuclear weapons, and examine the ways in which people have thought about these weapons over the years.

Although we have become numbed to the existence of nuclear weapons, we need to remember that many of the scientists involved in their development did not welcome their arrival, expressing deep concerns and misgivings.

In December 1938, the year before the outbreak of World War II, Otto Hahn (1879–1968) discovered nuclear fission of uranium in his Berlin laboratory. Realizing the horrendous possibilities, Hahn is said to have considered throwing all his uranium into the ocean and committing suicide.

In the following year, 1939, Leo Szilárd (1898–1964) proved that a chain reaction of nuclear fission—a next key step to producing an atomic bomb—was possible. He also foresaw tragedy, later declaring, “I knew the world was headed for sorrow.” [8]

In 1942, scientists at the University of Chicago produced the first controlled nuclear chain reaction in a nuclear pile, importantly advancing the Manhattan Project. And it was scientists involved in that work at the University of Chicago who drafted a petition urging President Harry S. Truman (1884–1972) not to use the atomic bomb against Japanese cities, even as the final

preparations for the first atomic bomb test were under way in July 1945.

In January 1975, just prior to the founding of the Soka Gakkai International (SGI), I had the occasion to visit the University of Chicago. After meeting with the vice president and visiting the library, I was crossing the campus when I saw a monument commemorating the nuclear development project. There, I reflected about the anguish that had tormented those scientists, and deepened my resolve to help achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons. My feelings were intensified by the fact that, just a few days earlier, I had submitted to the United Nations Headquarters in New York 10 million signatures calling for nuclear abolition collected by the Soka Gakkai Youth Division in Japan.

The University of Chicago is home to the Doomsday Clock representing the current status of the threat of global nuclear war. We must heed the concerns of the pioneers of nuclear science as encapsulated in the Doomsday Clock: although they have been accorded little prominence, the personal dramas behind the history of nuclear development urgently deserve our attention.

Also demanding our attention are the various responses of political leaders to the crises that have arisen during the nuclear age; important lessons can be derived from their experience and examples.

In the years since the end of World War II, there have been a number of situations in which the use of nuclear weapons was seriously considered. The most imminent was the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962, which brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the brink of all-out nuclear war.

What is remarkable about the attitude of U.S. President John F. Kennedy (1917–63) following the crisis is that he emphasized the importance of overcoming hostility and discrimination as the prerequisite to exploring possibilities of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union.

In his famous speech “The Strategy of Peace” in June 1963, President Kennedy referred to the Soviets’ allegations against the United States:

Yet it is sad to read these Soviet statements—to realize the extent of the gulf between us. But it is also a warning—a warning to the American people not to fall into the same trap as the Soviets, not to see only a distorted and desperate view of the other side, not to see conflict as inevitable, accommodation as impossible, and communication as nothing more than an exchange of threats. [\[9\]](#)

I believe that we must learn from his message—not to let our eyes become clouded by prejudice and preconceptions—if we are to untie the Gordian Knot of the nuclear age.

I was deeply convinced of this when I visited China and the Soviet Union in 1974 to meet with their top leaders in an effort to ease tensions between them. As a Buddhist who seeks a peaceful world, I believe that the people of no nation desire war, and made the determined effort to build a bridge between the two countries.

When I met with Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin (1904–80) three months after my first visit to China, we discussed the brutal Siege of Leningrad, which he had personally experienced. Then I told him that the Chinese leaders I met with had clearly stated that China would never initiate an attack against another country. China was anxious about the Soviet Union’s intentions: The Chinese people were building underground bomb shelters against the threat of Soviet attack. Finally, I asked: “Is the Soviet Union going to attack China?”

Kosygin responded that the Soviet Union had no intention of either attacking or isolating China. Soon afterwards, I brought this message to the Chinese leadership. I later visited the United States, where I exchanged views with Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger on Sino-American relations and the status of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT).

I took away two lessons from these meetings: The only way to accurately grasp the other’s intention is to conduct open and frank dialogue; and, no matter how difficult the circumstances may be, dialogue can lead to a breakthrough.

Although they failed to attain their ultimate objectives, I think that the meeting between Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan (1911–2004) at Reykjavik, Iceland, in October 1986, represents a striking example of the importance of maintaining this spirit of dialogue.

When, at the start of the year, Gorbachev proposed a program for achieving complete nuclear abolition, Reagan responded positively. His advisers were opposed to the radical proposal, but he reassured them: “I’m not going soft.... But... I have a dream of a world without nuclear weapons. I want our children and grandchildren particularly to be free of these terrible weapons.” [\[10\]](#)

For his part, Gorbachev was intensely impacted by the disaster at Chernobyl that occurred four months after he made his proposal, and this strengthened his resolve to achieve nuclear abolition.

At the October summit, the two leaders engaged in a frank exchange of views, and an agreement to reduce their nuclear arsenals

to zero within 10 years, by 1996, was in reach. In the end, however, they failed to conclude what would have been a historic accord because they could not come to terms regarding the U.S. missile defense plan, the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

In January 2007, George P. Shultz, who as Reagan's Secretary of State was a firsthand witness to the Reykjavík summit, joined with Kissinger, William J. Perry and Sam Nunn to call for "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons" in an influential editorial of the same name in *The Wall Street Journal*. With the danger of nuclear proliferation escalating, the aim of the proposal was to revisit the vision of a nuclear-weapon-free world that had almost been reached at Reykjavík.

I had an opportunity to hear directly from Gorbachev details of the Reykjavík summit during a meeting in 2001. He recalled, "We were determined to take the initiative and absolutely create a forum of dialogue regardless of the attitude on the part of the U.S. To be honest, to get the Soviet government to move in this direction was in itself an extremely onerous task. But the fact that the Soviet Union called for dialogue was unprecedented, and I believe this compelled President Reagan to modify his attitude as well." [11]

I think the Reykjavík summit demonstrated the particular importance of three qualities. These are: a shared vision based on a clear awareness of crisis; unflagging determination to take the initiative undeterred by the possibility of being rebuffed; and a sense of mutual trust sustained to the end despite the challenging negotiation process.

I urge that the world's leaders take these lessons to heart as they struggle to free humankind from the dire threat of nuclear weapons.

A prescient vision

In his Prague speech, President Obama declared: "Just as we stood for freedom in the 20th century, we must stand together for the right of people everywhere to live free from fear in the 21st century." [12]

In an earlier era, when the competition to develop larger and more deadly nuclear arsenals was escalating, my mentor Josei Toda issued a historic call for the abolition of nuclear weapons. His declaration was rooted in the perspective of ordinary citizens, an awareness of the fearful threat nuclear weapons bring to people's lives.

Toda delivered the speech in which this declaration was issued just seven months before his death, at a time when his health was extremely precarious. It was, in fact, 52 years ago today, September 8, 1957, that Toda addressed a gathering of some 50,000 people, principally young people, and declared the goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons from the face of Earth to be the foremost of his instructions to his followers.

In light of present-day realities, I think that three themes of particular relevance can be extracted from this speech. These are: the need for a transformation in the consciousness of political leaders; the need for a clearly shared vision toward the outlawing of nuclear weapons; and the need to establish "human security" on a global scale.

Regarding the first theme, Toda stated: "We, the citizens of the world, have an inviolable right to live. Anyone who jeopardizes that right is a devil incarnate, a fiend, a monster." [13] This was a striking condemnation of the national egotism that underlies the urge to develop and possess nuclear weapons. With this very strong language, he sought to jolt political leaders out of their existing way of thinking and encourage a transformation in their worldview.

While we may find such expressions as "devil incarnate," "fiend" or "monster" disconcerting, Toda's main intent in the use of such language was to expose the aberrant nature of nuclear deterrence. For at the heart of deterrence theory lies a cold and inhuman readiness to sacrifice vast numbers of people in order to realize one's own security or dominance. He was, at the same time, pressing political leaders to reflect on their assumptions and attitudes.

In the same year that Toda made this statement, Bertrand Russell (1872–1970), the British philosopher who cofounded the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, described those who wield power over others and look down on them, as from a great height, as being "armed, like Jove, with a thunderbolt..." [14] The sixth-century Chinese Buddhist philosopher Chih-i (the Great Teacher T'ien-t'ai) described those possessed by the desire to dominate others in these words: "always seeking to surpass, unable to countenance inferiority, disparaging others and overvaluing oneself." [15] Buddhism further describes the ultimate form of the life-state that sees everything and everyone as the means to the fulfillment of one's own goals and desires as a state in which the existence of others is reduced to insignificance, where one does not feel the slightest qualm or hesitation about inflicting upon them even the most terrible suffering.

Lee Butler, the retired general who from 1992 to 1994 had been in charge of the United States Strategic Command, has analyzed the psychology of the nuclear mindset this way: "By clinging to the extreme precepts of cold war nuclear deterrence we erode the respect for life that anchors our sense of humanity..." [16]

Joseph Rotblat (1908–2005) of the Pugwash Conferences gained renown as the only scientist to leave the Manhattan Project on moral grounds despite having been involved in it from its earliest stages. Rotblat worked with the delegation from the Solomon Islands preparing evidence for a public sitting leading up to the 1996 advisory opinion on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons by the International Court of Justice (ICJ). In his statement, he stressed: "The property of fall-out to extend the

injurious action both in space and time, is a novel and unique characteristic of nuclear warfare. Not only the inhabitants of the combatant countries, but virtually the whole population of the world, and their descendants, would be victims of a nuclear war—therein lies the radical change which nuclear weapons introduce into the whole concept of warfare.” [17]

Having studied the impact of radiation on the human body, and speaking on behalf of the people who have been exposed to radioactive fallout each time the nuclear-weapon states have conducted tests, he was particularly well placed to issue this warning to the whole of humankind.

The inability of decision-makers who are in full possession of the knowledge of the catastrophic consequences of nuclear war to rethink existing nuclear policy signals a bankruptcy of imagination, a failure of empathy toward those who would experience its realities. The time has come to muster the courage necessary to part ways with the doctrine of deterrence, this negative legacy of the Cold War, to consign it to the dustbin of history.

The second theme of Toda’s declaration is his assertion of the absolute inadmissibility of the use of nuclear weapons, whatever the rationale or justification. Here again, he used very strong language: “I wish to declare that anyone who ventures to use nuclear weapons, irrespective of their nationality or whether their country is victorious or defeated, should be sentenced to death without exception.” [18]

As a Buddhist for whom respect for life was a core principle, Toda was adamantly opposed to the death penalty. His invocation here of capital punishment should therefore be understood as an effort to undermine and uproot the logic that would justify the use of nuclear weapons. For Toda, nuclear weapons, which fundamentally threaten humanity’s right to survival, represented an “absolute evil.” He was determined to counteract any attempt to justify them as a “necessary evil” whose use might be viewed as an extension of conventional warfare.

At the time, the Eastern and Western blocs were engaged in a war of words directed at each other’s nuclear arsenals. Toda sought to refute the underlying fallacy of such an approach; impartial with regard to ideology, he denounced all nuclear weapons equally in the name of humankind. My mentor had at great personal cost resisted Japanese militarism during World War II, and it was his conviction that no country or people deserved to be victimized by war. He was an advocate of what he called “global nationalism”; his call for the abolition of nuclear weapons can be understood as the logical outcome of that thinking.

In the years since Toda’s declaration, a similarly unequivocal stance against nuclear weapons has been expressed by the international community on numerous occasions. In 1961, for example, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution declaring that: “Any State using nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons is to be considered as violating the Charter of the United Nations, as acting contrary to the laws of humanity and as committing a crime against mankind and civilization....” [19] Most recently, in 2006, the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission (the Blix Commission) offered the following view in their final report: “The Commission rejects the suggestion that nuclear weapons in the hands of some pose no threat, while in the hands of others they place the world in mortal jeopardy.” [20]

So long as the notion persists that it is possible to separate “good” nuclear weapons from “bad” ones, any attempt to strengthen the nonproliferation regime will lack legitimacy and persuasiveness. Toda’s declaration brings into clear relief this critical issue.

The third theme of Toda’s declaration is expressed figuratively with this language: “Although a movement calling for a ban on the testing of atomic or nuclear weapons has arisen around the world, it is my wish to go further, to attack the problem at its root. I want to expose and rip out the claws that lie hidden in the very depths of such weapons.” [21]

My understanding of my mentor’s declaration is that the “hidden claws” underlying nuclear weapons represent any conception of security predicated on the suffering and sacrifice of ordinary citizens. He is urging us to confront and extirpate such ways of thinking because, without this, no solution is possible.

Any hostile nuclear exchange would produce damage not limited to the opposing country; all countries involved would necessarily suffer massive casualties. In light of this reality, any call for “national security” rings hollow if it necessitates the slaughter of the very people whose lives and safety it claims to protect.

Even when nuclear weapons are not used, weapons testing has exposed large numbers of people to radiation, causing fatal cancers and genetic diseases. Similar patterns of negative impact on human health and life have been observed around nuclear weapons facilities throughout the world.

Toda’s deepest determination is perhaps expressed most fully in his statement: “I wish to see the word ‘misery’ no longer used to describe the world, any country, any individual.” [22] His call for the abolition of nuclear weapons gives condensed expression to that determination. It is rooted in a perspective remarkably cognate with the widely advocated concept of “human security.” This is an approach that sees alleviating the suffering—removing the misery—from each individual’s life as a necessary foundation for stability and peace. What I find especially important is that Toda stressed the need to eliminate situations of misery and suffering equally from all levels—the personal, the national and the global.

Put differently, the destruction of any nation or state is unacceptable, even if it were to be justified as essential to the maintenance of world peace. Likewise, the sacrifice of ordinary citizens cannot be justified in the name of achieving security for the state. I believe strongly that it is the shared task of all members of the human family to clearly identify the fundamental error in such

thinking and to “rip out the claws that lie hidden in the very depths” of the nuclear weapons issue.

Toda concluded with these words: “I ask those who consider themselves to be my students and disciples to be heirs to the spirit of the declaration I have made today, and to make its meaning known throughout the entire world.” [23] These words, which were burned into my mind that day, have remained with me and have inspired my actions in the more than half-century that has passed since then. I have never for even a single day forgotten his stirring call to action and have worked tirelessly to create a rising tide of public opinion in favor of nuclear abolition.

In 1960, two years after Toda passed away, I succeeded him as the third president of the Soka Gakkai, and in October of that year, carrying a photograph of Toda in the breast pocket of my jacket, I traveled to the United States. This was the first of a long series of journeys that would, over the years, take me throughout the world. In the course of these travels, I have met with leaders of the five declared nuclear-weapon states, secretaries-general and other officials of the United Nations, as well as numerous scholars and intellectuals. The elimination of nuclear weapons and the realization of global peace has been a consistent theme of these dialogues.

Further, I wrote proposals on the occasion of the three United Nations General Assembly Special Sessions on Disarmament (1978, 1982 and 1988) in the hope of contributing to their success. Since 1983, I have authored an annual peace proposal, released each year on January 26 to commemorate the founding of the SGI. Here also nuclear abolition has been a constant concern. In 1996, I founded the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research, which seeks to implement the vision of Josei Toda as a focal hub of a network of people-oriented peace research. The Toda Institute has taken up the abolition of nuclear weapons as one of its principal research projects, holding conferences and publishing proceedings on this theme.

As a movement of ordinary citizens, the SGI has engaged in an extensive range of activities to convey to a wide public the inhuman nature of and the danger posed by nuclear weapons.

Despite the continued existence of this threat—the shadow of violent death cast equally on the whole of humankind—it is rarely felt as a palpable reality because it is largely invisible, relegated to an unconscious realm. In our initiatives to advocate nuclear abolition, the SGI has considered that the first priority is to break down this barrier of unconscious avoidance.

To that end, we organized the exhibition “Nuclear Arms: Threat to Our World,” which was launched in June 1982 in support of the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign. Since then, the SGI has organized numerous exhibitions on this theme, which have been seen by many of the world’s citizens, including those of the nuclear-weapon states. In recent years, we have engaged in activities that seek to promote public awareness in support of disarmament and nonproliferation education as called for by the United Nations.

Rooted in the conviction that it is essential that the world’s people commit themselves and unite globally toward a world without nuclear weapons, in 1997 and 1998, members of the SGI collected 13 million signatures for the Abolition 2000 campaign, presenting these to the United Nations in October 1998.

In a proposal on UN reform written in August 2006, I called for a People’s Decade for Nuclear Abolition. In September 2007, on the 50th anniversary of Toda’s declaration, the SGI launched the Decade with a new exhibition that challenges the logic of nuclear weapons from the perspective of human security. Since then, the exhibition “From a Culture of Violence to a Culture of Peace: Transforming the Human Spirit” has been seen in numerous venues around the world.

Toward the same end, we have produced as an educational tool a five-language DVD documenting the experiences of atomic bomb survivors, “Testimonies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki: Women Speak Out for Peace.” We further intend to produce DVDs recording the testimony of people throughout the world whose lives have been impacted by exposure to toxic levels of radiation.

In this way, we have taken action over the past five decades to bring the underlying spirit of Toda’s call for nuclear abolition to the world and to generate a groundswell of popular opinion, making it the prevailing spirit of the new era. We are determined to continue to build a global solidarity toward the goal of a world free from nuclear weapons.

A five-part plan

Based on my many years of experience in this field, it is clear to me that a new confluence of forces is emerging.

That is, in addition to movements for nuclear abolition rooted in a traditional pacifist perspective, we now hear voices calling for a world without nuclear weapons, based on a “realist” assessment of the dangers, arising from within the nuclear-weapon states. As Henry Kissinger has recently pointed out, collaboration between people rooted in these two approaches could generate powerful new momentum toward nuclear abolition.

I am convinced that a clear vision, unyielding determination and courageous action are the pivotal factors for effective collaboration, and on the basis of this I would like to make the following proposals.

I believe it is possible to lay the foundations for a world without nuclear weapons during the five-year period leading up to 2015, and to this end would suggest a five-part plan. I call on:

1. The five declared nuclear-weapon states to announce their commitment to a shared vision of a world without nuclear weapons at next year's NPT Review Conference and to promptly initiate concrete steps toward its achievement.
2. The United Nations to establish a panel of experts on nuclear abolition, strengthening collaborative relations with civil society in the disarmament process.
3. The states parties to the NPT to strengthen nonproliferation mechanisms and remove obstacles to the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2015.
4. All states to actively cooperate to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in national security and to advance on a global scale toward the establishment of security arrangements that are not dependent on nuclear weapons by the year 2015.
5. The world's people to clearly manifest their will for the outlawing of nuclear weapons and to establish, by the year 2015, the international norm that will serve as the foundation for a Nuclear Weapons Convention (NWC).

1. A shared vision

The first element is for the five declared nuclear-weapon states to announce, at the 2010 NPT Review Conference, their shared vision of a world without nuclear weapons and to promptly initiate concrete steps toward implementation.

Despite the discriminatory structure of the NPT, most non-nuclear-weapon states are parties to it; its importance was recognized in 1995 when it was extended indefinitely. This reflects the judgment on the part of the non-nuclear-weapon states that their own security interests, and the cause of global peace, are best served by the permanent relinquishment of the option of possessing nuclear weapons, a choice predicated on the promise of the nuclear-weapon states to disarm.

For too long, however, the nuclear-weapon states have been delinquent in fulfilling their disarmament obligations. This, alongside efforts on the part of some states to develop nuclear weapons, has undermined the trust necessary to obtain international cooperation on nuclear nonproliferation. Thus, the four U.S. statesmen who jointly called for a world without nuclear weapons in editorials in *The Wall Street Journal* have warned: "Without the vision of moving toward zero, we will not find the essential cooperation required to stop our downward spiral." [\[24\]](#)

If, at the 2010 NPT Review Conference, the five declared nuclear-weapon states publicly pledge their commitment to realizing a world without nuclear weapons, their courageous action will be rewarded with a renewal of trust on the part of the world's people, and this in turn will prompt synergistic progress toward the twin goals of nonproliferation and disarmament.

Further, the five declared nuclear-weapon states should take the following concrete steps. They should commit to: 1) a moratorium on any further development or modernization of nuclear weapons; 2) substantively enhanced transparency regarding their nuclear capabilities; and 3) deliberations on the absolute minimum number of nuclear weapons on the path to total abolition.

Regarding the first of these commitments, I would strongly urge that, together with a shared vision of a world without nuclear weapons, the nuclear-weapon states pledge to refrain from further expansion or modernization of their nuclear arsenals. It is clear that nuclear weapons have no purpose other than to establish or perpetuate a dominant position relative to other states. An undertaking on the part of the nuclear-weapon states to freeze the arsenals in their current status would demonstrate a first and meaningful act of self-restraint. It would put a decisive end to any expansion of nuclear capabilities, and I am confident that such an act would be an important step toward overcoming the impulse to dominate others that Toda denounced as an inherent aspect of nuclear weapons.

Next, ensuring a high degree of transparency regarding nuclear capabilities is an important prerequisite to establishing a timetable toward the actual achievement of abolition. As the history of U.S.-Soviet disarmament negotiations makes clear, it is virtually impossible to conduct constructive debate without a clear understanding of each other's actual status. It would be desirable for the nuclear-weapon states, having announced a moratorium on further development, to make full disclosure of their capabilities to the United Nations Security Council within one year.

It would then be necessary for each state to conduct a careful review and initiate multiparty discussions regarding what each considers the minimum essential level of nuclear warheads while moving toward total abolition. The UN Secretary-General should be a party to these talks and, once a level—for example, 100 warheads each—has been determined, this should be positioned as

an intermediate goal on the path to zero.

This kind of concrete goal would provide important impetus to the vision of a world without nuclear weapons and could serve as a “base camp” in the ascent toward the summit of zero. Together, these actions would represent a good-faith effort to fulfill the “unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals...” [25] that was affirmed at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Immediately after the end of World War II, Einstein declared: “there is no distance ahead for proceeding little by little and delaying the necessary changes...” [26]

The five declared nuclear-weapon states are, of course, at the same time, the permanent members of the UN Security Council, bearing a principal responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Now is the time for them to act together to heed this warning, to feel the full weight of their responsibility and to make the “necessary changes” our world requires.

2. An expert panel

My second proposal is for the United Nations to establish a panel of experts on nuclear abolition, strengthening collaborative relations with civil society in the disarmament process.

In the early 1990s, a system was created by which different governments worked to support the dismantling and disposal of the nuclear arsenals of the newly independent states that emerged following the collapse of the Soviet Union. Further, the International Science and Technology Center (ISTC) was established, tasked with providing opportunities for scientists and engineers formerly involved in work related to weapons of mass destruction to put their talents to use toward civilian purposes. When all the nuclear-weapon states begin a disarmament process aimed at the ultimate goal of zero nuclear weapons, the demand for this type of support will far exceed that which arose in the wake of the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

The panel of experts whose formation I am proposing would build on the knowledge and experience of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters that currently reports to the Secretary-General. It would have, however, a specific focus on nuclear weapons and would include a wide range of specialists from both within and outside the disarmament field; it would advise the Secretary-General on the measures, including technical aspects, necessary to achieving complete nuclear abolition.

In addition to this central function, I would propose three further roles for the panel:

- 1) To periodically issue reports on the threat posed by nuclear weapons in order to foster international public opinion for nuclear abolition, developing this as the single greatest force for ensuring the irreversibility of the abolition process;
- 2) To support the development of more adequate medical treatment for those around the world who continue to suffer from the effects of exposure to radioactive materials;
- 3) To research means for establishing “societal verification,” that is, a system by which the ordinary citizens of each country can monitor their government’s compliance with its disarmament obligations and prohibitions, reporting any violations.

In creating such a panel of experts, it would be desirable for the Secretary-General to enlist support not only from the disarmament specialists of different countries and international organizations, but also from such NGOs as the Pugwash Conferences, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA), the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP), as well as academic and peace research institutions with specialist and technical knowledge. The Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research would fully support the work of such a panel, bringing to bear its research achievements to date and its wide-ranging network of peace researchers.

In 2010, Japan will host an international conference on nuclear disarmament. I strongly hope that Japan will exercise leadership toward the formation of the kind of panel I am proposing. In doing so, the Japanese government should collaborate with Norway, which has put forth a similar vision, and the U.K., which is stressing the importance of research into verification related to the dismantling of nuclear weapons.

3. Removing obstacles

My third proposal regards means of strengthening nonproliferation mechanisms to remove obstacles toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. As a first condition for this, I strongly urge that as many heads of state and government as possible attend the 2010 NPT Review Conference. I would hope that all of the leaders of the states parties to the NPT would attend; I would also propose inviting the leaders of states not part of the NPT regime to attend as observers, in order to enhance the character of the Review Conference as a global summit on nuclear issues.

I would also urge that the conference establish a standing working group to engage in intensive deliberations on strengthening international cooperation for nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation during the five-year period leading up to the next review

conference in 2015. It would further be worth considering developing, on the basis of this working group, a standing body with decision-making powers toward the fulfillment of the NPT's objectives.

In order to lay the groundwork for a world without nuclear arms, it is important to critically analyze the actual nature of the threats that have been used to justify deterrence and thus the development and possession of nuclear weapons over the years. Such efforts will bring greater clarity regarding the most effective responses to various threats.

With the end of the Cold War, it has become virtually unthinkable that any of the five declared nuclear-weapon states would use nuclear weapons against any of the others.

As a result, the justifications for the possession of nuclear weapons that continue to be put forward generally fall into the following three categories: 1) to deter the use of nuclear weapons by another state that would threaten oneself or an allied state; 2) to prevent or deter nuclear weapons development programs that can lead to nuclear proliferation; and 3) to prevent or deter nuclear terrorism by non-state actors.

The first case is one that requires careful examination and consideration, which I will attempt in my fourth proposal below. The second and third cases are widely considered by experts not to be amenable to the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Regarding these types of threat, rather than increased nuclear deterrent capability, it would certainly be more effective to seek to change the behavior of other states by first changing one's own stances and policies. Through such efforts, the declared nuclear-weapon states should seek to bring nuclear powers outside the NPT regime, as well as those whose intentions are suspect, into an expanded and strengthened nonproliferation system. It is also through such efforts that international structures for preventing the spread of nuclear technologies and materials can be strengthened in order to keep such materials out of the hands of terrorists.

At this juncture, few actions would carry a greater symbolic weight, a more powerful portent of self-transformation, than the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). President Obama has indicated that he will seek CTBT ratification by the U.S. Senate. Success here would greatly raise the likelihood that China would also ratify. Ratification by the U.S. and China would serve as encouragement to India and Pakistan to sign or ratify, moving the treaty closer to entry into force. Such changes would also encourage Israel and Iran, which have yet to ratify, and North Korea, which has yet to sign the CTBT, toward taking bold new steps.

If a positive reaction along these lines were to begin, it would lay the foundations for a nonproliferation regime that would comprise all states, including those which are currently outside the NPT system.

Beyond the goal of CTBT entry into force, a number of measures would have both a substantive and symbolic impact. These include the prompt conclusion of a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty, placing the nuclear fuel cycle under international control and encouraging further ratification of the Nuclear Terrorism Convention. Also important, in my view, are the complete demilitarization of outer space as well as measures to increase energy efficiency and encourage the use of renewable energy sources.

With demand for energy increasing globally, and out of the desire to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, there has been an expansion of nuclear power generation facilities with many countries considering the adoption of nuclear energy. This has led to an inevitable heightening of concerns regarding nuclear weapons proliferation and the threat of nuclear terrorism.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has expressed his own concern regarding the risk that a "nuclear renaissance" [27] will introduce new destabilizing elements into the world. From this perspective, it seems clear that, in addition to strengthening the monitoring capacities of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), international cooperation on energy policy—such as supporting the introduction of renewable energy sources and encouraging the diffusion of energy efficiency technologies—could help strengthen the bulwarks against nuclear weapons proliferation.

Such measures should be among the priority agenda items of the standing working group I am suggesting the 2010 NPT Review Conference set up, and I hope that this working group will engage in concrete deliberations over the five-year period leading up to the next review conference in 2015. To this end, it is necessary that the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs, which presently functions as a secretariat for the NPT, be strengthened.

4. Nuclear-free security

My fourth proposal is for all countries to coordinate their efforts to actively reduce the role of nuclear weapons in national security strategies in order to facilitate the transition to security theory and practice that is not reliant on nuclear weapons.

In his Prague speech, President Obama announced the scaling back of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. security strategy and urged other countries to follow suit. While stating that this is necessary to put an end to the ways of thinking that characterized the Cold War, he reserved the right of the U.S. to defend itself and its allies against nuclear threats.

Regarding this, one crucial fact cannot be overlooked: For 64 years since the unimaginable suffering unleashed by the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, no political leader of any country has been able to bring him- or herself to actually use

nuclear weapons.

To me, this indicates that the threshold against the use of nuclear weapons, comprising moral and other considerations, is quite high; there has been a steadily growing awareness among the leaders of states that nuclear weapons are essentially unusable as a means of achieving military objectives.

I believe that, more than deterrence, it is this unseen moral and practical threshold that has prevented the use of nuclear weapons over the years.

The fact is that the large majority of countries neither possess nuclear weapons nor rely on the “nuclear umbrella” of a nuclear-weapon state; and yet these countries have on the whole not been threatened with nuclear attack. By reducing regional tensions and through establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, these states have made continuous efforts to raise even further the threshold against the use of nuclear weapons.

Thus, regarding this final justification for nuclear deterrence, first priority should be given to reducing the perception of threat. This, rather than seeking to respond with increased nuclear weaponry of one’s own, represents both the most realistic and morally acceptable course of action.

Likewise, in seeking to remove nuclear weapons from the security framework, it is critical to always remember that the obligation to realize complete disarmament under Article 6 of the NPT is not limited to the nuclear-weapon states, but is equally shared by all states parties to the treaty.

Even if a nuclear-weapon state should seek to reduce the role of nuclear weapons and, through this, to achieve major disarmament, this will be complicated if its allies demand the continuance or strengthening of the nuclear umbrella. Such a demand would constitute a violation of the spirit of the NPT. How, then, is it possible to continue to justify extended deterrence as a vitally necessary security measure?

It is crucial for nuclear-weapon states and their allies to engage in careful and earnest deliberations regarding extended deterrence. Together, they should develop alternatives, starting with effective measures for reducing regional tensions. I first proposed such an approach some 10 years ago and today repeat that call with renewed urgency.

In Germany, which was on the front lines of East-West Cold War confrontation, there have been calls for a rethinking of security systems that rely on nuclear weapons. In January of this year, four important political figures including former president Richard von Weizsäcker and former foreign minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher issued a statement that responded to the editorials by George Shultz and his coauthors. Stating that “[r]elics from the age of confrontation are no longer adequate for our new century,” they advocate a “general non-first-use treaty between the nuclear-weapons states” and for all remaining U.S. nuclear warheads to be withdrawn from German territory. [28]

Translating this same thinking to a different context, I am convinced that a clear demonstration of political will on the part of the United States and Japan could transform conditions in Northeast Asia, where the lingering negative impact of Cold War thinking is symbolized by the stalemate surrounding North Korea’s nuclear development program.

The economist John Kenneth Galbraith (1908–2006) who, among other responsibilities, served as a key adviser to President Kennedy, in the course of our dialogue shared with me the following views regarding the respective roles and responsibilities of Japan and the United States:

I expect special leadership from Japan in the realm of peace. No other country on the globe has had the same experience with war. ... No other country is so aware of the meaning and effect of nuclear conflict. Perhaps this is a special responsibility of Japan and the United States. They are the two countries in the world with a history of nuclear war. Along with Japan, we should be ... a leader in the effort to see that humankind is not again subject to this massive and relentless death. [29]

As noted earlier, the SGI has produced a DVD recording the experiences of survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings, making these interviews available over the Internet. To quote one of the women from Hiroshima:

Having survived, I wondered what I should do with my life. But I came to feel that my role is to communicate the horrors of the nuclear attack and to share with people my sense of the utter folly of human beings killing each other in war. I now feel that is the reason why I am alive. [30]

What comes across with great power and poignancy through the testimonials of these women is the earnest hope that no one else should ever have to experience the suffering they have endured. This same determination must be the foundation of any antinuclear message issued from Japan.

It is morally impermissible for Japan, the only country to have experienced the use of nuclear weapons in war, to revise its non-nuclear principles (not possessing, not producing and not permitting the introduction of nuclear weapons into its territory), much less to consider becoming a nuclear-weapon state itself. I urge Japan to reaffirm its adherence to the three non-nuclear principles and to once again declare, promptly and categorically, that it will never possess nuclear weapons.

Based on this, Japan and the U.S. should cooperate to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue and build peace in Northeast Asia. Specifically, I call for all the countries currently engaged in the six-party talks on North Korea's nuclear program—China, Japan, North Korea, Russia, South Korea and the United States—to declare Northeast Asia a nuclear non-use region.

For many years, I have urged the same countries to establish a Northeast Asia nuclear-weapon-free zone. One factor that has seriously complicated the realization of such a zone is the fact that all six countries either possess nuclear weapons or have extended deterrence agreements with a nuclear-weapon state. Thus, as a first step toward breaking out of the current stalemate, I think it is crucial to offer mutual pledges not to use nuclear weapons against each other nor to take actions that would heighten the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction, and to give that pledge institutional form.

All six countries are parties to the Biological Weapons Treaty; with the exception of North Korea, all are parties to the Chemical Weapons Treaty. North Korea should be encouraged to become party to this latter treaty and to fulfill its commitment, announced in the Joint Statement issued by the six-party talks four years ago, "to abandoning all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs." [31] Concurrent with this, the other countries should pledge and support the pledge of the non-use of nuclear weapons. This would serve as the basis for the next step forward.

Should such a pledge be made and supported, it could function as a point of reference for South Asia, the Middle East and other regions where there has been no significant progress toward creating nuclear-weapon-free zones.

I am convinced that transforming the structures of confrontation in Northeast Asia and universalizing the commitment that no country or people should ever fall victim to the horrors of nuclear weapons should be the pivotal elements of U.S.-Japanese partnership in the 21st century. Together, our two countries should take the lead in creating a world without nuclear weapons.

5. Outlawing nuclear weapons

The fifth proposal I would like to make is for the world's people to manifest a clear expression of their will to see the outlawing of nuclear weapons and to establish, by the year 2015, the international norm that will serve as the basis for their prohibition.

Drawing from the 1996 International Court of Justice (ICJ) advisory opinion on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, in 1997 IPPNW in collaboration with two other NGOs drafted a model Nuclear Weapons Convention (NWC) that would prohibit the development, testing, production, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons. This has since been circulated as a UN document. The draft was revised in 2007 and has been submitted as a working paper to the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

There is a swelling chorus of calls for the establishment of a clear international norm against nuclear weapons, as evidenced by the statement made last October by Ban Ki-moon, in which he noted the importance of the draft convention. The SGI has to date supported the movement, led by the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) of IPPNW, to foster public support for the adoption of an NWC; and we will continue to do so.

What I would like to propose here is a campaign to give people, on the individual, community and national levels, the opportunity to express our desire to ban these most inhumane weapons that threaten our fundamental right to exist. This would solidify the international norm that would serve as the basis for the adoption of an NWC.

The preamble of the model NWC opens with the words: "We the people of the Earth..." [32] As this makes clear, this convention is not envisaged merely as an agreement among states, but is to be adopted in the name of each individual inhabitant of Earth, as an expression of the shared desire for peaceful coexistence.

The path to the adoption of an NWC is likely to be a difficult one. But, rather than be paralyzed by this difficulty, we should take action now to generate overwhelming popular support for the prohibition of nuclear weapons, such that calls for the adoption of an NWC become impossible to ignore.

In this connection, I would like to cite the very cogent comments of Rebecca Johnson of the Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy in her article titled "Security Assurances for Everyone":

[T]he process of stigmatising and outlawing the use of nuclear weapons offers opportunities for courageous leaders to take unilateral steps that build towards creating a multilateral norm. This is an important initiative that non-nuclear weapon states—and indeed citizens and public

movements—can declare support for, and help to build up a strong ethical norm and create a breathing space for nuclear disarmament initiatives to take hold. [\[33\]](#)

Specifically, I would like to propose initiating a movement in support of a “declaration for nuclear abolition by the world’s people” that could be jointly supported by individuals, organizations, spiritual and religious groups, universities and research institutions, as well as agencies within the UN system.

If we are to put the era of nuclear terror behind us, we must struggle against the real “enemy.” That enemy is not nuclear weapons *per se*, nor is it the states that possess or develop them. The real enemy that we must confront is the ways of thinking that justify nuclear weapons; the readiness to annihilate others when they are seen as a threat or as a hindrance to the realization of our objectives.

This is the new consciousness we must all share, and it was to this that my mentor Josei Toda referred when he spoke of declaring the threat hidden in the very depths of nuclear weapons and urged that the spirit of his declaration be made known throughout the world. He was expressing his conviction that the sharing of this kind of awareness could serve as the basis for a transnational solidarity among the world’s people. He further believed that a revolutionary change in the consciousness of individuals, spreading throughout the world, is the only force deep and radical enough to bring an end to the nuclear age.

When the ICJ was deliberating its advisory opinion in 1996, it received some 4 million “declarations of public conscience” in more than 40 languages, along with evidence of the widespread rejection by the public of nuclear weapons, and the ICJ considered these in the process of reaching its conclusion.

The SGI intends to consult widely with civil society and national representatives in determining the final content and form a new declaration should take. We would like to see this submitted to the UN General Assembly by the year 2015 in order to further momentum for NWC negotiations and as an important reference document for the drafting of the NWC’s preamble.

Gathering support for this declaration will be a core program for the SGI’s People’s Decade for Nuclear Abolition. We are determined to work with a wide range of individuals and organizations to foster global popular solidarity for the complete and final elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of Earth.

Building global solidarity

In conclusion, I would like to suggest that the real significance of achieving a world free of nuclear weapons is by no means limited to their physical elimination. Rather, it involves transforming the very nature of states and interstate relations.

Albert Einstein insisted that we should tackle the issue of nuclear weapons in the same manner we would “if an epidemic of bubonic plague were threatening the entire world.” Under such circumstances, Einstein argued, states would “hardly raise serious objections but rather agree speedily on the measures to be taken” and certainly would “never think of trying to handle the matter in such a way that their own nation would be spared whereas the next one would be decimated.” [\[34\]](#)

In this scenario, what would need to be done—from a moral and ethical as well as a practical and realist perspective—is urgently clear. It would be patently unacceptable for any state to pursue its own security without regard for others.

Just over 100 years ago, Tsunesaburo Makiguchi (1871–1944), the founding president of the Soka Gakkai, proposed a new mode of competition, “humanitarian competition”—in which “by benefiting others, we benefit ourselves” [\[35\]](#)—as a means of overcoming conflict among nations. He called on each state to engage in a positive rivalry to contribute to the world through humane action, in order to spread the spirit of peaceful coexistence and build a truly global society.

The five proposals I have presented here are all rooted in Makiguchi’s concept of humanitarian competition, which shares a basic orientation with the idea of a “joint enterprise” to change the “disposition of the states possessing nuclear weapons” [\[36\]](#) advocated by George Shultz and his coauthors. Such a change in the disposition of nuclear-weapon states is crucial to creating the conditions in which it will be possible to redirect the vast financial and human resources that have been poured into nuclear weapon development and maintenance toward the work of meeting such global challenges as ecological protection and poverty alleviation.

Martin Luther King Jr. (1929–68) was no doubt expressing a similar vision when he stated: “[W]e must transform the dynamics of the world power struggle from the negative nuclear arms race which no one can win to a positive contest to harness man’s creative genius for the purpose of making peace and prosperity a reality for all of the nations of the world.” [\[37\]](#)

Powerful support by civil society is indispensable to realizing the epochal challenge of building a global society. In this regard, it is timely and welcome that the 62nd Annual Conference of NGOs affiliated with the UN’s Department of Public Information to be convened in Mexico City this month will, for the first time in the history of this conference, take up disarmament as its central theme.

Let us abandon the habit of studiously ignoring the menace posed to Earth by nuclear weapons and instead demonstrate—clearly and through the power of people—that a world without nuclear weapons can indeed be realized in our lifetimes.

Raising one's voice or taking action is something we all can do. All that is required are the natural feelings shared by people everywhere: the desire to live in peace, the wish to protect those we love, the determination to spare the world's children needless suffering.

I remember Linus C. Pauling (1901–94), whose achievements are engraved in the history of science and of peace in the 20th century, telling me of the role his wife played in motivating his actions: "I felt compelled to earn and keep her respect." [38] I am convinced that such human bonds are shared by all people and can serve as the essential sustenance for action.

The members of the SGI in 192 countries and territories around the world have been working to build solidarity with and among our fellow citizens. Our efforts are based on the belief that it is dialogue, first and foremost, that opens one heart to another. However slow this process may appear, we are convinced that it is the most certain path to world peace.

The Buddhist concept "three thousand realms in a single moment of life" teaches that there exists in each of us an unlimited power or capacity. Thus a change in the deepest levels of an individual's consciousness and commitment can give rise to waves of transformation in one's surroundings and society, eventually spurring nations and even the entire world to change. Bringing forth this unlimited potential from within each individual and channeling it toward the quest for peace is at the heart of the SGI's endeavors.

Within each human being lies the potential to change one's circumstances—whether in a positive or a negative direction. For example, Einstein's famous mass-energy formula was originally just an equation in the field of physics. However, human beings discovered in it a blueprint for weapons of unprecedented cruelty. This blueprint was developed by governments around the world, devoting all their might to creating weapons of ultimate destruction. From that day forth, humankind has found itself mired in the dangers of the nuclear age.

It is time for us to apply Einstein's same equation to tap the infinite potential that exists in the depths of each person's heart and unleash the courage and action of ordinary people to create an indomitable force for peace. In the final analysis, this is the only way to put an end to the nuclear nightmares of our age.

In this work, no one has a more crucial role to play than young people.

Even the most brilliant ideal will be no more than a dream if it remains locked up in one's heart. To bring it into being as a lived reality requires that we confront and triumph over feelings of powerlessness and resignation. What is needed is the courage to initiate action.

It is the passion of youth that spreads the flames of courage throughout society. This courage, transmitted from one person to the next, can melt the daunting walls of difficulty and open the horizons on a new era in human history.

Based on the proud determination to make the struggle for nuclear abolition the foundation for a world without war, and convinced that participation in this unprecedented undertaking is the greatest gift we can offer the future, I call on people of goodwill everywhere to work together toward the realization of a world finally free from the menace of nuclear weapons.

Bibliography

Ban, Ki-moon. 2008. "The United Nations and Security in a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World." http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocus/sgspeeches/print_full.asp?statID=351 (accessed August 28, 2009).

Butler, George L. 1999. "On Ridding the World of Nuclear Dangers." Acceptance speech for the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's Distinguished Peace Leadership Award, Santa Barbara, CA, April 30. <http://www.peace.ca/genleespeech.htm> (accessed September 4, 2009).

Einstein, Albert. 1950. *Out of My Later Years*. New York: Philosophical Library.

———. 1954. *Ideas and Opinions*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

———. 2005. *The New Quotable Einstein*. Ed. by Alice Calaprice. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Galbraith, John K., and Daisaku Ikeda. 2005. *Ningenshugi no daiseiki o* [The Great Century of Humanism]. Tokyo: Ushio Shuppansha.

G8 Summit. 2009. "L'Aquila Statement on Non-Proliferation." http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/2._LAquila_Statent_on_Non_proliferation.pdf (accessed August 31, 2009).

Gorbachev, Mikhail, and Daisaku Ikeda. 2001. "Gorubachofu-shi to katara" [Dialogue with Gorbachev]. Seikyo Shimbun,

November 20, pp. 2–3.

ICAN (International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons). 2007. “Securing Our Survival (SOS): The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention.” <http://www.icanw.org/securing-our-survival> (accessed August 19, 2009).

ICJ (International Court of Justice). 1995. “Public Sitting.” <http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/files/95/5943.pdf> (accessed August 28, 2009).

Johnson, Rebecca. 2009. “Security Assurances for Everyone: A New Approach to Deterring the Use of Nuclear Weapons.” *Disarmament Diplomacy*, Spring 2009. <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd90/90sa.htm> (accessed August 19, 2009).

Kennedy, John F. 1963. “Commencement Address at American University.” <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POF03AmericanUniversity06101963.htm> (accessed August 19, 2009).

King, Martin L., Jr. 1964. “The Quest for Peace and Justice.” http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king-lecture.html (accessed August 21, 2009).

Leffler, Melvyn P. 2007. *For the Soul of Mankind*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Lens, Sidney. 1982. *The Bomb*. New York: E. P. Dutton.

Makiguchi, Tsunesaburo. 1981–97. *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu* [The Complete Works of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi]. 10 vols. Tokyo: Daisan Bunmeisha.

MFAPRC (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China). 2005. “Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks.” <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/zxxx/t212707.htm> (accessed September 3, 2009).

Nichiren. 1952. *Nichiren Daishonin gosho zenshu* [The Complete Works of Nichiren Daishonin]. Ed. by Nichiko Hori. Tokyo: Soka Gakkai.

Obama, Barack. 2009. “The Remarks by President Barack Obama.” http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered/ (accessed August 19, 2009).

Pauling, Linus, and Daisaku Ikeda. 2009. *A Lifelong Quest for Peace*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Russell, Bertrand. 1975. *Power: A New Social Analysis*. London: Unwin Books.

Schmidt, Helmut, Richard von Weizsäcker, Egon Bahr and Hans-Dietrich Genscher. 2009. “Toward a Nuclear-Free World: A German View.” *The New York Times*, January 9. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/09/opinion/09iht-edschmidt.1.19226604.html?pagewanted=print> (accessed August 31, 2009).

SGI (Soka Gakkai International). 2009. “Testimonies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki: Women Speak Out for Peace.” <http://www.peoplesdecade.org/involved/dvd.html> (accessed September 3, 2009).

Shultz, George P., William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn. 2007. “A World Free of Nuclear Weapons.” *The Wall Street Journal*, January 4. http://www.fcni.org/issues/item_print.php?item_id=2252&issue_id=54 (accessed August 21, 2009).

———. 2008. “Toward a Nuclear-Free World.” *The Wall Street Journal*, January 15. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB120036422673589947.html#printMode> (accessed August 28, 2009).

Toda, Josei. 1981–90. *Toda Josei zenshu* [The Complete Works of Josei Toda]. 9 vols. Tokyo: Seikyo Shimbunsha.

Toynbee, Arnold. 1939. *A Study of History*. Vol. 6. London: Oxford University Press.

———. 1966. *Change and Habit: The Challenge of Our Time*. London: Oxford University Press.

———, and Daisaku Ikeda. 2007. *Choose Life*. London: I.B. Tauris.

UN (United Nations). 1961. “Declaration on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear and Thermo-Nuclear Weapons.” 1653(XVI). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, New York, November 24. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/16/ares16.htm> (accessed August 31, 2009).

UNODA (United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs). 2000. “2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.” NPT/CONF.2000/28 (Part I and II). <http://www.un.org/disarmament/WMD/Nuclear/2000-NPT/OfficialDocs2.shtml> (accessed September 3, 2009).

Notes

- 1 *The New Quotable Einstein*, 156.
- 2 Einstein, *Out of My Later Years*, 190.
- 3 (trans. from) *Toda*, 3: 408–09.
- 4 G8, "L'Aquila Statement," 2.
- 5 Toynbee, *A Study of History*, 6:320.
- 6 Toynbee and Ikeda, *Choose Life*, 194.
- 7 Toynbee, *Change and Habit*, 100.
- 8 Lens, *The Bomb*, 8.
- 9 Kennedy, "Commencement Address."
- 10 Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind*, 388.
- 11 (trans. from) Gorbachev and Ikeda, "*Gorubachofu-shi to katarai*."
- 12 Obama, "Remarks."
- 13 (trans. from) *Toda*, 4:565.
- 14 Russell, *Power*, 22.
- 15 (trans. from) *Nichiren*, 430.
- 16 Butler, "On Ridding the World of Nuclear Dangers."
- 17 ICJ, "Public Sitting," 72–73.
- 18 (trans. from) *Toda*, 4:565.
- 19 UN, "Declaration on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear and Thermo-Nuclear Weapons," 5.
- 20 WMDC, "Weapons of Terror," 60.
- 21 (trans. from) *Toda*, 4:565.
- 22 (trans. from) *Toda*, 3:290.
- 23 (trans. from) *Toda*, 4:565.
- 24 Shultz et al., "Toward a Nuclear-Free World."
- 25 UNODA, "2000 Review Conference," 14.
- 26 Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, 117.
- 27 Ban, "The United Nations."
- 28 Schmidt et al., "Toward a Nuclear-Free World."
- 29 (trans. from) Galbraith and Ikeda, *Ningenshugi no daiseiki o*, 171–72.
- 30 (trans. from) SGI, "Testimonies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki."
- 31 MFAPRC, "Joint Statement."
- 32 ICAN, "Securing Our Survival," 46.
- 33 Johnson, "Security Assurances for Everyone."
- 34 Einstein, *Out of My Later Years*, 204.
- 35 (trans. from) *Makiguchi*, 2:399.
- 36 Shultz et al., "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons."
- 37 King, "The Quest for Peace and Justice."
- 38 Pauling and Ikeda, *A Lifelong Quest for Peace*, 66.