

Table of Contents

International Symposium	1
Special Lecture	2
H.E. Mr. Javier Ponce, Ambassador of the Republic of Ecuador to Japan		
Introductory Reports of the Panelists	5
John Lindsey-Poland (USA)		
Fellowship of Reconciliation		
Hannelore Tölke (Germany)	10
German Peace Council / Bonn City Council member		
Lee Junkyu (Republic of Korea)	13
Lecturer, Laborers' Academy for Alternative Society		
Corazon Valdez Fabros (Phillippines)	18
Stop the War Coalition Philippines		
International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases		
Tadaaki Kawata (Japan)	24
Executive Board Member, Japan Peace Committee		
Special Reports of Japanese Movement	28
Masahiko Goto (Kanagawa)		
Co-chair, Yokosuka Citizens against Homeporting of U.S. Nuclear Aircraft Carrier		
Teruo Onishi (Okinawa)	30
Nago Council against the Construction of U.S. On-Sea Heliport		
Nago Peace Committee		
Report of the International Symposium	32
Keisuke Fuse, symposium coordinator		
 2009 Japan Peace Conference		
Opening Plenary Session		
Keynote Report	35
Addresses by Oversea Delegates	43
John Lindsey-Poland, Hannelore Tölke, Lee Junkyu, Corazon Fabros		
Closing Plenary Session		
Addresses by Oversea Delegates	48
John Lindsey-Poland, Hannelore Tölke, Lee Junkyu, Corazon Fabros		
Conference Summary and Action Proposals	50
Yoshiro Hayasaka		
National Campaign Committee for the Abrogation of Japan-U.S. Security Treaty		

Program of the 2009 Japan Peace Conference

December 10-11	International Symposium
December 11	Opening Plenary Session
December 12	Symposia, Workshops & Field Trips
December 13	Closing Plenary Session
	Rally against U.S. Nuclear Aircraft Carrier
	Peace Parade

International Symposium

December 10-13, 2009

Theme of the Symposium

Our Movement Changes the World

- Growing Trend against Military Bases and Alliance, and toward a Nuclear-Free, Peaceful World

Common Theme of the Conference

Unite to Create a Nuclear-Free, Peaceful Japan Where the Constitution Shines

- No to SDFs overseas deployment! Defend and Make the Best Use of Article 9!
- No to Bringing in of the Nuclear Aircraft Carrier and Nuclear Weapons! No to the Strengthening of U.S. Bases and Crimes Caused by Their Presence!
- Cut Military Spending, Eradicate Poverty, and Stop Destruction of Life!
- 50 Years from the Revision of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty:
Time to Abrogate the Military Alliance and Establish a Peaceful and Equal Relationship between Japan and the U.S.

Special Speaker

H.E. Mr. Javier Ponce, Ambassador of the Republic of Ecuador to Japan

Panelists

Mr. John Lindsey-Poland (USA), Fellowship of Reconciliation

Ms. Hannelore Tölke (Germany), German Peace Council / City Council Member of Bonn

Mr. Lee Junkyu (Republic of Korea), Lecturer, Laborer's Academy for Alternative Society

Ms. Corazon Valdez Fabros (Philippines), Stop the War Coalition Philippines / International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases

Mr. Tadaaki Kawata (Japan), Japan Peace Committee Executive Board Member

Coordinator

Mr. Keisuke Fuse (Japan)

International Bureau Director, National Confederation of Trade Unions (Zenren)

Special Reports

Mr. Masahiko Goto (Kanagawa)

Co-chair, Yokosuka Citizens against Homeporting of U.S. Nuclear Aircraft Carrier

Mr. Teruo Onishi (Okinawa)

Nago Council against the Construction of U.S. On-Sea Heliport /

Nago Peace Committee

Special Lecture by Ambassador of the Republic of Ecuador to Japan

(Original: Spanish)

INTERVENCION DEL EMBAJADOR DEL ECUADOR EN JAPON, JAVIER PONCE, EN LA CONFERENCIA DE LA PAZ 2009.

KANAGAWA

EL 10 DE DICIEMBRE DE 2009

Deseo agradecer a los organizadores de este encuentro por la invitación que me han hecho para dirigirles una palabra. Interpreto este honor como un reconocimiento a la política exterior digna, soberana y democrática que lleva adelante el gobierno que dirige el Presidente Rafael Correa en Ecuador.

En primer lugar deseo destacar la importancia que en mi país tiene la activa participación de organizaciones de la sociedad como las que convocan el acto que hoy nos reúne en Kanagawa. Tenemos la población indígena mejor organizados del continente, y su capacidad de movilización llevo a que, desde la década de los ochenta, se les reconozca la propiedad de la tierra, así como derechos políticos y culturales que es habían sido negados desde hace cuatrocientos años.

La combatividad de los sectores populares y su acción pacífica pero decidida provocaron el derrocamiento de varios gobiernos que pretendieron, en la década pasada, imponer un modelo económico neoliberal similar al que se implantó en otros países de la región y resultaron en una mayor concentración de riqueza. El hecho de que los sectores populares encuentren canales de expresión y participación en las calles, es decir, que la democracia funcione, a pesar de sus imperfecciones, tal vez explica porque

Ecuador es el único país de Sudamérica donde no han tenido cabida aventuras de lucha armada que han asolado a otros países de la región, ni se han producido masivas y sistemáticas violaciones de derechos humanos, incluso durante los gobiernos militares de los años sesenta y setenta.

La vitalidad de las asociaciones de ciudadanos que se agruparon en defensa de la soberana frente a la injerencia extranjera, la promoción de los derechos de la mujer, el respeto a la naturaleza y la preservación de los recursos naturales en beneficio de la población, permitió que la nueva Constitución Política, aprobada en referéndum el año pasado, sea una de las más avanzadas del mundo en la protección de los derechos humanos, incluyendo el derecho a la paz. Así, su artículo 15 determina que Ecuador:

“2. Propugna la solución pacífica de las controversias y los conflictos internacionales y rechaza la amenaza o el uso de la fuerza para resolverlos.

3. Condena la injerencia de los Estados en los asuntos internos de otros Estados, y cualquier forma de intervención, sea incursión armada, agresión, ocupación o bloqueo económico o militar.

4. Promueve la paz”.

El establecimiento, en 1999, de una base militar de los Estados Unidos en la ciudad de Manta alentó la formación de un consenso nacional de rechazo a la existencia de bases militares extranjeras en el Ecuador. Ese consenso fue recogido por el Plan Nacional de Política Exterior 2020, resultado de un amplio proceso de consultas con todos los sectores políticos, económicos y sociales del país. Los artículos 5 y 416, num.5 de nuestra Constitución Política consagran la máxima jerarquía normativa a este consenso al señalar:

“Art. 5.- El Ecuador es un territorio de paz. No se permitirá el establecimiento de bases militares extranjeras ni de instalaciones extranjeras con propósitos militares. Se prohíbe ceder bases militares nacionales a fuerzas armadas o de seguridad extranjeras.,” y; Art 416.5. (Ecuador condena) la imposición de bases o instalaciones con propósitos militares de unos Estados en el territorio de otros.

La eliminación total de las armas nucleares, y el libre acceso de todos los países del mundo al uso pacífico de la energía nuclear ha sido un objetivo por el que han trabajado, desde hace décadas, sucesivos gobiernos en Ecuador. La dinámica e invariable acción de la diplomacia ecuatoriana en distintos foros internacionales de desarme, y en especial en el establecimiento de América Latina como la primera región del mundo libre de este tipo de armas consagrado en el Tratado de Taltelolco, llevaron a que los países de la región designen a un ecuatoriano como primer dirigente de la OPANAL, el organismo encargado de velar por el fiel cumplimiento de ese compromiso. Los principios que guiaron tradicionalmente la acción del Ecuador han sido recogidos en su

nueva Constitución que, en su artículo 15 determina:

“Se prohíbe el desarrollo, producción, tenencia, comercialización, importación, transporte, almacenamiento y uso de armas químicas, biológicas y nucleares, Así como la introducción de residuos nucleares y desechos tóxicos al territorio nacional”

Por su parte, el artículo 416, numeral 4 señala que el Estado: “Promueve...el desarme universal; condena el desarrollo y uso de armas de destrucción masiva”

La injerencia de las grandes potencias en los asuntos internos de los Estados ha sido una constante histórica. En el caso de América Latina los Estados Unidos han sido recurrente protagonista de dicha injerencia. Con el objetivo de fortalecer su propia capacidad para hacer frente a las nuevas amenazas a su seguridad, los países sudamericanos decidieron, en el marco de la Unión Sudamericana, creada hace un par de años que tiene su sede en Quito, establecer un Consejo de Seguridad y Defensa, que, bajo la presidencia del Ecuador ha acordado durante la reunión celebrada hace pocos días importantes avances para crear medidas de confianza entre los países de la región y varios procedimientos y mecanismos tendientes a favorecer el desarme.

En los últimos meses el Consejo ha manifestado su preocupación por el establecimiento de varias bases militares de los Estados Unidos en Colombia. En la reunión celebrada hace pocos días en Quito UNASUR adoptó medidas para disminuir el riesgo de que dichas bases se constituyan en una amenaza para la región. Los países

sudamericanos en reiteradas ocasiones han sostenido que el conflicto colombiano es un asunto interno que debe ser resuelto por los propios colombianos, y que el problema de la producción, consumo y tráfico de drogas y delitos conexos como el lavado de dinero no puede ser resuelto con un enfoque de seguridad que privilegia el uso de medios militares. Estamos seguros que la consolidación de un sistema sudamericano de defensa disminuirá la vulnerabilidad de la región y propiciará la búsqueda de soluciones a los desafíos de seguridad que enfrentamos. Adicionalmente este avance cualitativo de la integración sudamericana contribuirá a limitar los riesgos de injerencia externa en nuestros asuntos internos.

El próximo año se celebrará la conferencia de renovación del Tratado de No Proliferación de armas nucleares. Al igual que en anteriores negociaciones sobre este instrumento internacional, Ecuador insistirá en que se otorgue prioritaria importancia al objetivo último del Tratado que es la erradicación completa de las armas nucleares. No podemos permitir que las

potencias nucleares sigan pretendiendo la vigencia sólo las normas que impiden la proliferación, sin avanzar de modo decidido en las negociaciones a las que se comprometieron con el convenio para eliminar sus arsenales. Es este un campo propicio para fortalecer la cooperación entre los pueblos de Ecuador y Japón. Formulo votos porque el movimiento pacifista japonés, que tiene un liderazgo internacional ganado por su entereza al oponerse a la repetición de las tragedias de Hiroshima y Nagasaki, fortalezca sus lazos con la sociedad civil del Ecuador y los otros países aquí presentes y se mantengan vigilantes para que sus gobiernos cumplamos con la obligación que tenemos de impulsar el avance del derecho internacional, de conformidad con la voluntad popular, que de manera clara se pronuncia por la proscripción del uso de la fuerza en las relaciones internacionales, el respeto a la soberanía territorial de los Estados y la erradicación definitiva de las armas de destrucción masiva.

MUCHAS GRACIAS.

(English Translation)

Special Lecture by H.E. Mr. Javier Ponce, Ambassador of Ecuador to Japan

I would like to thank the organizers of this conference for inviting me to join you in this gathering. I understand this honor as recognition of foreign policy of dignity, sovereignty and democracy carried forward by the government under the leadership of President Rafael Correa in Ecuador.

First, I would like to underscore the

importance of the participation of social organizations in my country, just like the ones that are present here in this meeting today in Kanagawa. We have the indigenous population best organized in the continent, and their mobilization capacity has, since the 1980's, led to the recognition of their entitlements to land, as well as their political and cultural rights that had been

negated for more than 400 years.

Combativeness of popular sectors and their peaceful but decisive action toppled down various governments that had sought during the past decade to impose upon the people a neoliberal economic model, similar to the one introduced in other countries in the region and ended up in more concentration of wealth. Popular sectors found means of expression and participation in the streets, that is to say, democracy functions despite its defectiveness. This perhaps explains the reason why Ecuador is the only country in South America that has not fallen into the dangerous armed struggle suffered by other countries in the region, nor has conducted massive and systematic human rights violations even under the military governments in the 1960's and the 1970's.

The power of the citizens' organizations working for the defense of sovereignty from foreign interference, for the promotion of women's rights, for the respect to the nature, and the preservation of natural resources for the benefit of the people, made the new Political Constitution approved by the referendum last year, the most advanced constitution in the world in terms of the protection of human rights including the right to peace. Article 15 stipulates that Ecuador:

"2. Advocates pacific solution of international controversies and conflicts and rejects the threat or use of force as means of resolving them.

3. Condemns interference by States in other states' internal affairs, and any form of intervention, either as armed incursion, aggression, occupation, or economic or military blockade.

4. Promote peace."

The establishment or a military base of the United States in 1999 in Manta City helped to build national consensus on refusal of the existence of foreign military bases in Ecuador. This consensus was incorporated in the National Plan for Foreign Policy 2020, through a broad process of consultations with all political, economic and social sectors of the country. In its Article 5 and Article 416 No. 5, our Political Constitution grants the highest normative status to this consensus, saying:

"Article 5: Ecuador is a territory of peace. It does not permit the establishment of foreign military bases, or foreign installations with military purposes. It prohibits the cession of national military bases to foreign armed forces or security forces," and

"Article 416 No. 5: 416. (Ecuador) condemns the imposition of bases or installations for military purposes of States in the territory of others.

The total elimination of nuclear weapons and free access of all countries of the world to the pacific use of nuclear energy have been the objectives of successive governments of Ecuador since decades ago. Because of the dynamic and invariable action of Ecuadorian diplomacy in different international forums on disarmament, especially in the establishment of Latin America by the Taltelolco Treaty, as the first region of the world free of this type of weapons, countries of this region designated an Ecuadorian as the first leader of an organization called OPANAL, which is a monitoring body for the implementation in good faith of this treaty. Ecuador's long-held guiding

principles for action have been incorporated in the new Constitution in its Article 15, which determines:

"Development, production, possession, comercialization, import, transpot, stockpile, and use of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, ... as well as the introduction of nuclear and toxic wastes to national territory."

For its part, Article 416 No.4 stipulates that the State "promotes...universal disarmament; condemns development and use of weapons of mass destruction."

Interference of big powers into internal affairs of States has constantly been repeated in history. In the case of Latin America, it has always been the United States that carried out such interference. In order to strengthen theirs own capacity to confront new threats to their security, the South Amerian countries decided, within the framework of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) created two years ago with their head office in Quito, to establish a Security and Defence Council. In the meeting held just a few days ago under the Ecuadorian presidency, the Council agreed on the important progress for creating measure of confidence between countires of the region, as well as procedures and mechanisms to promote disarmament.

In these past months, the Council has expressed its concern over the establiehment of various US military bases in Colombia. In the meeting held in Quito a couple of days ago, UNASUR adopted measures so that those bases will not pose threat to the region. South American countries have on many occasions maintained that the Colombian conflict is an internal affair that

should be resolved by Colombians, and that the problem of prduction, consumption, and trafficking of drugs, and all related crimes such as money laundering cannot be settled from the security perspectives that places priority to the use of military means. We are convinced that the consolidation of a South American defense system will reduce the vulnerability of the region, and favor the search for solutions to the security challenges we face. In addition, this qualitative advance of the integration of South America will contribute to diminish the danger of outside interference into our internal affairs.

Within a few months, the Non-Nuclear Proliferation Treaty Review Conference will take place. Just like in the previous negotiations on this international instrument, Ecuador will maintain that it gives top priority to the Treaty's ultimate goal, that is, complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We cannot allow that nuclear powers only seek to keep the validity of the norms for preventing proliferation, without taking decisive steps forward in the negotiations to agree on the nuclear weapons convention. This is the area where peoples of Ecuador and Japan should strengthen cooperation. Japanese peace movement has been recognized as the intenational leader for its firm resolve in opposition to the repetition of the tragedies of Hiroshima and Okinawa. I hope that Japan's peace movement as such will strengthen its ties with civil society of Ecuador and that the two countries remain vigilant so that their governments implement the obligation to promote international law, in accordance with the people's will, clearly declaring the ban on the use of force in international relations, respect to territorial sovereignty of States, and the complete

elimination of weapons of mass destruction. Thank you.

Introductory Reports of the Panelists

John Lindsay-Poland
Fellowship of Reconciliation USA

Dismantling Military Bases: Constructing Our Own Narrative and Finding a Role for Each of Us

I am deeply grateful to the Japan Peace Committee for creating this opportunity to talk with you about movements to close US military bases around the world, especially in Latin America.

In the subway station near where I live, in California, I was looking at the billboard announcements on the walls. They were arranged in pairs, and it was very striking. In the first pair, was an ad promoting medical marijuana, together with an ad for a video gun game called “Resident Evil”, with a picture of a woman aiming a gun-like instrument at her TV, with a monster egging her on and the invitation to “Let your dark side come out.” In the second pair, was an ad promoting shots against the flu with an ad for the film “Left for Dead 2” with a picture of a ghoulish hand. In the third pair, was an ad that said “It takes the courage of a true warrior to ask for help,” from the Veterans Administration, for war veterans who need counseling, together with an ad for the film “SAW VI” about the violent deaths of corporate criminals forced to play sadistic games. And finally, there was ad that said “How will you take over?” about a basketball video, together with, again, “Resident Evil”.

I think these describe very well the fascinations of my country at this time – how to be healthy in a system that we can’t afford (and it’s California, so marijuana is part of this mix), along with images of death and murder for entertainment, along with a game about a game to “take over.”

People say that the United States leads the world in culture and that others follow. If that’s the case, I hate to think what these billboards in my city mean for Article 9 in yours.

I will talk about experiences with Latin America, because that is the area I have worked on for many years, as well as the United States, where I live. And I hope afterward we can have some dialogue. I have worked on this through the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist organization founded at the beginning of World War One, on the conviction that love and truth can reconcile human conflict without the suffering caused by war and injustice. In Latin America, we have worked with nonviolent justice and peace movements to promote a demilitarized US policy and collaborative relationships with similar

movements in the United States.

After the US invasion of Panama in 1989, we learned how the US military bases in Panama had been used as a platform for US intervention in other countries, as well as in 20 interventions in Panama itself, about the lives lost, about the environmental harms caused by these military activities. And we worked together with Panamanian groups to ensure the bases closed in accordance with the Canal Treaties. When they did, we also worked with the mass movement in Puerto Rico to close military bases there, and with organizations in Ecuador to support closure of the base in Manta that began to operate in 1999. Latin America has much to teach about transforming from the presence of military bases and domination by the United States to greater regional autonomy from the Superpower to the north.

In preparation for this presentation, I interviewed a number of veteran US activists working for the closure of foreign military bases, and for demilitarization and disarmament generally. What brought about the closure of foreign military bases in countries that have successfully accomplished this? What combinations of forces and spirit and politics and economy?

Gwyn Kirk of Women for Genuine Security observes that the successful campaigns – in the Philippines, Kaho'olawe, Panama, Vieques, Okinawa, Ecuador - all involved sustained direct action.

Let's look at what have been the conditions for closing the military bases in Panama, Puerto Rico and Ecuador. These conditions have included: rejection at a national level (though not at the local level in some cases).

Direct action. A substantially united population. These produced political will at the governmental level (though not of the same governments that negotiated the bases or their continuation). These conditions don't exist yet in Colombia, at least not yet. But they also did not exist at the beginning of the presence of bases in Ecuador, Puerto Rico or Panama.

National opinion on Manta began with a majority in favor of the base, but that majority declined until it became the reverse: the national majority wanted the US soldiers to leave. In Manta itself, there was a progressive increase of public opinion that rejected the US military presence, from 0% in 2000, increasing to 18% in 2004, and later to 30% in 2005 and 2006.

Another element has been that the circumstances of establishing the military presence were seen as illegitimate. In Panama, the bases were set up by a treaty signed in New York just a few days after independence in 1903, behind the backs of the new Panamanian leaders, that delivered US sovereignty over the most important real estate on the Panama isthmus. In Puerto Rico, the bases were established through conquest in the war with Spain and expanded through extraordinary legal powers in World War Two. In Ecuador, the agreement was signed in 1999 by President Jamil Mahuad, who was overthrown shortly afterward, and the agreement was never reviewed by the Ecuadorian Congress.

In Puerto Rico, the people's indignation about the elevated levels of cancer in the island-municipality of Vieques, bombed for more than 60 years, boiled over with the death of David Sanes, a civilian guard, by

two bombs that fell on the Observation Post in 1999. The US Navy used Vieques to train pilots before going to the Persian Gulf and in this case to the war in Kosovo. The movement that erupted after David Sanes' death united Puerto Rico, normally politically fractured over its relationship to the United States.

For four years they protested, setting up camps inside the bombing area. When the bombing was resumed after a year, small groups went inside the impact area – beginning with a group of women. More than 1,500 people were arrested in acts of civil disobedience. In 2003, the Navy announced the closure of the bombing range and an end to the bombing as a result of the nonviolent protests carried out by ordinary Puerto Rican people, people prepared their families for 30-day prison terms and made sure their medicines were in order, people who, by acting, became extraordinary. Or maybe we should say they already were. Not long afterward, the Navy closed the large Roosevelt Roads base that was operationally tied to Vieques, on the big island.

In Panama, the movement to remove the US military bases on the banks of the Panama Canal took hold in the late 1950s, with a strong nationalist student movement. After the “flag riots” in January 1964, the new US president Lyndon Johnson committed the United States to fundamentally restructure the US-Panama relationship, which led eventually to the 1977 Treaty that committed the United States to withdraw all of its troops by the end of 1999.

In these cases, solidarity in the United States played a role, though it was never the protagonistic role. It was most prominent in

the Vieques movement, mostly because the Puerto Rican diaspora living in the United States was very active, and large, and was able to access the media, political structure and courts more easily than most immigrant groups. The movement used legal strategies, such as civil lawsuits for health damages and for an injunction to stop the naval bombing practice. It used lobbying, bringing hundreds of Puerto Ricans to Washington. It used culture, with film and music that celebrate and documented the resistance in Vieques. It used dramatic action, such as when one man hung a Vieques flag and a banner to stop the bombing from the Statue of Liberty in New York. It used education, such as the work of our organization and many others that distributed written information and did presentations. It drew on technical experts, who investigated the environmental, military, health impacts of bombing in Vieques. There were discourses and roles for people of the church acting on their faith and religious values, for women acting against the pervasive male violence of the military, for politicians, for peace activists who understood the role of Vieques in US wars, for doctors who saw stopping the bombing as a health measure, for cooks and videographers, for journalists, for folks at home when their loved ones went to jail, for people who have money, for fishermen who brought protesters out to the bombing range, for businesspeople and urban planners who foresaw that ending the bombing would increase tourism, for some of you in Japan and Hawai'i and island cultures who felt a bond with Puerto Ricans and their situation, and for many of us around the world who visited and felt indignant and inspired and went home to find a way to act in our own contexts, out of our own gifts.

The movement to stop the bombing in Vieques was a mass movement, and although it has not yet accomplished all its goals – for community development and return of the lands and environmental cleanup – it did win a great victory when the Navy conceded in 2003 that “The level of protests, attempted incursions, and isolated successful incursions generally remains high when Battle Group training occurs on the island” requiring “extremely aggressive and costly multi-agency security actions” in order to bomb the island. “Navy’s departure from Vieques will relieve us from this burden,” the Navy concluded. This achievement by a people in a colony using nonviolence against the most powerful military in the history of the world was all the more impressive, considering that the Navy considered Vieques the “crown jewel” of its training facilities and it fought hard against the movement.

In Ecuador, the United States did not put up the same fight. The military had not had a military base in Ecuador for as long a time, and the activities there were not as integrated into its operations regionally and globally as in Vieques. It was a tenant and not an owner of the base. And a sovereign elected government had campaigned on the plan to terminate the lease for the base. In addition, Colombia next door provided a fairly simple exit. Like Guam for Okinawa, Colombia’s problems are exploited by the United States even as Ecuador achieves greater freedom.

So what is the state of activism in the United States to close foreign military bases now? In February of this year, 17 organizations organized a national conference in

Washington, titled “Security without Empire,” that brought more than 200 people together and included an intensive lobby day in Congress.

The United States is clearly an empire in decline, as measured by production, health, debt, and the ability to set global standards. (Empires always break international laws, but these days, the United States opposes even the establishment of many such standards.) This can be a very dangerous situation, in which the empire is tempted to compensate for its deficiencies and satisfy its subjects’ sense of entitlement through the use of violence to enforce unequal terms of trade. But in such a situation, other nations have an opportunity to assert their strength – I don’t mean military strength (in which the United States still dominates the world), but strength of culture, of production, of ethics, of community.

There are three things that are shaping the peace movement and specifically activism in the United States for the closure of foreign military bases.

The first is the economic crisis, which affects people of all classes, although in very different ways. The crisis may reflect imperialism’s decline, but it has deeply affected civil society organizations, including the peace movement. Many organizations are barely holding on, including the national coalition United for Peace and Justice, which has no staff and just two working groups.

A second factor is the love of Obama. “Every time you elect a Democratic president,” says Joseph Gerson of American Friends Service Committee, “for 18 months

to 2 years the liberal end of the movement has fallen in love with the president. You have a trough in that period. We're in that trough. As Obama's numbers decline, you'll see it coming back." Joseph says this period began last year when people started to get serious about the election, and an enormous amount of money and energy went into the campaign.

A third factor is the increasing digitalization of life, of media, and of activism. People spend a lot of time looking at screens that are connected to the Internet, text messages, and the phone, not as much time with print or face-to-face, which are more expensive than email blasts or web pages, especially for international activism. In one sense, this is an asset for international work at a time when the availability of jet fuel is peaking. But it also means that many people's connection to others' experience of war and injustice is thin and abstract.

What this has added up to is that peace activism is drawing from the solid core of activists, many of whom are middle aged and older.

So what is it that moves people to action? There is some kind of emotional pinch, something that grabs you and you say, "I'm going to do this." "Urgency works on you when you're in place when you can make some choices, and when basics of life are taken care of," says Gwyn Kirk. "It doesn't have the same impact when your sense of urgency is how you're going to put food on the table."

Humor also helps. Some of you know CODEPINK, the women's peace organization in the United States. They

issued an action appeal about the reduction of US military force in Iraq, about which the Obama administration has given mixed messages. "Ladies," they said, "is this a withdrawal method that you trust?"

For military bases, it is also important to frame the bases as part of the large and deep issues that concern us. At the moment, a majority in the United States opposes an escalation of the US war in Afghanistan, which is being fought from bases in Afghanistan and Qatar and Germany and other nations. Some messages focus on how overseas military bases cost the United States more than \$100 billion (after you subtract what nations like Japan are paying for them), which could be used to make the United States more healthy, productive and self-sufficient.

There is a good deal going on: research by academics such as the books on Diego Garcia by David Vine and global bases by Catherine Lutz; educational events such as what Grannies for Peace organized in New York last month; campaigns to stop the production of drones (Unmanned Aerial Vehicles used to attack Afghanistan and Pakistan) in towns where people are being hired to make them; the gathering of women in Guam in September that celebrated the fragile reconstruction of Chamorro culture. The successful campaign against missile 'defense' radars in the Czech Republic was well supported by Global Network and the Campaign for Peace and Democracy. Our own work to make visible and oppose the new US bases in Colombia has found resonance with many people in the United States and beyond.

The work to close US military bases finds

strength and energy in the relationships born of people-to-people connections, in visits and speaking tours and events like this one, when we engage the emotions we feel about the lives of Amer-asian children and Okinawans living in such a militarized island and the dugongs and the painful history the two countries share, about wars in Iraq and elsewhere and cruelty in California or Tokyo, and we also engage our minds to understand why and how these things happen and what is effective to do in response. We also find energy in what we do physically, with our bodies, where we place ourselves in critical moments, with whom we stand.

In all of this, we can draw up from our core, from the knowledge that there is no reason to harm, that none of us carry “resident evil” or need be “left for dead” as the movies say, that we are creating another narrative. Call it love. It is our own narrative, it has force, and whatever happens in the world, it is what gives our lives meaning and beauty. In this swift life, we will keep finding ways to walk together, to work together, and hear – really hear - each other’s voices across ocean and city and table. This is our faith; this is our peace.

Thank you for listening.

Hannelore Tölke
German Peace Council / Bonn City Council Member

NATO – a security risk

In the last 20 years since the end of bipolarities NATO changed its strategies and area of operation. I would like to speak about these changes and I will speak about concepts of security that could guarantee security in the 21st century and which could be an option for Europe.

The NATO summit that took place in April 2009 decided to work on a new strategic concept for a new long-lasting strategy for NATO in the 21st century. The decision about this new strategic concept will be made assembly on the next NATO Summit 2010 in Portugal.

One important point in this concept of the new NATO Strategy is the so called Comprehensive Approach which means an

involvement civil actors and international aid organisations in the so called deployment of stabilisation. Military and civil actors will work hand in hand so in this CIMIC (Civil-Military Co-operation) civil actors will become part of the military deployment of NATO.

The Afghanistan strategy is an enlargement of troops in Afghanistan. The aim which was announced this week is to bring 100.000 soldiers to Afghanistan.

Another point of new NATO strategies is the change of the communication structures and decisions. It proposed to renounce on decision making by consensus, member who will not be part of NATO-wars will not participate in decisions but NATO member have to pay

for all deployment coast, not only those who take part in the action. Experts are in the opinion that this will change the proportions of power completely. It will give the adventure to bigger countries and will significant enlarged the ability of warfare for NATO.

Despite NATO declares just the opposite it is in confrontation with Russia. NATO and especially the USA want that Georgia and Ukraine will become NATO members. In future NATO will work closely with Non-NATO-Democracies such like Australia, Japan, New Zealand, and South Korea. This change NATO will be a competitor organization to UNO. The aim is to avoid the Russian and Chinese veto right against military deployment in the UNO. This remoulding of NATO has the aim to be ready for new war around the world.

NATO an organisation for warfare up from the beginning

A retrospection to the past shows, up from the beginning NATO was military alliance not for warfare and not for defence.

Even the foundation of NATO in April 1949 is only understandable in connection with the confrontation of USA and Soviet Union that starts 1945 and expressed the increasing system confrontation between two political systems.

Germany's accession to NATO was a milestone of warfare. Germany became NATO Member in 1955. For this German Bundeswehr was founded in the west part of Germany. The remilitarisation was accompanied by a bitter struggle in the Western German society and a broad

political debate. The question discussed with great passion not only by politicians but also among people in Western Germany was the following: would Germany have the right for a special way of neutrality or would integration in the western systems be the best way?

Stalin tried to prevent the remilitarisation of Western Germany and its integration in the NATO by proposing limited military forces in whole Germany, reunifying Germany, free elections and a neutral Germany. In connection with a non-allied Yugoslavia, a neutral Austria, Sweden and Finland a so-called cordon sanitaire between both blocks in Europe would be possible in this case.

In May 1955 the Allied High Commission, which included USA, Great Britain and France in Western Germany, signed the proclamation for the removal of the Occupation Statute of Germany and the Allied-High- Commission law that forbade an army in Germany was suspended in Western Germany. In June 1955 the German army "Bundeswehr" was founded and Germany became a member of NATO.

After Western Germany became NATO Member the Warsaw Treaty was founded and a further level of system confrontation was reached.

A process of rapprochement started not until 20 year in 1975 with the Conference for Security and Cooperation“.

During the KSCE Summit in Paris from 19th to 21st November 1990 16 NATO States and 6 Warsaw-Treaty states executed a common

declaration in which they defined them self not as rivals but as partners.

The Charta of Paris was the last point of this process. The idea of the Paris Charta was to create a regional system of mutual collective security. A mutual and collective security should be guaranteed by OSCE, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Europe was regarded as a geographical Europe from the Atlantic to the Ural in which Russia without any question was a member. The OSCE declared that it want a Europe from which comes peace, which is open for dialogs and cooperation with other countries und ready for sharing experiences and for searching common security. If this principles and aims would be transformed, a change in the history of world could be possible. Europe could be an independent and peace orientated force, in which the former European member states of NATO and Warsaw Treaty would find a place in a common house Europe.

But in the same time the 2 plus 4 agreement destroy the idea for a common house Europe, 2 plus 4 agreement 2 Germany states, and the 4 allies in the word war II USA, Great Britain, France and Russia which is practically the peace treaty. In the 2+4 agreement GDR joints FRG as a part of NATO area, even a few months after the Warsaw Treaty were dissolved. NATO states decided in November 1991 on the NATO Summit in Rome a new strategic concept. They confirmed the NATO politics of determent and the option of the first strike for the use nuclear weapons. To justify to ongoing the existence of NATO the summit detected a number of threats.

- The instability of Eastern Europe,
- A possible treat of nuclear weapons

in Eastern Europe and

- A possible treat coming from the Middle East and the Mediterranean Sea

With this scenario Eastern Europe, especially Russia, and the Middle East was identified as a possible treat, the responsibility of NATO was enlarged from the North Atlantic area to Middle East. The Security of this alliance has to be regarded in global framework.

In April 1999 in the Summit in Washington NATO changed its strategies to a worldwide acting military instrument. Just one month after the NATO-war against Yugoslavia started.

Just in the same moment when the NATO treaty was reinterpreted the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe CFE was put on hold. The chance to build a European Security System was given up and Europe subordinate to the hegemony interests of the USA.

Divergences between Europe and USA

But a conflict of interests and divergences were existing and they are existing even now. These divergences are caused by different safety needs.

Since 1990 especially the US are carrying out an enlargement to the east. The accession of Georgia and Ukraine is one important point of divergences. This accession means that not only in Baltic, but also in the south NATO will approach to the Russian frontiers. Nowhere else are nowadays the divergences between US and Western Europe so obvious than in the

conflict about Georgia and in the gas clash with Ukraine. It is important to notice, that since 1992 and 2001 the UN Security Council mandated Russia as a stabilisation force in the Caucasus. Russia is regarding this region as its region of interest. Despite the European resistance USA is making pressure and is claiming for a membership of Georgia and Ukraine in NATO.

Another divergence of interests was visible in the coalition of the willing during the Iraq war in March 2003, when the axes Berlin-Paris refused the fellowship to the US. Also in the relationship to Iran are significant differences of interests and behaviour visible.

Also a very hot topic of competition is the engagement Africa. An very important in Africa to have resources such like Oil and Gas, Water and mineral resources, under control. The UN mandated EU-Military intervention in Tschaad is only one spotlight to this. USA and Europe are also competitors to in Congo and Darfur.

Rivalries do not only exist concerning resources but also because to control pipelines. This is visible in the latest crisis about Georgia. This country The Russian Southstream leads from Baku in

Aserbaidschan via Tbilisi in Georgia over Russian territories to the Balkan and from there to the North. The Nacucco leads as well from Baku-Tbilisi to Turkey via Balkan to Vienna and Prague.

The control over the petrol-bottleneck Georgia completes the picture that also in case US tries to control the energy transport to Europe.

Nowadays Europe has two Options.

- The first is to follow NATO and USA leaded military actions in order to be allowed to take part in decisions. This is what EU states are doing in the Operation Enduring Freedom and Active Endeavour in the Mediterranean Sea.
- The second option could be to create an own cooperation with Russia, just what Europe did in the Ukrainian-Russian gas-clash, Iran and Georgia.

A clear political line is until now not visible. But a combination of alt strategies and the will for global military interventions will provoke a heavy security problem and will continue the division of Europe.

Lee Junkyu
Lecturer, Laborers' Academy for Alternative Society

Challenges for 2010 -A South Korean Perspective -

My name is Lee Junkyu from South Korea.
Thank you for inviting me to this Japan Peace Conference.

What I want to tell you today is about the so-called “North Korean Nuclear Issue” and the alliance between South Korea and U.S. and the alliance between Japan and U.S. The former is represented by U.S. forces in South Korea and the latter by the U.S. forces in Japan. These two alliances may seem to be two separate problems if you look at them in certain way, but in my view, these two issues are closely linked to each other.

As the representatives of North Korea and the U.S. are going to meet, there is a growing expectation that it will create a breakthrough in the stalemate over the Korean Peninsula. It can be said that the “North Korean Nuclear Issue” is now at a turning point.

There have been many twists and turns until today. The response of the Japanese government of Aso and the South Korean government of Lee Myung-bak to the North Korean satellite testing conducted on April 5 this year led eventually to a declaration of the U.N. Security Council Chairman condemning North Korea, to which North Korea responded by conducting nuclear testing in May for the second time. In addition, since its inauguration, the new Lee government has tried to precede to an overall revision the policies of the previous government, putting the North-South relationship on the Korean Peninsula in a deadlock. In this context, people place hope in the serious dialogue between North Korea and the U.S. that commenced around summer this year.

However, it is an undeniable reality that the prospect for the settlement of the “North Korean Nuclear Issue” remains as opaque and uncertain as before. It remains to be

seen whether the direct dialogue engaged between North Korea and the U.S. will produce any tangible result and whether it will facilitate the resumption of multilateral consultations including the Six Party Talks which would in turn set the process of solving the North Korean Issue again in motion.

There are voices questioning whether North Korea is serious about abandoning its nuclear programs. I was asked similar questions quite often when I was staying in Japan for a year since last summer for field research. I think that it is a wrong way to look at the question. I believe that what we must ask ourselves at this moment instead is “what we should do to make North Korea give up its nuclear program”.

In addition, posing the question “does North Korea really intend to renounce its nuclear weapons” may well lead to a preconception or a prejudice about a country like the DPRK. Preconception and prejudice will narrow the options for the policy to be implemented towards North Korea and it would thus make the solution more difficult. Moreover, they would have negative effect for the establishment of a peaceful order in East Asia.

I would like to take up, as example of this, the question of Kim Jong-Il’s successor in North Korea, which was one of the favorite topics for South-Korean, Japanese and U.S. media from last autumn till spring this year. In fact, when the U.S. State Secretary Hilary Clinton toured in Asia in February this year, she referred to the question of successor which irritated North Korea. The New York Times commented that her statement “broke the diplomatic taboo”.

In March this year, South Korean and the U.S. armed forces conducted a joint military exercise. It was then pointed out that that exercise was actually for “operational plan 5029” that supposes an “emergency situation in North Korea” and the subsequent intervention of U.S. troops stationed in South Korea as well as South Korean troops and ROK-U.S. allied troops. It was natural that North Korea strongly reacted to such a military exercise. Walter Sharp, the commander of U.S. armed forces in South Korea, first in April and then in October, stressed the need for measures to cope with an emergency happening in North Korea. I believe that this can explain partly if not completely why the U.S. accepted the hardliner policy or sanction against North Korea proposed by Japan and South Korea in the first half of this year. In my view, it can be described without exaggeration as “North Korean demise” theory or “Obama Model North Korean regime change” theory.

A sudden change in or collapse of North Korea is something that South Korea would hate even to imagine. However if it happens, it is common sense to seek for a solution with peaceful means whatever the nature of the event is. With ROK and U.S. boasting their alliance to be 100% ready for any event that will occur, the imaginable future of East Asia seems to be chaotic for us. I cannot but wonder if the scenario with an emergency situation happening in North Korea followed by a military intervention by ROK-US joint troops, backed up by Japanese self-defense troops, or a “chaos in East Asia” that will lead to Chinese and Russian responses and interventions really corresponds to the “spirit of alliance” they used to stress.

It goes without saying that the current stage of the “North Korean Nuclear Issue” consists of creation of a breakthrough allowing the concerned parties to get out of the current stalemate to advance towards dialogue. If we look at the issue in a wider perspective, we will see that upheavals are taking place in East Asia and the world. The advent of Obama Administration in the U.S. has important implications. It is also important that the new government of Hatoyama that replaced the successive LDP governments refers to the possibility of resuming dialogue with North Korea. This in turn means that if the current South Korean government does not change its policy towards North Korea, it will be isolated in the course of future developments or may even be treated as a nuisance.

We can easily tell that while the situation on the Korean Peninsula over the North Korean Nuclear Issue swings between deadlock and progress, the phenomenon or measures or ideas that run counter to peace in Asia or to the establishment of a non-nuclear and peaceful world will gain strength. The first to gain strength is the logic “nuclear deterrence” and then the obsession for alliance that is underlying the nuclear deterrence logic. I used the word obsession, because I find it abnormal from political psychology perspective to rely heavily on alliance with other countries.

Nuclear deterrence supposes that a nuclear attack is inevitably responded with nuclear attack. For Japan and South Korea, nuclear deterrence is provided by the US nuclear umbrella and its extreme form is going nuclear. I say “extreme” but I find it rather natural for a country believing in nuclear deterrence logic to eventually conclude that

it must have nuclear weapons to make deterrence most effective.

In the two North Korean nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009, the governments of Japan and South Korea moved to make sure that the nuclear umbrella provided by the U.S. would work. South Korean Lee Myong-bak government is boasting itself that at the summit meeting with the U.S. held in June this year, it succeeded in including the “provision of nuclear umbrella – extended deterrence-“ in the joint declaration as the most significant outcome. We can see here the obsession of the government that underlies the nuclear deterrence logic.

There is something more. The operational deployment of the missile defense and its acceleration are going on in the reality, sometimes on the pretext of “the North Korean threat” and sometimes on the pretext of “Chinese threat”. It is well known that protagonists of Japanese missile defense officially invoke the threat of North Korea going nuclear and increasing the number of missiles, but at the same time, they make often reference to the strengthening of nuclear capabilities as well as projection capabilities of China. In case of South Korea, it promotes a South Korean -type MD” despite its official policy of not taking part in the U.S.-led missile defense system. Within the country, people wonder if it does not actually mean South Korea’s participation in the East Asia Missile Defense.

President Obama declared in September this year that the U.S. would drop the MD plan for Eastern Europe. As you know, the MD promoted by Bush administration scrapped the Anti-Balistic Missile Treaty and stopped

the “START” process. Some warned that the plan of MD deployment in Eastern Europe would provoke Russian reaction and would initiate a new arms race between the U.S. and Russia. For all these reasons, Obama’s recent declaration must be welcomed.

However, this new wind has not yet reached East Asia. The MD continues to be promoted in the region, officially, for coping with North Korean nuclear weapons and missiles, but the result is the resurgence of Cold War confrontation between “U.S., Japan, South Korea versus China, Russia, North Korea”. The deployment of defense missile system whose efficiency is questioned is throwing the foundation for a new arms race in the region. Moreover, the U.S.-led MD deployment, whatever the form it takes, once it is completed, is likely to induce negative reaction from China that is the strengthening of its nuclear projection capabilities. Such a scenario is contrary to our desire for “a world without nuclear weapons” and we must call into question those who are trying to make this scenario a reality while praising the alliance and the spirit of alliance.

At the beginning of my talk, I said that the North Korean Nuclear Issue has come to a turning point. However, a deeper consideration makes us realize that it is actually a turning point for the entire East Asia. Seen from South Korean perspective, the North Korean Nuclear Issue has never been the question of North Korea alone but a Korean question in East Asia.

We learned lessons from our 20-year movement on North Korean nuclear issue: A hope of resolution was opened only when this issue was linked with building up a

peace framework of the Korean Peninsula and East Asia and North Korea attended negotiations seriously. Conversely, a prospect for the resolution got gloomy when the “acquisition of nuclear weapons” was separated from the “North Korean nuclear issue” and the strengthening of security of each country was prioritized than cooperation of those parties concerned.

From the strategic viewpoint, now is the third turning point in East Asia. As conclusion, I want to propose concrete tasks to tackle in this turning point.

First is to promote negotiations on peace agreement without delay. The provision 4 of the September 19 Joint Statement, agreed in 2005, states that those parties concerned discuss a permanent peace setup in the Korean Peninsula in an appropriate place. But the negotiations have not yet started. Since this year, North Korea has demanded the resolution of military issues with the US. I believe that the peace agreement will help develop multinational negotiations such as six-party ones for the resolution of North Korean nuclear issue.

Second, together with the peace agreement, we need to proceed normalization of relations between North Korea and the US and North Korea and Japan. South Korea, Japan and the US have fear that if they agree with those talks, they may be caught in a trap of North Korea. However, the peace agreement and the normalization are the tasks we cannot get around not only for the resolution of North Korean nuclear issue but for peace of the Korean Peninsula and East Asia.

In particular, Japan is responsible for

Korean Question. Japan has a duty to answer the Question that arises from the history of colonization, division, war and confrontation of the Korean Peninsula. The normalization of relations between North Korea and Japan will be one answer. Next year marks the centenary of Japan’s annexation of South Korea. I hope that Japan will not miss the chance to contribute to peace of the Peninsula.

Third, Japan should break away from military alliance. I already spoke about “nuclear umbrella” and “missile defense”. As is made clear, the decline of US hegemony has caused an increase of burdens on its allies. It is clear that safety of allies cannot be ensured by the US. It is a “myth”. Ongoing realignment of US forces stationed in South Korea and Japan clearly shows that it is true. Actually, allies have been dragged into US wars such as Iraqi War and Afghan War. Those bases maintained at the sacrifice of local people are getting to be threat to the people’s right to live in peace in South Korea and Japan.

In addition, “obsession with alliance”, a political state of mind, is permeating not only into the diplomacy and security elites and politicians but also ordinary citizens in their daily life. As a result, general public in South Korea and Japan now accepts the reality of bilateralism created by ROK-US alliance and the Japan-US Alliance without being aware of the danger of military tension and war it generates. Rather, they think that getting out of the security umbrella provided by the US would increase future uncertainties.

What is essential is that South Korean and Japanese citizens, and more generally

citizens of East Asia, share the lessons of history and mobilize their imagination to use more efficiently the existing space of possibilities. The first step in this direction is to free our minds from the alliance policy

logic and in this process create and share a “multinational and multilateral” vision that will enable us to achieve “common security and peace”.

Corazon Valdez Fabros

Stop the War Coalition Philippines

International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases

U.S. Military Presence and Intervention and the Unfinished Struggle for a Peaceful and Bases Free Philippines¹

A snapshot of US Military presence in the Philippines and our continuing struggle for a peaceful, sovereign and bases free Philippines is one that can enrage as well as inspire. It is a story of a nation and its people aspiring to free itself from the most visible symbol of our colonial legacy and the Cold War in the Philippines. After almost a century of occupation, the United States had to leave their bases in the Philippines in November 24, 1992 brought about by the historic Senate vote to reject the new Military Bases Agreement in September 1991 and decades of people's resistance.

It did not take long before the US and Philippine governments forged a new agreement – which is now euphemistically named Visiting Forces Agreement. This indicated that our work has not been finished and remains as a major issue if not the most important one in the peace and justice movement in the Philippines today.

Since 2001, a steady stream of U.S. troops have been coming to the Philippines to take part in the annual Balikatan joint military

exercises with Filipino troops. An increasing number of such exercises have been held year-round in venues throughout the country from Batanes (North) to Tawi-Tawi (South). Since 2002, a unit of US Special Operations Forces has been stationed continuously and indefinitely in various camps throughout Mindanao. An increasing number of US warships have been entering and visiting various ports throughout the country. It has become clear that the Philippines now hosts a new, more sophisticated form of US basing. (*See Philippine map*)²

These exercises are part of the continuing, expanding, and deepening US military presence and intervention in the Philippines. Though less visible than the large bases that the US used to maintain in the Philippines until 1991, this basing's impact is no less direct, its implications on peace and people's security no less threatening. And yet, much of the US military's actions in the Philippines have been concealed from the public, with both the US and Philippine governments deliberately attempting to package and project US military presence in ways that directly contradict available

information. Eight years since the first deployment of troops to Mindanao, unanswered questions about their intentions and their actual conduct, as well as their alleged involvement in direct combat actions and their construction of permanent military structures, have been mounting.

Concerned about these developments, social movements and civil society organizations and networks as well as academics and local government officials, many of them part of STOP the War Coalition Philippines came together to form the Citizens' Peace Watch. An independent initiative of concerned citizens brought together to continuously report on US military presence and intervention in the country.

The Citizens' Peace Watch has embarked on important and timely fact-finding missions, consistent monitoring efforts, research, reporting, lobbying and information campaigns to contribute to the public discussion on the issue of US military presence and intervention.

One of Citizens' Peace Watch's major activity was a fact-finding mission to Zamboanga City and Sulu in Southern Philippines last year. Zamboanga City is known to host the headquarters of the US Special Forces unit that has been deployed to the Philippines since 2002; some members of this unit have been sent in small groups to Sulu -- site of ongoing military offensives ostensibly targeting the Abu Sayyaf Group (listed by the US as a terrorist organization).

The Citizens' Peace Watch fact-finding mission to Zamboanga City and Sulu last year confirmed and found proof reinforcing concerns that

- The US has established military basing in the Philippines
- The US is involved in actual combat operations in the country
- The US military has, in complicity with the Philippine military, committed human rights violations in the Philippines
- The US is conducting operations outside the control of the Philippine government and military
- The US military's so-called humanitarian projects are mere cover for military operations that do not benefit the local population
- US basing and intervention in the country is contributing to insecurity and leading to an escalation in conflict.

In light of the clear violation of the Philippine Constitution and actual danger to lives and human rights, the Citizens' Peace Watch challenged elected representatives to take the initiative to demand and conduct Congressional and Senate inquiries on the issue of US military operations and interventions especially in Southern Philippines. We also issued an urgent demand for the suspension of US military deployment to the Philippines, specifically the stationing of the Joint Special Operations Task Force-Philippines as well as the military exercises, pending fair and independent review of and investigations on their presence and intervention.

This led to a series of Senate investigation and inquiry into the activities of US troops in the Philippines as well as a recommendation to review the Visiting Forces Agreement. Lately, the Philippine Senate issued a resolution directing the

Executive to review and renegotiate the agreement with the United States and in case the US refuse to a process of review, that the agreement be abrogated. In the wake of the visit of State Secretary Hilary Clinton to the Philippines recently, the Philippine President declared (as expected) its continued support and cooperation to the US war on terror.

Subsequent investigations and Fact Finding Missions to Mindanao conducted by various citizens groups including the Senate Legislative Oversight on the Visiting Forces Agreement indicate very critical updates most notably the findings of US Troops Out Now Coalition Mindanao which categorically claims:

a) Involvement of US military personnel in combat operations

Over the past 8 years, the United States military and/or its personnel has played a role in actual combat related activities. While US and RP military officials continue to state in media reports that US soldiers are not engaged in “combat operations,” it is clear that the US military has played a crucial role in the execution of direct combat missions by the Armed Forces of the Philippines. Documented incidents involved US military personnel gathering critical intelligence for use in AFP operations. The Philippine Information Agency reported that a high-ranking official of the Philippine Army admitted that US troops have been providing technical support in operations against the Moro Islamic Liberation Front. He said that the US provides maps and aerial pictures to the Philippine military for use in their operations. Intelligence is an essential part of any combat operation and without it, any operation would be impossible to

execute.

The Armed Forces of the Philippines is acting on intelligence gathered by the US military, and therefore, US military personnel are directly engaging in combat operations through the provision of intelligence support and information. Clearly providing technical intelligence to the AFP combat maneuvers, the American operatives used satellite discs, laptop computers, scanners and an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV), spy planes (US P-3 Orion) providing intelligence for assaults on civilian population suspected as insurgents. Dynacorp (defense contractor) helicopter carrying supplies for US troops have also been reported seen in areas of Moro Islamic Liberation camps and offensive sites against Abu Sayyaf.

US military personnel also provide combat assistance by transporting wounded Philippine soldiers. These kinds of roles are defined in military terminology as “combat support,” or “combat service support.” US soldiers are carrying out this work in conflict zones, and integrating with AFP personnel engaged in direct combat. The common explanation by authorities is that US military personnel were present in an area because of infrastructure projects, medical missions, and other humanitarian assistance. Such activities fall under “civil-military operations”.

b) Evidence of infrastructure within Philippine territory for the sole use of the US military.

The following data regarding the existence of US military infrastructure in the Philippines has been culled from both

primary and secondary sources:

- Camp Navarro, Upper Calarian, Zamboanga City - Headquarters of the JSOTF-P, which is for the sole and exclusive use of US military personnel under the JSOTF-P; Philippine military personnel are prohibited from entering, unless by invitation. The area is enclosed by walls, concertina wire, and sandbags. Satellite dishes, antenna, and other communications equipment are visible from the outside.
- Camp Malagutay, Gate 2, Upper Calarian, Zamboanga City - Pier and communications tower as well as building which reportedly serves as a communications outpost. Regional Special Action Forces serve as security for the area. The pier and tower were reportedly constructed by the US military for their exclusive use.
- Jolo, Sulu - Forward Operating Base 11 (According to research conducted by Herbert Docena)
- Jolo, Sulu - Advanced Operating Base 920 (US Overseas Basing Commission Stars and Stripes (online US military publication)
- Jolo, Tawi-Tawi, Maguindanao Provinces - On June 6, 2007, US Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) awarded a six-month, \$14.4-million contract to "Global Contingency Services LLC" of Irving, Texas, for "operations support" for the Joint Special Operations Task Force-Philippines (JSOTFP). The NAVFAC is the unit responsible for providing the US Navy with "operating, support and

training bases." It "manages the planning, design, and construction and provides public works support for US Naval shore installations around the world," as quoted from their website.

The Philippine Constitution prohibits the presence of foreign military personnel, bases, and facilities on Philippine soil except where authorized by a treaty. Findings indicate that despite constitutional restrictions on foreign military infrastructure, the US military has established certain areas as off limits to Philippine military personnel, and constructed intelligence infrastructure such as communications equipment. The United States Military itself considers its facilities on Jolo as "Advanced Operating Base - 920," counter to claims that the United States no longer has military bases in the Philippines. While we are holding fast to the technicalities of our agreements with the United States, in practice, the US operates out of its own bases on Philippine soil.

c) Human Rights Violations and other incidents affecting civilians involving US military personnel.

Human rights violations being committed are the following:

- Involvement in the assault operations of the Philippine Navy and Army that killed eight civilians, including a pregnant woman and two children.
- Vehicular accidents involving US soldiers carrying high powered weapons, intimidating victims and simply leaving a calling card of the Joint Special Operations Task Force – Philippines.

- Ordering staff of a municipal hospital to shut down operations after sundown, threatening to shoot them if they did not follow his orders.
 - A picture of Ustadz Yahiya ‘Tuan Yang’ Sarahadil Abulla of Sulu, an official of the Ulama Council for Peace and Development, was included in the US-prepared booklet ‘Rewards for Justice Handbook’ identifying supposed leaders of the Abu Sayyaf and Jemayah Islamiya.
 - 50-year old Bizmah Juhan was wounded by shrapnel of an M203 bomb which was accidentally shot out of range by a US soldier while training Filipino troops. Bu Bizma was in her house washing clothes when the incident happened. She was made to sign a waver by the US soldiers.
 - 53-year old Saldia Abu Calderon died of an aggravated heart ailment due to fright over the arrival of 2 US military helicopters in the area. The landing of the planes also caused damage to corn crops and fear among other residents who thought a war was starting again.
 - Accidental shooting of Arshad Baharun during a marksmanship training between US and RP troops. Victim is said to have waived his right to pursue damages against the US and RP troops.
 - Indiscriminate shooting on civilians during heavy drinking spree.
 - Rape and sexual abuse of women and children (I will explain this in detail at the women’s symposium)
 - Damage to property and environment with the use of live ammunitions during wargames and military exercises
 - Other incidents that disturb the day to day peaceful lives of people where US soldiers undertake their military training and exercises.
- Article VI of the Visiting Forces Agreement provides for the waiver of any and all claims for damage, death or injury, loss or destruction of property arising from activities to which the agreement applies. The VFA’s treatment of damages, loss, personal injury or death caused by acts or omission of US personnel undermines the rights of victims to pursue justice as they chose. By allowing the US to merely pay compensation to the victims, the incidents are swept under the rug and are forgotten about, while larger related issues of public health and safety remain unresolved.
- A declaration made by a U.S. Pentagon official during a February 21, 2003 interview with CNN on US military deployment in the Philippines “***This will be a no holds-barred effort. This is not an exercise,***” were indicative of the nature and extent of Activities of US military personnel in the country, particularly the integration with Philippine military personnel in combat operations against the MILF, MNLF, and NPA. This is consistent with the claim of the afore-cited anonymous Pentagon official. Evidence suggesting the establishment of permanent, or long-term use facilities of US military personnel that are recognized even by the Overseas Basing Commission as operating bases of the US military, further indicates that US military presence in the country is not short-term and not for the sake of simple training exercises. Further, the existence of the Joint Special Operations

Task Force – Philippines, a unit under the United States Pacific Command and based in Camp Navarro in Zamboanga City since 2002 to date are clearly grounds for serious investigation by the Philippine government as it is a clear departure from the framework of the VFA which only provides for the “time to time” visits of US military personnel. While we believe that the VFA is in contradiction with the Constitution, it is also clear that the VFA itself is being violated through the continuous presence of US military personnel in the country. As the VFA continues to be invoked as the justification and basis for US military intervention in the Philippines without the governing terms of reference, we have continuously and strongly called for the immediate abrogation of this one sided agreement.

Our work continues in different fronts integrating our local as well as our regional work to contribute the global movement for the abolition of foreign military bases. International solidarity, consistent and sustained campaign initiatives and media work and more importantly the work to expand our constituency to build a critical mass of committed and dedicated campaigners in many fronts (in the academe, the government, business, the churches,

social movements, the communities, etc.) with priorities on the student and young generation who will continue the struggle in the future.

We continue to take a stand on international issues by linking them to gut (bread and butter) issues and local concerns believing that civic life and social involvement should be practiced on a day to day basis. Learning from our experiences during some painful and difficult periods in our history, we will continue to be inspired by the experience of ousting a dictatorship, closing the bases, resisting the operation of nuclear power facility, ousting a corrupt and inept president thru the power of the people. We continue to be inspired by the continuing and dedicated struggles and victories of friends in Okinawa, Vieques, Italy No Dal Molin, Prague, Manta/Ecuador and in other parts of the world where people continue to organize and unite for peace, justice and freedom.

I hope that this conference will strengthen our lifetime commitment and give us the courage and inspiration that will lead us to the victory and success that we all long for and realize someday a world that is just, peaceful, nuclear free and bases free. Gambari Mashio!

1. Presented to the 2009 Japan Peace Conference, December 10-13, 2009 in Yokohama City, Japan by Corazon Valdez Fabros, Co-Convenor, STOP the War Coalition Philippines and member of the Coordinating Committee of the International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases (NO BASES Network)

2. For more details, see Focus on the Global South, At the Door of All the East: The Philippines in United States Military Strategy (Quezon City, 2007),
<http://www.focusweb.org/docman/at-the-door-of-all-theeast/download.html?Itemid=99999999>

Tadaaki Kawata
Executive Board Member, Japan Peace Committee

Roles of Movements and Public Opinion for Building up Peace in Asia

Under the theme of the symposium, I will speak about the roles of Japanese citizens' movements and opinions in Asia.

The relocation of US Marines Corps Futenma Air Station in Okinawa is getting to be a political focus. Look at Map 1. A number of elementary and junior high schools, kindergartens and hospitals are marked. They are located near the base. You will see that the base stays in the center of the people's daily life. On Aug. 13, 2004, a big helicopter for transportation, which belonged to Futenma base, crashed into Okinawa International University and went up in flames. Fortunately, no citizens were injured. But if it had crashed into a more crowded place, it could have been a disaster.

The US bases stationed in Japan is threatening the people's safety and lives. If the government says that security means protecting the people, shouldn't it remove the "threat" immediately as a political responsibility? Based on the Constitution that proclaims the "right to live in peace, free from fear and want", I demand the closure and removal of Futenma base as the execution of the right.

The Japanese government pays much attention not to undermine the Japan-US alliance. Many commercial mass media are reporting that US is irritated and trust between the two countries is wavering. However, look at the world. No countries have been suffered from the closure of US bases and the deterioration of relations with

the US.

The US forces, deployed to Manta base in Ecuador, withdrew in September this year, following the decision of the Ecuador government that refused the extension of the base lease agreement. There is no sign that this has intensified tension in their bilateral relations. Now the US is not able to do as it likes by force even in Latin America where was once called its "backyard". A serious question is rather the US attempt to build a new base in neighboring Colombia. It is not the removal of bases but the construction of a new base that creates tension.

Public Opposition to US Bases Works – US strategic documents

It is extraordinary that the US has a network of over 1000 military bases in about 40 countries. At the same time, there is a growing current of taking an independent position without relying on US bases and military alliances with the US, which has raised an awareness of the US administration that the era of holding bases on its allies and using them at its disposal is coming to an end.

The Bush administration was faced with worldwide criticism for its war on Iraq and Afghanistan. It was forced to respond with priority to the "political conditions of the US allies": Use of the bases and transit of airspace and territory of allies were getting restricted by the development of public opposition.

For instance, the US military strategy, announced after 9/11 terrorist attack says that the reorientation of the posture abroad should be reviewed, taking account of new challenges, particularly anti-access and area-denial threats. While putting forward strengthening US posture abroad, a document “Strengthening US Global Defense Posture”, submitted to the Congress by the Bush administration in 2004, emphasizes that the heavy footprint that abrades on regional sensitivities should be avoided. (The heavy footprint includes damage and economic loss caused by the bases.)

There is a thesis of a US Marine that expresses such concern more frankly. Its author Lieutenant Colonel Dale Houck says, “Consequently, we must be concerned that allies and friends will not grant the US rights to access its territory when needed.” And he gives the following reason that “More and more often our interests do not seem to match those of our friends and allies. Many of our allies are now less dependent on us for security...As a result, there seems to be a dramatic increase in anti-Americanism, antiglobalization, and anti-US presence throughout the world and particularly in the third world”.

The “dramatic increase in anti-Americanism, antiglobalization and anti-US presence” can be put in another way the “evolution of public opinion and movement against US bases”.

Moreover, a document, released by the Department of Defense in 2005, expresses concern that many countries may feel unable to hold out particularly when the political

situation restricts basing, overflight or US presence. He picks up Japan, Saudi Arabia, Greece, South Korea and Italy as examples of reduced foreign tolerance for basing of US forces in their countries. It is not too much to say that the list reflects the advance of our movement.

Saying that “hostility in countries that host US bases has brought about a change in basing arrangements”, Mr. Anita Dancs, Foreign Policy in Focus, concludes that those in the core of the US strategy have been unable to ignore critical opinion of the people about US bases.

Thus, the US thinks that public opposition will bring about no access to the bases. The US bases and training sites in Ecuador, the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Italy were closed. Turkey, at the time of Iraqi war, and Greece, at the time of bombing to former Yugoslavia, refused US access to their airspace and territories. Of course, the US has always found other options and it will never give up the bases. But our movement and public opinion has work effectively, so that the US is worried that public opposition may lead to the removal of bases. If the US tries to do anything to deal with the worry, we will counter them.

For an Asia without nuclear weapons and without foreign military bases – Roles of civil society

Japan’s public opinion and movement for peace and against US bases has played a part in the growing current for peace in Asia.

The Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) aims at establishing an ASEAN community in 2015. According to its Charter,

the community is characterized by “peace, safety, stability and a nuclear free zone”, and has the principles of “independence, sovereignty and equality”, the “renouncement of aggression, threat and use of force”, “peaceful settlement of disputes” and a “ban on foreign military bases”.

What should be taken note of is that importance is attached to the participation of civil society including NGOs in establishing the community. The article 1 of the ASEAN Charter proclaims, “to promote a people-oriented ASEAN in which all sectors of society are encouraged to participate in, and benefit from” (Provision 13). Since the Charter entered into force at the end of last year, a dialogue forum between representatives of governments and citizens was held twice with the participation of the secretary general of ASEAN and ministers of each government. In the second forum held in October, the representatives of civil society and governments discussed the demands of the citizens such as disarmament, no use of force and ban on nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Cooperation between governments and citizens has just started. It is a fact that there are discords between them, but it is significant that the establishment of the community is being promoted, involving civil society. This shows that the establishment of a new international order of peace needs effort of not only governments but also of the peoples of the world.

Vital role of anti-nuclear opinion for peace of Asia

Public opinion and movements in favor of peace has played an important role in the

history of Asia. For example, the US planned to use nuclear weapons in Asia several times, but the plan was aborted by strong opinion against nuclear weapons.

In November 1950, General Douglas MacArthur proposed to make nuclear attack on Chinese mainland in order to achieve a breakthrough in the Korean War. Against the backdrop that US President Truman, who ordered atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, gave up the attack this time, there was “irresistible force” represented by a surge of the signature campaign in support of the Stockholm Appeal. This was referred by Henry Kissinger.

Some years later, the US again planned to use nuclear weapons. In 1954, then Vice President Nixon proposed to President Eisenhower to attack Vietnam with nuclear weapons in order to support the French Army in the battle of Dien Bien Phu. It was public opinion that prevented the attack from happening.

In his note of April 7, 1954, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles insisted that 3 atomic bombs could put an end of the life of Viet Minh. The Department of State, however, gave up the attack, by reason that the use of atomic bombs might cause serious effects on public opinion in Asia and response of allies to the US. (Note of the State Department of May 11, 1954)

Without doubt, the US bore Japan in mind. Because at that time, there was a surge of nationwide movement against A and H Bombs which was triggered by Japan’s exposure to the US Bikini H-bomb test in March, 1954. The signature campaign against A and H Bombs spread across Japan,

which led to the holding of the 1st World Conference against A and H Bombs.

I want to add that a surge of anti-Vietnam war movement became a turning point to the development of the current of peace in Asia. In November 1971, the ASEAN special foreign ministerial conference, held in November 1971, declared a “zone of peace, freedom and neutrality” with an aim of establishing a peace community. Behind ASEAN went through a change from an anti-communist and closed body, there was a surge of international anti-war movement in Japan and the rest of Asia. In 1976, next year of the end of the War, the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) was concluded. With the USA and EU as signatories, it has developed into a framework that covers 68% of the world population and puts forward a peace platform.

With confidence of the role of public opinion and movement in Asia, we are needed to develop our movement further.

For a new Japan-US relations and the establishment of an international order of peace

What public opinion is Japan's movement required to build up?

On the Futenma base issue, Japanese government is thrown into confusion, which stems from its stand of regarding Japan-US military alliance as axis. There is a tendency that many politicians and commercial mass media in the two countries regard enormous US presence and the Japan-US military alliance as fixed, saying that they work as “deterrence” to the threat of North Korea.

We have to overcome the “myth” and build up a national opinion seeking new relations with the US. It is significant for Japan to join the current of peace in Asia.

Mr. Suchit Bunbongkarn, one of drafters of the constitution of Thailand, mentions about relations between Japan and ASEAN:

“ASEAN hesitates in strengthening cooperation with Japan positively because Japan is dependent on the US in defense and security.” “Unless Japan breaks away from dependence on US, it would be hard for us to cooperate with her in the field of security”.

As US troop strength and strategy show, Japan cannot be equal with US within the framework of military alliance. Naturally, the US policy is prioritized. Japan must break away from the stance of regarding the military alliance as axis and is needed to create a nonmilitary relations with the US based on equality. With this relationship, I believe that both countries will make more valuable contribution to the global issues such as global warming and the abolition of nuclear weapons. Therefore, the Futenma base issue is a touchstone to measure whether Japan can proceed to the new relations with the US.

If the new bilateral relations based on equality and friendship is established, it will have positive influence on the whole of Asia. The security environment of Asia will change fundamentally. It will also be a great contribution to putting an end to the world order of wealth and power and the realization of cooperation of all nations for peace and equality. Next year marks the 50th year from the revision of Japan-US Security

Treaty. We have to promote dialogue with the people and build up public opinion in favor of the establishment of the new constructive relations with the US and the abrogation of the Security Treaty. I conclude

my presentation, expressing my determination to make utmost effort for this cause.

Special Reports of Japanese Movement

Masahiko GOTO

Co-Chair, Yokosuka Citizens against Homeporting of U.S. Nuclear Aircraft Carrier

Kanagawa Prefecture

Dangers caused by homeporting of nuclear-powered aircraft carrier G. Washington at Yokosuka and movements against it

The U.S. Yokosuka Naval Base is a stronghold for the U.S. Seventh Fleet, and accordingly has served as a homeport for many U.S. vessels. On September 25 last year, amid strong opposition from many citizens and their concerns about possible nuclear reactor accidents, the USS George Washington, a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, was deployed and Yokosuka was made its homeport.

For four months from January this year, works for maintenance of nuclear reactors on the George Washington took place in the Yokosuka base. The U.S. Navy admitted in response to an Asahi Shimbun inquiry that such works involved handling of radioactive materials. During a hearing held on March 19 by the U.S. House of Representatives, Commander Timothy J. Keating of the U.S. Pacific Command testified that the U.S. Navy had already constructed a controlled industrial facility on the Yokosuka base. At the end of March, according to the Navy,

a transport ship loaded with radioactive wastes generated from the maintenance work left Yokosuka to the United States.

These facts revealed that the maintenance work of the reactors on the George Washington included replacement of the primary coolant water, filters, and parts contaminated with radioactivity, and therefore the work was very dangerous, with potential radiation exposure of workers, problems of generating radioactive wastes and their storage, and a possible radiation leakage to surrounding environment. The maintenance work proved to pose serious threat to the health and livelihoods of local people.

Yokosuka is located at the entrance to the Tokyo metropolitan area where 30 million people live. If a reactor accident occurs on the aircraft carrier in Yokosuka, radioactive fallouts could shower down also on Tokyo and Yokohama, and experts estimate that

depending on conditions, more than one million people will be killed in the accident.

In addition, what contributes to an increase in dangers of a nuclear accident is the fact that there is no system to monitor or inspect the reactors on the U.S. vessels. As for reactors of nuclear power stations in Japan, the Japanese government discloses information, conducts on-site inspections, checks the safety of plants, including giving orders to shutdown their operations, and implements a system to supervise and monitor all the plants based on related laws. But the Japanese government does not have access to information on the reactors of U.S. nuclear vessels and has no authority to inspect or order their suspension of operation to secure the safety. This is nothing but sacrificing the safety of the Japanese people to the United States.

The more the maintenance system in Yokosuka for U.S. nuclear warships is improved, the more nuclear ships come to Yokosuka, using the port as an important strongpoint of the U.S. Navy.

On August 24 this year, another U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carrier Nimitz made a port-call at Yokosuka. Although Yokosuka Port is designated as the homeport of the USS George Washington, the Nimitz came there. This has never happened before. On the following day after the Nimitz left Yokosuka on August 28, the former strategic nuclear submarine SSGN Ohio entered Yokosuka Port, and the day after the Ohio left the port on September 2, the George Washington came back to the port.

In order to enable a large nuclear submarine to be anchored at Berth 13 next to Berth 12

where the George Washington is now berthed at, dredging work is now on the way to start.

For more than a decade, we have conducted activities in opposition to the homeporting of Yokosuka for U.S. nuclear warships. Through our various activities, including two initiatives for referendum on pros and cons of the use of Yokosuka as the U.S. Navy homeport, many people have become aware of the dangers from the deployment of a nuclear aircraft carrier and of the need to decide the future course of our city on our own. The deployment of the George Washington to Yokosuka last year was not the end of our movements, but marked the start of a new campaign to defend our safety from dangers of increasing number of nuclear accidents.

In the Yokosuka City mayoral election in June this year, I myself as a candidate for mayor appealed to voters on my opposition to the planned homeporting. I could not win in the election but a young mayor was born after defeating the incumbent candidate who had allowed U.S. forces to use Yokosuka.

As a result of the August general elections, the long-standing conservative government that had accepted homeporting of U.S. vessels at Yokosuka was replaced by a new coalition government. We will call on the new government to make a shift from the conventional attitude the past governments had taken towards U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carriers.

Any information of U.S. nuclear carriers is military secrets. To place the homeport of such a vessel in a foreign country and carry out its repair works there is an inconsistent

choice for the United States. The Japanese and the Yokosuka City governments should not unconditionally cooperate with the U.S. scheme and should demand that all information be disclosed to the public, carry out safety inspections, prevent the U.S. forces from conducting any more dangerous practices, and appropriately check the funding related to the Yokosuka base. All these measures will shed light on further inconsistencies and bring about a new situation leading to the cancellation of the use of Yokosuka as the U.S. military homeport.

We will strengthen our movements more than before, calling for the withdrawal of the U.S. decision to use Yokosuka as its military homeport, through a variety of activities,

increasing public awareness, filing of a lawsuit for suspension of homeporting and campaigning for holding a referendum. From 1 p.m. of December 13, a citizens' parade calling for a Yokosuka free of foreign military vessels will take place in the city.

At the same time, we will also call on the international community, the U.S. government, the U.S. Congress, and people of the world to be aware of the dangers caused by hosting a homeport of the U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carrier in the metropolitan area of Japan, where 30 million people live. We will make our utmost effort to free Yokosuka from being a homeport of the U.S. Navy without further delay. I ask all of you present here today for strong support to our movements. Thank you.

Teruo Ohnishi
Representative member, No to Heliport Base Council
Nago Peace Committee, Okinawa Prefecture

Close Futenma Base, No to New Base in Henoko
We do not want US base anywhere in Japan

The question of closing of Futenma Base and the construction of a new base on the coast of Henoko has become a burning issue that is shaking the governments of both Japan and the U.S. Following the very successful rally organized by Okinawa people on November 11, U.S. Marines camped out at Camp Schwab during President Obama's visit to Japan, as if to back up the president. President Obama acknowledged for the cheers by saying that he was "proud of U.S. soldiers" three times.

The coalition government led by the

Democratic Party of Japan, intimidated by the US Defense Secretary Gates' blackmail message on one hand and flattered by Obama's statements in its favor on the other hand, is now subserviently committed to rapidly implement the Japan-U.S. agreement.

The courageous Henoko tent village continues to challenge the Japanese and U.S. connivance for relocating Futenma Base nowhere but Henoko. Our position on this issue is clear and invariable: "We do not want any U.S. base. We do not want it either

in Ginowan Bay or Nago or anywhere in Japan. We demand its closure, the return of the occupied land and not its relocation". We reject either "relocation" as the media say or "lightening of the burden" as the Osaka governor claims.

During the thirteen years of struggle in Henoko with 2,063 days of sit-in, we had good times and bad times. It is a precious history of struggle whose gains we would like to share with you.

We succeeded in getting the plan of a sea base rejected through a referendum, and defeated the plan of military-civilian airport through non-violent means and by the strength of public opinion. We maintain the obstacle to the construction of V-shaped runway required for the reorganization of U.S. forces by challenging the environmental assessment report. We are now building prospects for the third victory. Let me briefly look into the factors that have contributed in winning these victories with people's power.

One of the major factors is systematic sharing of information, learning, and building of public opinion by using means of non-violence.

The second important factor is the cooperation with groups and individuals working for culture of peace and biodiversity, and conscientious international networking.

The third factor is the persistence, steadfastness, refusal to obey and bend, giving priority to friendship, dialogue and negotiation.

And above all, the courage of that young girl and her parents that is still moving the history that seemed running into at the dead-end.

Dear friends, can we win the battle and how?

Today the government and the media are trying to sell the "plan of a new base with V-shaped runway" (the so-called road map) as the "plan" on the table. This plan is a key for the reorganization of U.S. forces and is being implemented, bound by the obligation to be completed by 2014. The Heiwa-maru Foundation is working in many ways: organizing protest action against the preliminary study, illegal environment assessment surveillance, study of corals, learning activities on boat etc.

The governmental plan was delayed by 8 months due to 400 public comments on the assessment result. We have submitted opinions and proposals to the Assessment Examining Committee. In this effort we have given importance to building close cooperation with researchers and scholars, and in our comment published in the Okinawa Times on December 31, 2007, we valued the work of researchers and scholars stating that the Committee is conscientious – the governor denied the Committee's opinion".

We submitted about 5,000 letters to the preparatory document and the Committee eventually recommended the governor that the assessment should be conducted again.

My letter was 105 pages' long. Okinawa Peace Committee and the Heiwa-maru Foundation presented letters of opinion to

the Assessment Examination Committee regarding military and environmental problems (we find the opinion letter of Ohkubo excellent).

The blog diary “Takarano Umi (sea of treasure)” is updated every day (since September 2004) to disseminate information about Henoko, and more and more blogs about Henoko have been created.

Taking advantage of the confrontation of different opinions over the assessment, the Democratic Party of Japan succeeded in attracting popular support with a proposal for “relocation to outside Okinawa or outside Japan”. But once convinced of its victory in the general election, the DPJ toned down the demand to call for “revision of the U.S. forces reorganization,” and now being in power, it shamefully stresses the need for Japan to honor the previous Japan-U.S. agreement, serving the interests of the U.S.

The true aim of the governments of the two countries is to remove the deadline of “completion by 2014”. The Japanese government and media are using the rhetoric of “relocation” or “reducing the burden on Okinawans,” in desperate attempt to hide the real issue. A new base will be a “fortress of devil” in the Asia-Pacific region. We go back to the starting point of our struggle. This year will mark a major change in history, a change brought about by the forces for the abrogation of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

The year 2010 starts with the mayoral election in Nago City. It took a courageous struggle of the citizens to be united in support of the candidate who is against the new base. Let us work to achieve a Nago City that refuses any military bases. We are looking forward to having a vast support from our friends around the country.

Report of the International Symposium

**Keisuke FUSE (Symposium Coordinator)
Director of International Bureau
National Confederation of Trade Unions (Zenroren)**

The International Symposium of 2009 Japan Peace Conference in Kanagawa was held in Yokohama on December 10 and 11 with 140 participants, around the theme “Our Movement Changes the World”. At the opening of the symposium, H.E. Javier Ponce, Ambassador of Ecuador to Japan, gave a special lecture. On the panel were Mr. John Lindsay-Poland from the US,

co-director of the Fellowship of Reconciliation from the U.S., Mr. Lee Junkyu from Republic of Korea, lecturer at Laborer’s Academy for Alternative, Ms. Hannelore Tölke from Germany, National Council member of the German Peace Council and a Bonn City Council member, Ms. Corazon Valdez Fabros representing the Stop the War Coalition Philippines and the

International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases, and Mr. Kawata Tadaaki, Japan Peace Committee Executive Board member. Fuse Keisuke, Director of International Bureau, National Confederation of Trade Unions acted as coordinator. The symposium heard special reports from Mr. Goto Masahiko, lawyer from Kanagawa, and Mr. Ohnishi Teruo from Okinawa.

This International Symposium took place at a time when the movement against foreign military bases and military alliances is growing internationally, and when the world is moving forward toward a world without nuclear weapons. In Japan, people opened a new page of history by throwing out the LDP-Komei coalition government in general election last August. With the relocation of the Futenma Base becoming the focal issue under the new coalition government, symposium participants shared the importance of developing the struggle against the base relocation in solidarity with people all over Japan and around the world. It is of great significance that we had this symposium as an opportunity to exchange the experiences of movements in Japan and other parts of the world here in Kanagawa, where citizens are tenaciously carrying on the movement against the homeporting of US nuclear aircraft carrier and crimes committed by US military personnel.

It is the first time for the Japan Peace Conference to hold an international symposium with attendance of a government representative to give a special lecture. By the decision of President Rafael Correa not to renew the lease of the Manta Air Base to the U.S., the U.S. military had to withdraw from Ecuador last September. Ambassador

Ponce spoke in detail about Ecuador's experience of successfully removing the U.S. military base and enacting a progressive constitution by people's movement. He also explained the role Ecuador played in the regional effort for solving disputes peacefully and for establishing a nuclear weapon-free zone in Latin America. It was particularly meaningful for us to learn from the lessons of Ecuador, as we are struggling for the removal and reduction of U.S. military bases in Japan. The lecture also gave us a valuable opportunity for increasing exchanges and cooperation with governments that pursue a common goal.

Mr. Poland reported on the solidarity between anti-US base struggles in Latin America and the movement within the U.S., as well as on the challenges facing the peace movement. Mr. Lee pointed out that we were at a turning point in making the Korean peninsula and East Asia nuclear free and in breaking away from the military alliance. He called for sharing of lessons of history and overcoming of the military alliance identity. Ms. Tölke referred to the history of NATO, which marks the 60th anniversary this year, and explained the role of NATO in making the war possible. Ms. Fabros reported the actual situation of her country, where the U.S. military had returned under the framework of the Visiting Forces Agreement after the closure of their bases to conduct exercises and operations as if they owned the land. She also spoke of the movement against such moves. Mr. Kawata, referring to the Futenma Base issue, pointed out that strong public opinion and movement against U.S. bases have influenced the world and that the civil society was playing an important role in making a peaceful Asian community. He stressed the need for

developing strong public opinion demanding a new relationship between Japan and the U.S. as equals and abrogation of the Japan-U.S. security treaty.

After the floor was opened for discussion, participants actively spoke of their respective experiences, showing the struggle and cooperation are developing in different countries and across Japan to remove military bases, to abrogate military alliances and to achieve a nuclear-free, peaceful world. Many participants emphasized the importance of proposing alternatives for the development of local economy after the closure of the bases. They also stressed the need for connecting the anti-base struggle with individual demands and interests, such as poverty and social gap, environment and biodiversity as a way to expose the very nature of the military alliance. There were many reports on the grassroots efforts to cast off the yoke of violence and military alliance identity and to bring the principles of peace enshrined in Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution into full play. It was noteworthy that many referred to the importance of reaching out to younger generation. In this regard, continued effort for sharing of information and good practices is called for.

Under the ongoing globalization that benefits only a handful of people while increasing poverty and social gap, the U.S. has been making use of the unchallenged

network of military bases it maintains throughout the world, as steppingstones for dominating and intervening in all parts of the world. Our struggle aims at ending the Cold War Era's world order of rule by wealth and power, to realize peaceful coexistence of equal nations, as envisaged in the U.N. Charter. The coming year of 2010 is the year of the 50th anniversary of the revised Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, and of the NPT Review Conference. It will be a year for us to gear up our movement, which has proved to be a driving force for changing the world, to accomplish our goal. Let us open a new horizon to achieve a foreign bases-free and peaceful world and Asia by developing solidarity between grass-roots movements around the world.

Those of us who are participating in the 2009 Japan Peace Conference should take every opportunity to learn about the realities of military presence and struggles in different places both in Japan and abroad, and bring all the things we have learned here back to our communities, workplace and schools. It is my sincere hope that all of you here learn the outcome of the International Symposium where struggles and experiences of different countries were exchanged, have better understanding of it through listening to others, discussions and exchanges during the Conference, and make the best use of it in your campaigns and activities. With this, I conclude my report of the International Symposium.

2009 Japan Peace Conference in Kanagawa

Opening Plenary
Dec. 11 Kannai Hall

Keynote Report to the 2009 Japan Peace Conference

For the Abrogation of the US-Japan Military Alliance and Removal of Military Bases

Jun Chisaka
Secretary General, Japan Peace Committee
Organizing Committee of the 2009 Japan Peace Conference

Introduction

The Japan Peace Conference has been held since 1986 with the aim of establishing a peaceful Japan and world, especially of reducing or removing U.S. military bases from Japan and eventually breaking away from the Japan-U.S. military alliance. Our movement has now become a major driving force of real politics. It has also played a part in handing down a popular verdict that succeeded in replacing the Liberal Democratic Party-Komei government in the August general election. During the election campaign, we expressed our opposition to the plan to build a new U.S. base in Okinawa, called for cuts in the so-called "sympathy budget" for the stationing of U.S. forces in Japan, and took up the issue of Japan-U.S. secret agreements on bringing-in of U.S. nuclear weapons to Japan. All these questions we raised during the campaign have become major focal points in politics. As a result of our struggle, a possibility to materialize our demands for peace is emerging. Under such budding

circumstances, I propose that we shall move forward to further strengthen our efforts for peace towards 2010, the year marking the 50th anniversary of the revision of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

1. Time has come for public opinion calling for peace to influence politics

(1) Situation largely changed -- popular power and demand put an end to the LDP-Komei government

During the period of the previous LDP-Komei government in subservience to the United States, we have conducted campaigns against its attempts to support the Iraq War, to dispatch Japan's Self-Defense Forces abroad, to revise the Constitution for the worse, and to realign and reinforce U.S. forces in Japan. Our efforts are opening up a totally new phase in the situation.

In the struggle to oppose the strengthening and realignment of U.S. forces in Japan, tenacious resistance of Okinawan people

against the new base has prevented for 13 years the construction works from taking place. In June 2009, the Okinawa Prefectural Assembly with the previous opposition becoming the majority bloc adopted a resolution opposing the plan to construct a new base. What is more, all the candidates promoting the new base construction backed by the LDP and Komei were defeated in the House of Representatives election last August. In the Takae district in Okinawa, residents opposing the construction of a U.S. helipad have carried on monitoring and protest actions on a daily basis for more than two years and succeeded in halting the construction work. In Yokosuka, Kanagawa Prefecture, citizens' united efforts to oppose the deployment of a U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carrier to Yokosuka have also developed and the incumbent mayor lost in the election for he had broke his public promise and accepted the deployment. In Iwakuni City, Yamaguchi Prefecture, the residents through the referendum rejected the relocation of U.S. carrier-borne aircraft. Even after the anti-base candidate lost the mayoral election though by a narrow margin due to dirty tricks such as terminating the subsidy to construct a new city hall, people's cooperation is expanding through the movement to oppose the construction plan of housing complex for U.S. military personnel, through the lawsuit over noise pollution caused by U.S. military aircraft, and through the movement against the strengthening of the U.S. Yokosuka Air Base. In Fukuoka, calls for opposition from residents and surrounding municipalities have prevented the extension work of a runway of the Tsuiki base located in Fukuoka. As for the movement to preserve the Constitution, Article 9 in particular, about 7,000 "Article 9 Associations" have been created so far

throughout Japan, and the public opinion in favor of preserving Article 9 is now widespread thanks to the struggle carried on by the Joint Action Center against Adverse Revision of the Constitution. Before the law on national referendum enters into effect next year, allowing amendments of the Constitution through national referendum, these struggles prevent the Constitution Review Boards of the Diet from being activated. Regarding the overseas dispatch of the SDF troops, we won a Nagoya High Court ruling, saying that it is violation of Article 9 of the Constitution for the Air SDF to carry U.S. troops or multinational forces participating in the illegal Iraq War. Our struggle also helped contribute to a cessation of refueling activities of the Maritime SDF in the Indian Ocean for foreign vessels participating in the Afghan war.

The joint efforts of people calling for peace and severely criticizing the neo-liberal structural reform policy that undermines their living conditions while giving priority to the interests of large corporations, resulted in a severe verdict on the previous regime in the August general election and drove the LDP and the Komei Party out from power. This clearly shows that people's action and choice are the greatest power to change politics. The time has come for public opinion aspiring to peace to determine

(2) Policy based on 'Japan-U.S. alliance' increasingly contradicts people's demand for peace

Against the backdrop of popular "No!" to the LDP-Komei government, the new government was born. Some of its promises reflect people's demand. In the Policy

Agreement upon the Establishment of a Coalition Government, it says, “[F]rom the perspective of reducing the burden placed on the residents of Okinawa prefecture, we will propose a revision of the Japan Status of Forces Agreement, and move in the direction of re-examining the realignment of U.S. forces and the role of U.S. bases in Japan.” Whether or not to keep this promise is being tested before the public. The DPJ-led new government has also launched the investigation into the Japan-U.S. secret agreement on nuclear weapons; another example of a change that would never take place under the previous regime. At the same time, the new government maintains a policy based on the Japan-U.S. alliance. At the Japan-U.S. summit meeting, Prime Minister Hatoyama Yukio said that the Japan-U.S. alliance is “the foundation of all Japan’s diplomacy,” and agreed on “deepening” of the Japan-U.S. relationship. However, this stance basically conflicts with people’s aspiration for peace. In fact, regarding the issue of the construction of another U.S. base in Okinawa, the new government is wavering between the U.S. military requirements and its initial promise to remove the U.S. Marines’ Futenma air base out of Okinawa or even out of Japan. Such a swinging attitude of the government is severely criticized by the people of Okinawa and Japan.

This situation is offering the people a political experience that public opinion, and our movement and grassroots actions can change the course of history. At the same time, it helps people to understand that the root-cause that prevents the realization of our various demands regarding peace is the Japan-U.S. military alliance. Meanwhile, a wide range of people are discussing about

what kind of course or what kind of relations with the U.S. Japan should pursue. Now is the time for us to hold dialogue with as many people as possible, increase our concerted efforts, and intensify our activities to make full use of Article 9 for establishing a Japan without U.S. bases, military alliance, or nuclear weapons and bringing about peace in Asia and the rest of the world.

(3) The world current towards peace is taking our movement forward

The major change in the world and the growing trend towards peace are both encouraging our movement. The reckless war against Iraq shows that unilateralism of the previous U.S. administration led by George W. Bush collapsed and international criticism against it brought Barack Obama to power. The new U.S. administration tried, to a certain extent, to make a shift from the previous unilateral policy that ignored the United Nations. Along with the world majority calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons, U.S. President Obama also proclaimed that the pursuit of a “world without nuclear weapons” would be his country’s goal. The fact that, for the first time, the U.N. Security Council in its special summit meeting in September adopted a resolution announcing its “determination to create conditions for a world without nuclear weapons” constitutes a significant change.

The Obama administration, in its attempt to “settle” the Afghan war by intensifying its sweeping operations, announced that the U.S. would substantially increase its troops in Afghanistan. This will only cause more casualties and invite a vicious circle of war and terrorist retaliations. What is needed is

to end the war and move forward towards solving the issue peacefully by political means. Anti-Afghan war opinion calling for withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan has become a majority force not only in the United States but also in member NATO countries. It is to be noted that on the occasion of NATO's 60th anniversary in April, demonstrations took place throughout Europe against NATO and against Afghan War. The Afghan War quagmire becomes apparent in the recent U.S. move: while planning to increase U.S. troops, President Obama had to express his intention to begin the withdrawal from Afghanistan in July 2011.

The number of countries belonging to NATO and other military alliances was 52 half a century ago, accounting for 67 percent of the world population. As a result of dissolution of cessation of functioning of military alliances one after another, there are only four alliances that are still functioning in the world, all of which are under U.S. military leadership - Japan-U.S., South Korea-U.S., Australia-U.S., and NATO. They embrace 31 countries and account for only 16 percent of the world population. In sharp contrast with this, regional communities such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC), the European Union (EU), and the South American Community of Nations (CSN), calling for international order of peace based on the U.N. Charter are developing.

In addition, Ecuador adopted a Constitution that prohibits hosting of foreign military bases and thus succeeded in removing a U.S. base from its territory. The plan to construct a U.S. "missile defense" base in the Czech

Republic also failed because of the opposition of 70 percent of Czech people. There is an increasing trend around the world to remove existing U.S. military bases and to refuse the deployment of foreign troops and bases.

2. Act now for a nuclear-free and peaceful Japan which will stand on the Constitution – achieve a Japan without U.S. bases and military alliance

Let us strengthen our actions now to realize the following demands:

(1) Struggle for reduction and removal of U.S. bases – Say "No" to the construction of a new U.S. base in Okinawa

Let us look at the facts about U.S. military bases in Japan. 1) While the U.S. bases stationed in other countries have been drastically reduced since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the area of U.S. facilities in Japan, with the area of co-use bases with the Japan's SDFs included, has more than doubled. 2) With the presence of the U.S. Marine Expeditionary Forces and the Carrier Strike Group, U.S. bases in Japan constitute a stronghold for its aggression abroad serving as the sortie bases for attacks against Iraq and Afghanistan; their activities have nothing to do with Japan's defense. 3) With the U.S. forces given extraterritorial rights by the Japan-U.S. Status of Forces Agreement and a bilateral secret agreement on jurisdiction, many accidents and crimes by U.S. servicemen are taking place causing tremendous damages to residents. 4) Japan ranks first in the world in terms of the amount of money it spends for bearing the stationing cost of U.S. forces in the name of

“sympathy budget.” All these show that Japan’s situation regarding U.S. bases has no parallel in the world. We are required to rectify the current abnormal situation and achieve the reduction and removal of U.S. bases in Japan. Being impatient of such extraordinary burden of hosting the U.S. bases, even conservative mayors of local governments started to speak out together with local people against the U.S. military realignment plan, saying that they will not tolerate further reinforcement of U.S. bases and any more damage caused by the U.S. military presence.

The new government pledged to review the realignment of U.S. bases and the stationing of U.S. troops in Japan. Its position is greatly wavering due to the strong pressure from the U.S. Above all, concerning the construction of a new base in Okinawa, the government broke the promise of relocating the Futenma base abroad or other areas of Japan. It is highly likely that the government may conclude the issue by relocating the base within Okinawa. However, Okinawans’ voice is clear. They held a nonpartisan rally with the slogan of “Remove the Futenma base, No to relocation of the base within Okinawa and No to the construction of a new base”. 21,000 people took part in the rally. A recent opinion poll shows that more than 70 percent of local people are against the relocation of the base within Okinawa and that 83.5 percent demand the reduction and removal of U.S. bases in Okinawa. The 13-year-long struggle of Okinawa people has shown that the only way to solve this issue is the unconditional withdrawal of the U.S. base.

The new coalition government should not accept the realignment of U.S. bases in

Japan under the thumbs of the U.S. government. It should not permit the relocation of the base within Okinawa. Instead it should fundamentally review the current abnormal situation involving U.S. bases and should negotiate with the U.S. government, standing on the side of the people. Let us raise our voices with Okinawa people and achieve the reduction and removal of U.S. bases.

A nuclear-powered aircraft carrier was deployed in Yokosuka. And U.S. atomic powered submarines are making port calls constantly. The maintenance of atomic reactors on board is underway. These problems are critical, endangering the lives of 30 million people living in the capital area. Let us increase our voices calling for the withdrawal of the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier from Yokosuka, halt to the reinforcement of U.S. bases in Iwakuni, Zama, Sagamihara and Yokota, stopping of Japan’s payment for the construction of U.S. military facilities in Guam and the “sympathy budget” for the U.S. forces stationed in Japan, and the revision of the Japan-U.S. Status of Forces Agreement.

(2) Let us create a nuclear-free Japan and make it take the lead in effort for a nuclear weapon-free world.

Toward the NPT Review Conference, a new opportunity is opened up to realize the abolition of nuclear weapons. At the United Nations, Prime Minister Hatoyama pledged to take the lead in the abolition of nuclear weapons and to observe the Three Non-nuclear Principles. Now is the time for Japan to take initiative appropriate for the only A-bombed country in the world. It should frontally propose the commencement

of negotiations for an international treaty totally banning and eliminating nuclear weapons, and should take initiatives to overcome “nuclear deterrence” theory as obstruction to the abolition of nuclear weapons.

However, in its resolution to the U.N., the Hatoyama government failed to call for the conclusion of the international treaty, carrying on its predecessor’s position that the U.S. nuclear umbrella under the Japan-U.S. military alliance is necessary. Regarding its investigation and verification of the Japan-U.S. secret agreement on bringing-in of nuclear weapons, the government has not declared so far that it will reject U.S. aircraft and warships carrying nuclear weapons to enter or pass Japan’s territory. As long as it holds on to such an attitude, the government cannot fulfill appropriate role for the government of the only A-bombed nation in the world.

We need to break away from the U.S. nuclear umbrella, disclose and abrogate the secret agreement on bringing-in of nuclear weapons, and adhere to the Three Non-nuclear Principles. Japan should also reject the port-calls by U.S. nuclear-powered submarines capable of carrying Tomahawk cruise missiles at Yokosuka, Sasebo, and Okinawa’s White Beach.

Toward the NPT Review Conference, let us widely develop the signature campaign “For a nuclear weapons-free world” and enhance the public call for a nuclear weapon-free Japan.

(3) Stop SDF dispatch overseas, promote peaceful diplomacy based on the Constitution

The former government of Japan, led by the Liberal Democratic and Komei parties, had repeatedly violated the Constitution by supporting the Iraqi war and Afghan war and sending the SDF troops to help the wars. The dispatch of Maritime, Air and Ground SDF units to the sea off Somalia is continuing, and there is a possibility for them to use force. Placing overseas activity as central mission of the SDFs, the former government had promoted arms buildup. In order to meet the requirement of overseas dispatch of troops, the former government had placed overseas activity as SDFs’ central mission and had promoted arms buildup, including training of the Ground SDF Central Readiness Force and other units, holding of close-quarters combat drills and purchasing of mid-air refuel aircraft and other large transport aircraft as well as helicopter-carrier destroyers. Aiming to get everything ready for the U.S. forces and the SDF to jointly fight wars on a global scale, the government is trying to push forward the “realignment” of the U.S. forces in Japan. It is thus going ahead with the integration of Army commands in Zama and Sagamihara bases, the establishment of the Bilateral and Joint Operations Coordination Center in Yokota base and the integration of Air force commands. The attempt to adversely revise Article 9 is part of the plan and therefore we should block all these moves from the Constitutional perspective.

The U.S. Obama Administration is trying to send more troops to Afghanistan. Japan’s new government has decided to invest 5 billion dollars (about 450 billion yen) to support the Afghan war. What Japan should do is not to support the war but to take initiatives for ending the war and forging

peace.

The DPJ intends to prohibit bureaucrats from answering in Diet discussions. We must be cautious about the real aim of this dangerous attempt – to change the government's Constitutional interpretation in their favor and open the way for the SDFs' use of force abroad. Let us develop joint effort for defending Article 9 and promote peace diplomacy.

(4) Toward the 50th anniversary of the revision of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty – Abrogate the Japan-US military alliance and build peaceful and friendly relations with the U.S.

Amid deepening contradiction between the people's demands and Japan-U.S. alliance

Contradictions between the people's demands for peace and the Japan-U.S. military alliance are more visible than ever, over the issue of reduction and removal of U.S. bases as well as the issue of defending Japan's Constitution and realizing a nuclear-free Japan. Even on the people's living conditions, it has become clear that one of the major causes of deterioration of employment, agriculture, businesses, and social welfare is the Japanese government's subservience to the U.S. in its economic policies. Against this background, people of different thought and positions have begun to talk about what the Japan-US relations should be. Here lies a new condition for us for developing public opinion.

In Okinawa, where contradictions with the Japan-U.S. alliance are most visible because of the heavy U.S. military presence the prefecture has endured, a recent public

opinion poll showed that only 16.7 percent of the respondents supported the maintenance of the security treaty; 42 percent said that the treaty should be changed to a peace and friendship treaty; 10.5 percent supported the abrogation of the treaty; and 15.5 percent said that it should be converted into a multilateral security treaty including the U.S. This result indicates what course we should pursue. Now is the time for us to have dialogues with a wide range of the people, strengthen cooperation, and enhance public opinion in favor of abrogation of the Japan-U.S. military alliance and the creation of peaceful and friendly relations with the U.S.

Connect with effort to realize a peaceful Northeast Asia

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the revision of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, those who want to strengthen the bilateral military alliance intend to run a campaign advocating that the Security Treaty is essential for defending Japan, and that it underpins the foundation for peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. In reality, however, the very fact that the U.S., the nuclear superpower and Japan with world-class arms capabilities are military allies has been the cause of a vicious circle of arms race and tension in East Asia. Disarmament and easing of tension are called for. What is required now is not the strengthening of military alliance, but efforts for ending hostility and easing tension to build peaceful relations, as seen in the Six-Party Talks. Japan should do its utmost to forge such relations with its neighboring countries, based on the Constitution.

The world is heading in the direction of

abolishing nuclear weapons, removing U.S. bases, abrogating military alliances, and developing peaceful relations based on the U.N. Charter. With conviction that the people's power can bring about political changes, let us build solidarity among peace-loving peoples around the world and take action to achieve a peaceful Japan free of nuclear weapons, U.S. bases and military alliance.

<< Immediate priorities >>

- Develop nationwide solidarity with the struggle of Okinawa to stop the construction of a new base and to achieve unconditional closure of the Futenma base. Make a success of Tokyo solidarity rally to be held on December 17 in support of the Nago City mayoral election campaign. Work for a victory of a candidate ready to work for the benefit of the people in Okinawa's gubernatorial election next year.
- Put an end to the use of Yokosuka as the homeport of a U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. Call for a halt to nuclear reactors' maintenance works and for a removal of related facilities. Strengthen solidarity with the struggles of Iwakuni, Zama, Sagamihara, and Yokota against the realignment of the U.S. forces.
- Urge the government to abolish the "sympathy budget" for the U.S. military and revise the humiliating Japan-U.S. Status of Forces Agreement.
- Bring the SDF units back from the Indian Ocean and the sea off Somalia. Oppose SDFs' overseas dispatch and develop cooperation in the effort to defeat the attempts to revise the Constitution in whatever form. Stand against the arms buildup to enable the SDFs dispatch abroad and strengthen the movement to reduce military spending calling for redirecting budget resources to the betterment of people's livelihood.
- Enhance public support for the abolition of nuclear weapons by collecting signatures from more than 10 percent of the Japanese population by the NPT Review Conference in May next year. Urge the government to abrogate the secret agreement with the U.S. allowing the bringing-in of nuclear weapons and to strictly observe the Three Non-Nuclear Principles. Demand the government that it reject the entrance of U.S. nuclear-powered submarines into Japanese ports.
- Toward June 23 next year, which marks the 50th anniversary of the revision of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, develop grassroots activities to enhance public support for the abrogation of the treaty by organizing study meetings and promoting dialogues. Make a success of a rally planned for early June and a month-long campaign for the abrogation of the treaty in June.



Addresses by Oversea Delegates

John Lindsey-Poland (USA)

A year ago, all over the world our peoples awaited with great anticipation the departure of George W. Bush and the entrance of Barack Obama as the first non-white president of the United States who campaigned on change.

Today, the U.S. military budget is greater than at any time in history, and there are as many U.S. military troops in Iraq and Afghanistan combined as before President Obama took office.

But the United States is a superpower with waning influence, and the future of our countries is never in the hands of the U.S. government. It is in our hands, once we have decided to be the protagonists of our own story, to act on that decision, and to communicate this strategically throughout the world. There are many places across the planet where people besieged by the wrongs of U.S. military bases have done this – in Panama; in the Philippines; in Kaho’olawe, Hawai’i; in Vieques, Puerto Rico; in Greenham Common in England; the Czech Republic; Henoko, Okinawa; in my town of San Francisco, California; in Ecuador; in Vicenza, Italy. When we become the primary actors in the story of liberation from militarism, the hearts of people around the world respond.

It is very difficult for the Japanese government to abrogate the US-Japan Security Agreement. It is also difficult for

the Obama government to abrogate the agreement. Why is it difficult? Because the military bases are tightly wedged into the two countries' close relationship, into our very identities. It is difficult to change this unless a new identity is proposed, developed, and lived. The militarists say: the only path in eastern Asia is *war or submission*. They insist you can be a warrior or submissive, nothing else. But there is another way: the way of nonviolent conflict. This is the way that people in Henoko are showing us, the people in Ecuador, and even in Iraq where public pressure led to a government requirement for foreign troops to leave by 2011, a promise we will work to ensure is fulfilled.

So let us issue a challenge to ourselves and to our leaders: Not to relocate the US Marine base in Futenma into some other country, but to abolish the mission of the Futenma base, to abolish expeditionary war. To dismantle the Futenma base and send the Marines back to the United States, so that they take all that energy and learn to be solar panel workers, teachers, health workers, and gardeners. To dismantle all the bases, and reshape our alliance based on what we really want.

It will take persistence, and creativity, and solidarity, and sacrifice. But we know if we don't imagine it, it will never happen. So let's begin.

Hannelore Tölke (Germany)

Dear friends

First of all I would like to bring warmest greetings from German peace movement.

Your struggle against military bases and for peaceful and equal relations without military alliances really encouraged us.

We are claiming the same things and we are struggling for the same aims.

Germany also has a huge number of US military bases. People around these bases are suffering in noise and environmental destruction caused by these bases. From these bases as well as from NATO bases comes war, they are important hubs for the war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Without these bases the US leaded NATO war in Afghanistan and Iraq would not be possible.

German peace movement wants the shutdown of these bases. We demand therefore from German government to cancel all agreements that allows US bases on German soil.

We are demanding to dissolve NATO. Just from the beginning **when ist was** founded in April 1949 up to now NATO was an organization of war fare.

In April 2009 NATO had its 60 years anniversary. The NATO summit which took place in April 2009 decided to work on a new strategic concept for a new long-lasting strategy for NATO in the 21st century. The decision about this new strategic concept will be made assembly on the next NATO Summit 2010 in Portugal.

One important point in this concept of the new NATO Strategy is the so called Comprehensive Approach which means an involvement civil actors and international

aid organisations in the so called deployment of stabilisation.

The Afghanistan strategy is an enlargement of troops in Afghanistan. The aim which was announced this week is to bring 130.000 soldiers to Afghanistan.

Another point of new NATO strategies is the change of the communication structures and decisions. Experts are in the opinion that this will change the proportions of power completely. It will give the adventure to bigger countries and will significantly enlarged the ability of warfare for NATO.

NATO is in confrontation with Russia because NATO and especially the USA want that Georgia and Ukraine will become NATO members

NATO has become competitor organization to UNO. The aim is to avoid the Russian and Chinese veto right against military deployment in the UNO. This remoulding of NATO has the aim to be ready for new war around the world.

Nowadays Europe has two Options.

- The first is to follow NATO and USA leaded military actions in order to be allowed to take part in decisions.
- The second option could be to create an own cooperation in whole Europe including Russia

The continuation of NATO strategies and the will for global military interventions will provoke a heavy security problem for the world.

Europe has to take the chance to create a regional system of mutual collective security system in whole Europe and a peaceful cooperation around the world. A mutual collective system could bring a big impact

for a peaceful world. War is not a option and war is not a solution.

Therefore is our appeal is NO TO NATO – NO TO WAR

Lee Junkyu (Republic of Korea)

My name is Lee Junkyu from South Korea. Thank you for inviting me to the Japan Peace Conference.

This is the first time for me to attend the Japan Peace Conference. However, as I have taken part in the World Conference against A and H Bombs and other Japanese events, some people here may have met me before. To me, the theme of this Conference, namely, military alliance with the US is very significant.

As you may know, a dark shadow of military alliance with the US is cast on South Korea and the Korean Peninsula. The shadow may be darker than that on Japan. You will make sense of what I am saying if you look at the situation of the Korean Peninsula over North Korean nuclear issue.

As the representatives of North Korea and the U.S. are going to meet, there is a growing expectation that it will create a breakthrough in the stalemate over the Korean Peninsula. I know that at the same time, there is a suspicion on what outcome the direct dialogue between the two countries can produce; and on whether it can lead to the resumption of multilateral talks, including the six-party ones, and reopening of the process for the settlement of the North Korean nuclear issue. How it goes will depend on the effort of those concerned and the international environment.

There have been many twists and turns until today: North Korea conducted a satellite testing on April 5 this year; and in response to it, the governments of South Korea, Japan and the US worked to increase sanction against North Korea; and North Korea waged the second nuclear test in May. The nearly 20-year history of twists and turns shows some problems which have direct relevance to the theme of the Conference. We have to take note of them as “result of clinging to military alliance”.

After the second North Korean nuclear test, Japanese and ROK governments have worked to make sure US “nuclear umbrella” on them. As most important achievement of the ROK-US summit talks held in June, the ROK Lee Myung-bak government is boasting of successfully putting the “provision of nuclear umbrella” in its joint statement. This move totally runs counter to the trend of the world to move toward a nuclear weapon-free world. The establishment of the US-Japan-ROK missile defense (MD) network is being promoted on the pretext of “coping with the threat of North Korea”. But on the contrary, it has a danger of reviving a confronting structure of “US-Japan-South Korea versus China-Russia-North Korea”.

The ongoing “realignment” of the US bases in South Korea has intensified the offensive nature of the military alliance as seen in the Operation Plan 5029. The Plan assumes a

military intervention by the ROK troops or ROK-US joint ones in case of an emergency of North Korea. I don't want even to imagine such an emergency would happen. However, it is obvious that even if such an emergency takes place, it should be settled by peaceful means. But what is going on under the military alliance is totally the opposite and may lead to chaos of East Asia.

If we conceive it differently, East Asia may have had a chance now. In order for the chance to be fully used, the "North Korean nuclear issue" must be grasped from the viewpoint of the "Korean Question in East Asia". That is why the process of resolving North Korean nuclear issue requires the conclusion of a peace agreement and the normalization of DPRK relations with US

and Japan, as tasks to be pursued in parallel.

Finally, we have to break away from politics clinging to military alliance. It is important for the people of South Korea and Japan to display their imagination to make use of possibilities arising from the reality. The first step is to get out of clinging to military alliance, which will lead to creating a "multilateral" vision which not only contributes to the security of one country but ensures common safety and peace.

The year 2010 marks the 50th year from the revision of the Japan-US Security Treaty and the centenary of Japan's annexation of ROK. Let us take a big step forward to make the year 2010 a full of advances.

Corazon Fabros (Philippines)

Warm solidarity greetings from the STOP the War Coalition Philippines and the International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases.

I wish to thank Japan Peace Committee for the privilege of joining you this year especially at this time of great change and development. At no time in the recent past has the US-Japan security relations been challenged and put to a test than today. These are indeed moments that present us with opportunities to push for eventual closure of the foreign military bases especially in Okinawa and Kanagawa that have seen the impacts of such facilities in the lives of people and the environment. Let us renew our commitment and work hard for peace and the abolition of foreign military bases

In my long years in the movement, I realize that gatherings such as this provide us with opportunities to share our stories. There is always something meaningful in listening to people's stories. These stories have shaped our lives in the movement for peace and justice. Everyone morning when I wake up I listen to these stories in my mind and in my heart.

We are grateful to the countless men, women and children who often had to bear the brunt of the social costs of foreign military presence and intervention, but who often have also shown more courage than the pliant armed men in uniform and the public officials and leaders who have the responsibility to implement laws and policies for the preservation of life and

environment. We thank them for sharing their experiences: their pain as well as their joy, their despair as well as their hope, their courage that inspire us all. We can never really feel the depth of their loss but we can take them as own - mentors as they are in our search for directions and alternatives to peace, freedom and justice.

In most cases, they are invisible. Victims and survivors they are - of what local and foreign militarists whose minds are imbibed with the creed and greed of "anti-terrorism", "national security" and "national interest" referred to as "collateral damage".

We are at an important juncture of our regions history. Okinawa is important not only for the people of Okinawa and Japan, but for all of us in the Asia and Pacific region. It will define the future of our peace and security. I find meaning in Mr. Shii Kazuo's challenge to Japan's Prime Minister Hatoyama that "it's time for government to end subservience to the United States". I know it is a political call crying for concrete and committed response. There is no alternative to the question about Futenma except to recognize and honor the long time dream and aspiration of the Okinawan people's desire for a bases free Okinawa. There will never be real and genuine development for the people as long as the

U.S. bases continue to dominate and define the quality of life of the Okinawan people.

I wish to thank you all for the many meaningful experiences with the peace movement here in Japan and Okinawa, especially now that we are all facing tremendous challenges in our countries as well as in our region. And as we face those challenges, we are strengthened by our coming together. That as we share our own situations and campaigns, we try to find solutions, strategies and alternatives. And at this juncture, our call continues to be for peace, justice and freedom. We ask for genuine friendship with the United States. Friendship that rejects the presence of nuclear weapons and military bases in our midst, in our lives, in our environment. We find meaning in people to people solidarity so that we can consolidate our action towards pro-active grassroots activism on international issues. There is so much that we can do together and which we can never do alone. There are alternatives. We can convert the military facilities to peaceful and development uses. The Philippine economy did not collapse after the bases were closed. THERE IS LIFE AFTER THE BASES. Let us continue to be hopeful and courageous. Gambari mashio!



Closing Plenary

Dec. 13 Yokosuka Cultural Hall

Addresses by Oversea Guests

John Lindsey-Poland (USA)

Listening to the amazing work you are doing in Iwakuni, in Kanagawa, Yokosuka, in Okinawa, in Sasebo and Misawa and Tokyo and the many other communities represented here, to close military bases and challenge the nuclear umbrella and dismantle the Japan-US security agreement, I am very excited about the visit of more than a thousand Japanese activists – including many of you in this hall - to the United States in May for the NPT conference, and to visit many towns and cities besides New York. We need to hear the testimonies of people like Jane-san and Mr. Yamasaki, to hear about the resistance of Japanese people to nuclear homeporting and to relocation of the Futenma base, about what it means for

children and others on the ground to be assaulted by the deafening noise of military jets. We need to hear about Article 9, about your hopes and doubts for the new government, about your opposition to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, about your peaceful responses to North Korean fears. And we need to hear your proposals for change, for how to dismantle the military bases and war-crazy policies that harm communities from here to Afghanistan. We need our legislators and our activists and our journalists to get to know you. We need to get angry together and laugh together. And we need to act. Because together, we will succeed. Gambare masho!

Hannelore Tölke

Dear friends,

I would like to say “thank you” for inviting me to your conference and for sharing experiences with me.

It is a great honor for me to be invited to your conference. Here I got a large number of new information. It was interesting for me to learn about your struggle against military bases. The reports from Okinawa, from Iwakuni and from Kanagawa encouraged me. I will bring your experiences to the activists

in Germany.

That will strengthen our worldwide networks against military bases as well as our network against military alliances. Military bases are a precondition for the warfare of military alliances. From this bases come death and destruction, we do not believe in the fairy tail of so called humanitarian interventions. The aim of NATO is a world wide warfare leaded by the USA. For this NATO also in future wants the first strike option to use nuclear weapons.

In Germany we issued last year a campaign with view to the NPT-conference with the motto “Germany without nuclear weapons until 2010” We are demanding the withdrawal of 20 nuclear warheads which are until now stored in the NATO-base Buechel in the west of Germany.

It is good to know that you are also working for a nuclear weapon free world.

Our common work for a peaceful world will strengthen our movement.

Thank you once again for hosting me so friendly here in Japan and good luck for your peace activities in 2010.

Lee Junkyu (Republic of Korea)

I learned a lot and got great encouragement from you. I would like to extend solidarity to your struggle for liberating East Asia from the rule of military alliances between Japan and South Korea and the US, and for creating an East Asia based on a new order.

As you may know, the dark shadow of military alliance with the US is cast on South Korea and the Korean Peninsula, as it is on Japan. Perhaps, it might be darker than that on Japan. These two military alliances and the US forces stationed in the two countries are closely linked. That is why I want to emphasize that solidarity between the citizens of the two countries is essential.

The current situation of East Asia over “North Korea’s nuclear issue” and historical moves for a nuclear weapon-free world

remind me of a wording, “A crisis can be a chance.” By changing a way of thinking and getting more far-sighted, you can find a possibility to turn the crisis into a chance.

I am so excited even to imagine the citizens of South Korea and Japan, who are regarded as subordinates to the US, walking hand in hand in the center of New York next year. Next year, the NPT Review Conference is held. It also marks the 50th year of the Japan-US Security Treaty and the centenary of Japan’s annexation of South Korea. Let us devote ourselves to turn 2010 into the first year in which we can achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons and establish a new order of East Asia based on common security and peace by breaking away from politics of military alliance. Thank you.

Corazon Fabros (Philippines)

As we bring to a close this year's Peace Conference, and as we prepare to go back to our own communities where the real work and continuing challenge to our commitment confront us daily, may we be hopeful and steadfast knowing that we are not alone.

May we be strong knowing that in other parts of the world we have friends, brothers and sisters, comrades they are in our struggle who stand in solidarity in our quest for a world that is peaceful, bases free, nuclear free - - in all the continents of the

world, especially here in Asia and the Pacific region where we witness the continuing escalation of militarization, we find solidarity in this work for the abolition of foreign military bases.

And always, we must remember that foreign military bases perpetuate and support the US Empire. Without foreign military bases, wars would be more difficult to wage; nuclear weapons would be impossible to stockpile; men and women trained for war would be difficult to forward deploy.

Foreign military bases are used to secure the interests of a few at the cost of democracy, justice, sovereignty and self-determination. They are reasons for the destruction of our environment, the confiscation of our farmlands, the abuse of our women and children, the violation of our human rights, the repression of our local struggles, the control of our resources, and undermining our freedom and independence in our own country. They are instruments and infrastructures for military and economic

domination.

Let us continue to inform, educate, conscientize and organize in our communities so that we can build a critical mass of constituency that believes in the need for urgent removal of foreign military bases and troops in our communities.

Okinawa and Guam is important work for all of us now and in the immediate future in this region. Let us continue our solidarity knowing that the struggle of our friends in Okinawa and Guam is not theirs alone but one that is also our own. I take to heart the Okinawan saying "LIFE IS PRECIOUS". Let us carry that in our mind and in hearts and uphold it every day as we continue to do our share in this long and meaningful struggle. And because the strategy of the Empire is global - so must our response.

Bases out of Okinawa and Japan! No to relocation to Guam! No to Bases!
We shall overcome!

Conference Summary and Action Proposals for 2010

**Yoshiro Hayasaka
Japan Peace Conference Organizing Committee
National Campaign Committee for the Abrogation of Japan-U.S. Security Treaty**

I thank all of you for your participation in and contribution to the 2010 Japan Peace Conference. On behalf of the Organizing Committee, I will present a conference summary and action proposals for 2010.

1. Participation

The Conference has been successful, with a total of 3,600 people participating in the

events held in the last four days, starting from the International Symposium, which was followed by the opening plenary, symposiums and workshops, field trips, youth forum/peace shout and this closing plenary. I want to thank you all who have come all the way to this conference from different places of Japan, and from abroad, for your cooperation.

Let me cite some of the comments from participants. A woman from Osaka said, "This is my first time attending the Japan Peace Conference. I've learned a lot, deeply and broadly. I've heard so many impressive words that I will never forget." A man from Kanagawa said, "I was reminded of the importance of focusing on the issue of abrogating the Security Treaty next year, on the occasion of the 50 anniversary of the revision of the Treaty." Many people have expressed their resolve to work hard as they were asked for their impressions of the Conference. Yesterday, each of us took part in different symposiums and workshops and learned a great deal about the connection between the question of "U.S. military bases and military alliance" and "war and peace" from different aspects. Let us confirm that the Japan Peace Conference has been a great success, inspiring and encouraging the participants to carry on their struggles, with particular emphasis on taking actions toward the 50's anniversary of the revised Security Treaty next year.

2. Characteristics and Outcome of Discussions

First, the 2010 Japan Peace Conference was the first one held since the inauguration of the Hatoyama government led by the Democratic Party of Japan after the Liberal

Democratic Party, which had stayed in power ever since the end of WWII, was swept away from office as the result of the general election last summer.

Sticking to the position to place the Japan-U.S. alliance at the center of all policy, the Hatoyama Cabinet has been wavering over the Futenma Base issue, trying to find an alternative to relocate it. This situation is something we could hardly imagine to happen; this tells us that people's movement and opinion are influencing real politics. What is important now is that we strongly urge the Hatoyama Cabinet to respect the Okinawa people's will and go all out to negotiate with the U.S. government on the "unconditional removal of the Futenma Base," instead of looking for an alternative site.

The 2010 Japan Peace Conference participants have now confirmed that we will be all united with the Okinawa people in our hearts, wherever we are, and carry on the struggle calling on the "unconditional and immediate return of the Futenma Base and the withdrawal of the plan to construct a new base in Henoko." From this Conference, a powerful message has been sent out nationwide.

Secondly, the Conference affirmed that a new situation has emerged concerning the Japan-U.S. security regime. The current Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, which came into effect in 1960, will mark its fiftieth anniversary next year, 2010. Being described as "drifting alliance," the present Japan-U.S. security regime is not functioning as the Japanese and U.S. governments want it to be. This is precisely the result of the persistent struggle carried

out by broad sections of people in different municipalities including Okinawa, Kanagawa, and Iwakuni in opposition to the plan to realign and reinforce U.S. military bases in Japan.

The discussions during the Conference have given us the opportunity to look into, from different angles, the realities and problems related with the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. It has been made clear that if we effectively organize the struggle in 2010, the fiftieth year of the revision of the Security Treaty,

we will be able to give a big blow to the realignment plan, and to open up prospects even for changing the paradigm of the Japan-U.S. security regime being all about the “Japan-U.S. military alliance”.

Thirdly, the Conference has highlighted the fact that moves toward “cooperation for peace” are dramatically growing worldwide. In the International Symposium, friends from the U.S., Germany, Republic of Korea and the Philippines reported on the _

**Organizing Committee of Japan Peace Conference
C/o Japan Peace Committee
1-4-9, Shiba, Minato-ku, Tokyo
Tel: 03-3451-6377 Fax 03-3451-6277
E-mail: info@j-peace.org**

