

A Look Back on the Year After Our Founding

Hiromichi UMEBAYASHI (RECNA Director)



(Hiromichi UMEBAYASHI,
RECNA Director)

A year and a half has already passed since RECNA was established. The memory of our scramble to monitor the Preparatory Committee for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference in Vienna a mere month after the center's establishment is still fresh in our minds, but this year's monitoring of the 2nd Preparatory Committee (Geneva) is already over. RECNA has come full circle at full speed, and perhaps we have gotten somewhat of a grasp on the pace.

In general, the undertaking proceeded smoothly, but the important issue of establishing a translation system for new international documents has surfaced. Currently, priority is being given to the online communication of document outlines, even if a translation has not been closely scrutinized.

(2) Track global nuclear disarmament/non-proliferation inter-governmental forums

This activity is critical both because of its necessity to our own research activities and because it contributes to capacity building for citizens and students by conveying information in real time. First, daily reports were communicated through blogs and monitoring of the 1st Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference held in Vienna from April to May 2012. The same activities were also conducted for the 2nd Preparatory Committee that took place in Geneva in 2013. If diplomatic consultations and discussions toward the abolition of nuclear weapons intensify, then simply following the meetings in relation to the NPT will be inadequate. There will likely be an even greater need to monitor other meetings such as the UN General Assembly First Committee and the open-ended working group (OEWG) meetings inaugurated in May 2013, for which, regrettably, we could not send our staff.

(3) Research Project: "Developing a Comprehensive Approach to a NEA-NWFZ"

To reinforce the momentum of the paradigm shift toward surpassing nuclear deterrent theory to a world free from nuclear weapons, global attention is turning to issues including (1) legal frameworks for a ban on nuclear arms, (2) newly establishing and strengthening Nuclear Weapon Free Zones, and (3) approaches to nuclear disarmament that focus on international humanitarian law. While paying close attention to these trends, RECNA has concentrated on research that will contribute to policy change in Japan, a nation that has experienced nuclear bombing. That is the research project with the title of this Section. Utilizing the new proposal on a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Northeast Asia (late 2011) presented by Dr. Morton Halperin (former Special Assistant to President Clinton), we took important first steps that included holding an international workshop that invited 7 overseas guests, including Dr. Halperin (December 2012). In addition, we had the second international workshop held in Seoul in June 2013 which was co-organized by Center for Peace and Public Integrity of Hanshin University in Seoul.

(4) Develop new leaders, particularly students

Nurturing young leaders is crucial to the achievement and maintenance of a world free from nuclear weapons and requires a double approach of shaping basic understanding through university lectures and seminars, and creating proactive and responsible individuals through exchange with international and local communities. As for the former, a module class entitled "Toward a World Free from Nuclear Weapons" was started. Initiatives to foster student activities have been launched through the creation in October of the consultative body, "PCU Nagasaki Council for Nuclear Weapons Abolition," which was organized among the Nagasaki Prefecture, Nagasaki City, and Nagasaki University. From that, the "Nagasaki Youth Delegation" was

The total abolition of nuclear weapons is an acutely urgent issue for humankind and a theme that is constantly in motion. From its establishment, RECNA has been questioning how to sort out this wide-ranging problem and draft effective action plans with limited resources. In the end, we organized the current issues into the following 4 main elements.

(1) Develop infrastructure for factual information → Construct a database for citizens

(2) Track global nuclear disarmament/non-proliferation inter-governmental forums

(3) Conduct research projects contributing to the achievement and maintenance of a world free from nuclear weapons → Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Northeast Asia (NEA-NWFZ)

(4) Develop new leaders, particularly students, dedicated to nuclear disarmament efforts

RECNA has held repeated discussions on how to tackle the serious issues related to the history of Nagasaki's bombing (the history up to the atomic bombing, collecting facts about after the atomic bombing, investigations and research on hibakusha, etc.). As can be gleaned from the above 4 main elements, we have charted a course for the present that focuses on investigation and research for the purpose of achieving a world free from nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, within activities related to the 4 main elements, we should utilize knowledge accumulated that is based on the history and experience of the Nagasaki bombing, and should remain committed to those concerns. New involvements may arise from that process.

What follows are thoughts on future issues and an overview of the year's progress in terms of the 4 main elements.

(1) Develop infrastructure for factual information

Considering the fact that the theme of the abolition of nuclear weapons has an interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral character, we aimed to build a factual foundation as an online citizens' database that can be utilized by people from many disciplines. The first development plan was drawn up and executed in this first year. To create a database on nuclear weapons, we also gained the participation of non-RECNA researchers to organize the "Nuclear Warhead Data Tracking Team."

initiated to participate in the 2013 Preparatory Committee for the NPT Review Conference (Geneva). Ensuring the drive and endurance of the students is an important issue for the future.

The above was a look back on RECNA's main activities, but there were

many more, and it is impossible to note them all here. We are also keenly aware of having received support from many people who fill us with their sense of solidarity. At this stage, everything lies in the future, but it has been an extremely full first year that bodes well for further development. (June 30, 2013)

2nd Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference: Mounting Issues & Faint Hopes

Satoshi HIROSE (RECNA Vice Director)

Keiko NAKAMURA (RECNA Associate Professor)



(Amb. Laajava, a facilitator for the Conference on WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East, consulting with Ms. Kane, UN High Representative for Disarmament at the 2nd PrepCom in Geneva, May 2013)

be found in the 2013 NPT BLOG on the RECNA website: www.recna.nagasaki-u.ac.jp/nptblog/npt2013/. The 11 instances of on-site reporting from The Nagasaki Shimbun appearing April 24th–May 6th are also available.)

This Preparatory Committee garnered international interest prior to the meeting over what stance the various nations would take toward the progress of the international conference on a Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Free Zone in the Middle East scheduled for December in 2013 that was suddenly postponed, and discussions on the growing global concern over the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, including a joint statement prepared among some nations at the 1st Preparatory Committee and The First Committee of the UN General Assembly in 2013, and the international conference held in March 2014 in Oslo, Norway. In addition to these two issues, the actual Preparatory Committee saw particularly vigorous exchanges of opinions on the peaceful utilization and development of nuclear energy, and the ideal state of the Preparatory Committee. However, here we would like to touch on the humanitarian dimension of nuclear weapons that is directly relevant to nuclear disarmament and developments involving the WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East.

The “Joint Statement on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons” (a full Japanese translation is uploaded to the NPT BLOG) was delivered by South Africa, representing the signatory nations, on the last day of the general debate, April 24th. It was the content that first attracted attention. While the statements released twice last year (“Joint Statement on the Humanitarian Dimension of Nuclear Disarmament”) contained nearly identical content, this joint statement included significant changes to the content, as can be discerned by the change in title. Most important is the elimination of the wording, “outlaw” nuclear weapons. While many countries, including Japan, oppose linking the focus on inhumanity to arguments on nuclear weapon convention, this statement focuses solely on the “catastrophic humanitarian consequences” of nuclear weapons, thus earning the support of different nations in what can be called an attempt to broaden international common understanding. The same strategy was also taken at the Oslo Conference (Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons) last March. Clarifying the goal of sharing scientific knowledge on the humanitarian consequenc-

es of using nuclear weapons succeeded in garnering the participation of 127 countries.

There were 74 countries that agreed with the joint statement at the time of its announcement, but ultimately that number grew to 80. Compared to the 16 countries at the 1st Preparatory Committee last year and the 34 countries (plus the observer state, the Holy See) at the First Committee of the UN General Assembly, it is evident that that number dramatically increased. The fact that within the statement many nations touched on the inhumanity of nuclear weapons, combined with the Oslo Conference, attest to the gathering momentum of this movement in international discussions over nuclear disarmament, as stated by the South African representative on the last day when he said, “[The catastrophic consequences of the use of nuclear weapons] has established a firm presence in the international agenda.” On the other hand, very little progress was seen in terms of support from countries that rely on nuclear deterrence, such as Japan, Australia, South Korea, and NATO nations (the 3 countries of Norway, Denmark, and Iceland supported), so that it may well be that this statement was regarded as a “target.” It also served as a reminder of how high the “wall” of obstruction stands.

Japan, which did not sign the last two joint statements, also declined on this occasion due to the 3 words, “under any circumstances” that appear in the sentence, “It is in the interest of the very survival of humanity that nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances.” It was said that up until the very end negotiations continued with South Africa and other nations over the deletion of that phrase.

The Japanese government talked about that reason on the 25th, the day after the joint statement was delivered, saying that while Japan “shares concerns about the humanitarian impact caused by the use of nuclear weapons,” Japan “carefully and earnestly examined the compatibility (of the joint statement)” while “taking into account the security environment surrounding Japan.” The Japanese government held discussions over revising the joint proposal, but with no result, and took a wait-and-see attitude. The mention of “immediate damage” in addition to “unbearable socioeconomic and cross-generational losses brought about by nuclear weapon use,” and the statement that, “Japan wishes to explore seriously the possibility of joining the statement with the same theme in the future,” should likely be given a measure of approval. However, it goes without saying that the issue is not whether the statement would be acceptable if the 3 words were deleted, but we must recognize the magnitude of the fact that Japan, which is a country that has experienced atomic bombings, once again sent the wrong message to the world that “nuclear weapons have a role.”

In regard to promoting the establishment of a WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East, which was decided at the Review and Extension Conference of the of the NPT in 1995, together with the “Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament” and strengthening of the treaty review process as conditions of the materially indefinite extension of the NPT. This decision was reconfirmed at the 2000 Review Conference. At the 2010 Review Conference, more specific decisions were made to appoint a facilitator (role of

mediator) to be in charge of conference preparations, and that the Secretary-General of the United Nations together with the United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia would convene an international conference in 2012 on the establishment of a WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East in which all countries in the Middle East would participate.

Based on these 2010 decisions, in 2011 the United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which were tasked to convene the international conference, appointed Finland's Under-Secretary of State, Jaakko Laajava as a facilitator. It was also decided that the conference would take place in Finland. Looking toward the conference, Under-Secretary of State Laajava energetically continued discussions with relevant nations and international organizations and he received an enthusiastic response from the majority of countries at the 1st Preparatory Committee held in Vienna. Based on the 2010 agreement, a presentation was made indicating the intention to hold an international conference on a WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East at Helsinki in December 2012, and approval was gained. Then, Under-Secretary Laajava and his staff continued discussions with various relevant countries, but in the end, just before it was to be held, he concluded that since a certain country in the Middle East disagreed on participation and it was not possible by the deadline to fulfill the condition that "all countries in the Middle East participate." Consequently, the plan for 2012 conference was abandoned, and apparently Under-Secretary Laajava notified only limited number of the relevant parties in advance that the conference would be postponed.

At the 2nd Preparatory Committee, many countries one after another expressed critical opinions over this development, particularly the Middle Eastern and non-aligned countries. The majority of criticism was aimed at the facilitator's approach of unilaterally deciding on, and giving notice of postponement without prior discussion with some

major relevant parties including Russia. The United States and relevant countries that displayed a supportive attitude for Israel, which refused to attend an international conference on establishing a WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East and was the only country in the Middle East not included in the NPT were also criticized. And the third criticism targeted the lack of progress in the process for establishing a WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East, which had been agreed upon as a condition of the 1995 indefinite extension of the NPT. Though these criticisms are all valid and fact-based, actually resolving these issues in a short period is nearly impossible. For the Middle East to be a WMD-Free Zone, it must be premised on the establishment of an international security system that can be trusted by all Middle Eastern nations, including Israel. However, that cannot be expected to be achieved at the present when diplomatic relations between Israel and Arab nations do not even exist.

On the other hand, putting off the issues over a WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East is liable to cause a serious situation in the credibility of the NPT structure itself, as illustrated by Egypt's boycott of the 2nd Preparatory Committee in the midst of it. As a way to proceed with future endeavors, Under-Secretary Laajava hopes to shift the spotlight from the two-nation discussions that have been the focus to multilateral discussions and stress the securement of transparency among relevant countries to gain the understanding of all countries. However, will that really lead to understanding from Middle Eastern countries? It must be said that the situation is extremely difficult.

Looking at the outcomes of the 2nd Preparatory Committee, overall it appears that progress toward the 2015 Review Conference is insufficient, but with less than 2 years remaining until the Review Conference, the Preparatory Committee has only one meeting left. We hope for further progress toward resolving outstanding issues by the time the Review Conference is held.

Unification at the Nuclear Weapon Free Zone Workshop in Seoul & the United Nations Open-ended Working Group

Hirofumi Umebayashi (RECNA Director)

The "OEWG (open-ended working group) to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons" (hereafter, UN OEWG) was established in accordance with the United Nations General Assembly Resolution (67/56), "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations*1" that was adopted in December last year. It is a resolution led by Australia, Mexico, and Norway to overcome stagnation in the movement toward a world without nuclear weapons. The substantive discussions of the UN OEWG took place at the United Nations Office at Geneva (Geneva) during the May session (14th-24th) and August session (19th-30th). On August 30th, a report by the UN OEWG was adopted for the autumn U. N. General Assembly. It was a groundbreaking new movement in the field of nuclear disarmament.

In the midst of that, the 2nd workshop for RECNA's project, "Developing a Comprehensive Approach to NEA-NWFZ" was held from June 20th-22nd at the central venue of Hanshin University in Seoul. Conscious of the 20th anniversary of the armistice agreement for the Korean War that fell on July 27th, the workshop was titled, "Envisioning Peace and Security in Northeast Asia." The principal joint researchers for the project, Dr. Morton Halperin and Dr. Peter Hayes also participated in the Seoul workshop after having taken part in the 1st workshop last December at Nagasaki University.

Ambassador Enkhsaikhan from Mongolia, who was not available to the workshop in Nagasaki last year, could take part in this Seoul workshop. He is now affiliated to a Mongolian NGO "Blue Banner" that has close working relationship with Mongolian government, and

his participation in the project has a great significance.

As was stressed at the Nagasaki workshop and the Seoul workshop, the major reason why RECNA is tackling this research project is because the efforts to establish a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Northeast Asia touch on the essence of, and constitute the effective and feasible first step for, the two main goals; active contribution to global nuclear disarmament and the creation of a system for easing tensions and maintaining peace in Northeast Asia. The Seoul workshop aimed to share such concepts further in South Korea and to create ongoing cooperative relationships with Japanese and Korean researchers, and civil society to develop approaches for achieving the concepts. In actuality, in-depth collaboration between RECNA and Korean researchers has only just begun.

At that time, the OEWG report*2 adopted on August 30th gave us great courage. The first-line, international argument for pursuing the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons was shown to precisely overlap with our awareness of issues being pursued in Northeast Asia. When attempting to develop regional collaboration at the researcher level, the sharing of this kind of global argument and its significance will surely become a great strength.

NPT nuclear-weapon states (the United States, Russia, France, China, and Britain) boycotted this UN OEWG. However, it would be a mistake if non-nuclear-weapon states advance a one-sided argument without the participation of nuclear-weapon states. The boycott by the nuclear-weapon states indicates an important aspect of the stale-

mate in nuclear disarmament talks, and the participants earnestly debated how to break the deadlock in current conditions based on this reality. In the OEWG, NGOs also were able to participate in discussions on equal footing with state representatives. Through the submission of proposals for which there is not always agreement among them, NGOs made extensive and sincere efforts to enable the conference to fulfil the task of breaking the deadlock.

As a result, we would like to point out that the OEWG report includes content believed to demarcate a new dimension in multilateral conferences on nuclear disarmament. It should be recognized as a significant contribution by OEWG. Until now, while basing arguments on Article 6 of the NPT, nuclear disarmament efforts have emphasized that all countries should be obliged to undertake the endeavor, not just nuclear-weapon states. This emphasis meant that nuclear disarmament penalized the tendency to make it a problem of countries that possess them. While this report is premised on that, it sets down a new, clear message that “States have differentiated roles and functions” (Section 41). In particular, it notes that, “non-nuclear-weapon States have a role in promoting global nuclear disarmament” (Section 42). Furthermore, in regard to “the role of non-nuclear-weapon States

under extended nuclear deterrence guarantees” such as Japan, it points out their role “in challenging the status and attached to nuclear weapons” (Section 44).

Japan and Korea’s adoption of policies for establishing a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Northeast Asia perfectly conforms to the arguments given by the UN OEWG, because it means the shift by non-nuclear-weapon states away from the present policy of assigning status and value to nuclear weapons while moving toward a new cooperative security. The Japanese government’s stance that “nuclear umbrella” policies and “nuclear disarmament” policies do not conflict will become more and more disparate with the explicit messages being sent by international conferences (written September 16th).

*1 The English text and Japanese translation are in the RECNA citizen’s database.

*2 An advance copy of the entire text (English) dated September 3rd distributed prior to the United Nations General Assembly and a Japanese translation of the main sections are in the RECNA citizen’s database.

2013 Nagasaki Peace Declaration* The Frustrations of Nagasaki, a Victim of the Atomic Bomb

Satoshi HIROSE (RECNA Vice Director)



(A panel placed at the main gate of Nagasaki University, explaining the damage inflicted by the A-bomb on the Ohashi Branch of Nagasaki Mitsubishi Armory, which is now a part of campus of Nagasaki University)

Perhaps there were many people who felt the content of the Nagasaki Peace Declaration of 2013 was specific and bold. What particularly drew attention was the fact that it strongly criticized the Japanese government’s decision not to agree the joint statement on the inhumanity of nuclear weapons at the Preparatory Committee for the NPT Review Conference in 2013, just like at the Preparatory Committee and the United Nations General Assembly in 2012, as

well as the fact that there was a clear opposition to the government policy on promoting talks for concluding an nuclear cooperation agreement between Japan and India. In addition, the declaration showed an outright concern over the accident at the Fukushima No. 1 nuclear power plant.

Japan, which is the only country to have been bombed, has yet to indicate a clear posture of agreement with discussions involving the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons that are quickly gaining support in the international community. The reason is the “bread-and-butter theory” that the nuclear umbrella cast by the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty is effective and necessary against real threats from nuclear weapons in nearby nations. The argument written in the joint statement submitted at the Preparatory Committee for the NPT Review Conference last year that “nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances” was a renouncement of retaliation with nuclear weapons against nuclear attack by an enemy, and its incompatibility with the existing nuclear deterrent strategy was Japan’s reason for not supporting the joint statement. However, whether it is retaliation or not, in reality the use of nuclear weapons leads to consequences that directly and indirectly cause lethal and profound injury to many people without discrimination. It is precisely because Nagasaki has been the victim of an atomic bomb that this declaration is full of vexation toward the Japanese government’s stance of constantly trying to stress the necessity of nuclear weapons without looking squarely at the dire consequences. When the nuclear deterrent strategy which Japanese government is attempting to justify

from the perspective of the security of state is put into action, from the standpoint of the citizens who are sacrificed, “humanity” is an assertion that attempts to declare dissent against the gravity of the consequences, not the justification of that strategy.*1

In regard to talks on a nuclear cooperation agreement between Japan and India, no doubt the precedent of the negotiations on a nuclear cooperation agreement between the United States and India will be useful. In the United States, the jury is still out over the nuclear cooperation agreement with India. Not only that, but critics say there is a considerable difference between India and the United States over the interpretation of the agreement. Even if countries such as India that refuse to join the NPT and continue with development of nuclear weapons restricted their use to peaceful means, would the attempt to promote cooperation in the nuclear energy field bring a positive outcome to the abolition of nuclear weapons? Moreover, if the Japan-India nuclear cooperation agreement is concluded and hypothetically speaking in the future some country tries to conclude the same agreement with North Korea and existing sanctions are lifted by the UN Security Council, on what grounds could Japan protest? It is only natural that questions are raised against the promotion of talks without first solving these kinds of various issues. There are probably many citizens concerned over the rush to negotiations with India through hasty judgment out of pursuit for economic gains.

Victims of the atomic bombing are aging and many have already passed away. As was stated in the declaration, we are the last generation to hear the voices of the atomic bomb victims firsthand. It is unacceptable that the memories of the horrors of the atomic bomb fade with time, but the fading of memories is undeniable. When humans forget the mistakes of the past, they repeat them. Before it is too late, we must expedite the total abolition of nuclear weapons. This year’s declaration overflows with that frustration.

* Refer to the translations of the Nagasaki Peace Declaration available in English, French, Chinese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, and Dutch on the following URL.

<http://www.city.nagasaki.lg.jp/peace/japanese/appeal/pdf/index.html>

*1 The Japanese government agreed with the joint statement on the inhumanity of nuclear weapons for the first time during The First Committee of the UN General Assembly in October 2013.

New Staff

Associate Professor (Part-time)



TOMIZUKA, Akira
Associate Professor (part-time)
Faculty of Environmental Studies
Ph.D in Environmental Science

Visiting Researcher

SHIJO, Chie
Visiting Researcher
Ph.D in Social and Cultural Studies

TAKAYAMA, Makoto
Visiting Researcher
Ph.D. in Sociology

Retired

Professor (Part-time)

HIMENO, Jun'ichi
Professor (part-time)