

Nagasaki special citizens' seminar: Commemorating the publication of the Japanese-language version of *Nagasaki: Life After Nuclear War* by Susan Southard

Keiko Nakamura (Associate Professor, RECNA)

There is a book for which the author spent 12 years studying the lives of many atomic bomb survivors and carefully tracing the deep scars of the atomic bomb that the city of Nagasaki suffered. It's *Nagasaki: Life After Nuclear War* (2015). The fact that the author is a native-born American will undoubtedly surprise many people.

In commemoration of the publication of this book in Japanese, on November 10, 2019, a special citizens' seminar, "Facing History: Lessons from Nagasaki," was held at the Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Museum Hall, and the author, Susan Southard, was the keynote speaker. (Organized by: PCU-NC; with cooperation from: Misuzu Shobo; supported by: Nagasaki Prefecture, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki University, RECNA, Nagasaki Foundation for the Promotion of Peace, and Nagasaki Global Citizens' Assembly for Elimination of Nuclear Weapons). About 200 citizens of all ages participated.

In her keynote speech, Southard talked about how she came to face the problems of nuclear weapons and the atomic bomb, starting at the age of 16 when she came to Japan as an exchange student, visiting the Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Museum, and later meeting the late atomic bomb survivor Sumiteru Taniguchi, a symbol of Nagasaki.

In her speech, she repeatedly emphasized the importance of "remember and tell others." Many people regard the atomic bombings 75 years ago as nothing more than "an abstract event that occurred long ago." In

the United States, in particular, there is a widely shared justification that the bombings ended the war and saved one million American lives. To change that situation, she urged, and face the world today in which nuclear weapons exist, we need to know the "truth" of what happened "under the mushroom cloud." "Everyone must know and remember the experiences of atomic bomb survivors. Because it's part of our shared history," she said.

RECNA Visiting Professor and Akutagawa Prize-winning author Yuichi Seirai and children's book author and poet Arthur Binard took part in the discussion in the latter half of the symposium, which was moderated by Professor Fumihiko Yoshida, director of RECNA. The themes were deep and varied, including how they got into their present jobs as creatives, the relationship between fiction and non-fiction, the relationship between their lives and atomic bomb survivors, and what is important in considering the inheritance of the atomic bomb survivor experience. High school students in the venue also asked questions. The discussion, which revealed the warm personalities of the panelists, had a friendly atmosphere from beginning to end, with occasional laughter from the audience. The long line of people outside waiting to have Southard sign their books at the end also was impressive.

Videos of the keynote speech and the discussion can be found [here](#).



Ms. Susan Southard at the Seminar
(Atomic Bomb Museum Hall, November 10, 2019, photo by PCU- NC)

Pope Francis's visit to the atomic bombing site

Chie Shijo (Visiting Researcher, School of Global Humanities and Social Sciences, Nagasaki University)

On the occasion of Pope Francis's visit to Japan from November 23–26, 2019, RECNA put together a policy paper entitled, "Pope Francis: A Message from the Atomic Bombing Site," and released it on February 4, 2020. Three researchers, two from RECNA, reviewed the significance of the visit. A concise summary of the contents is introduced below. Firstly, RECNA Vice Director Prof. Satoshi Hirose indicates, within the broad context of international politics, the potential impacts on global nuclear arms reduction and non-proliferation of the stances taken by successive generations of popes and Pope Francis himself. Dr. Hibiki Yamaguchi, Visiting Researcher at RECNA, noting a perception gap between the Pope and the Abe administration with regard to the atomic bombs and nuclear weapons, is conducting a study of the visit's meaning for Japan's nuclear policy. Lastly, within Nagasaki's regional and historical context, my paper made comparisons between this visit and the visit 38 years ago of the then Pope John Paul II, and studies the impact of this visit mainly upon the Catholic Church. Though the number of authors was only three, we reviewed the significance of the visit in the contexts of international politics, Japanese politics, and the Nagasaki Catholic church. These analyses are released relatively earlier than other analyses on this visit

The unique characteristics of Pope Francis's visit to the Atomic bombing site lay in the specificity of his message solely focused on nuclear weapons and in his plea for everyone to participate. The policy papers opened with, "making this ideal a reality requires the involvement of everyone", and "our response to the threat of



Pope Francis at his visit to Nagasaki (Photo courtesy of Nagasaki City)

nuclear weapons must be joint and concerted", quoting partly from the "Address of the Holy Father on Nuclear Weapons" delivered at the Atomic Bomb Hypocenter Park in Nagasaki. In the atomic bombed city of Nagasaki, the Pope certainly delivered the powerful message that had been expected by the city, the Catholic Church and Nagasaki's citizens. But after the lapse of two months, mass media opportunities to take up his words have largely faded away. So that the visit will not be simply a one-off event, RECNA is drawing attention to its significance by publishing the policy paper in hopes that it may be a spur to action.

Nagasaki special citizens' seminar: US Tactical Nuclear Weapons in Asia: Past Present and Future

Tatsujiro Suzuki (Vice Director, RECNA)

On January 11, 2020 (Saturday), a special citizens' seminar on "US Tactical Nuclear Weapons in Asia: Past, Present and Future" was held (sponsored by PCU-NC), to which was invited Dr. Gregory Kulacki, who is China Project Manager of the US NGO Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) and RECNA Visiting Fellow conducting research in Japan from this fiscal year. A video of his lecture and handouts are available on the PCU-NC's Website. (See the endnote *)

Reflecting on his life, Dr. Kulacki explained the international situation surrounding nuclear weapons in the Cold War and background to his research career spent in China as a researcher specializing in that country's nuclear strategy. He further talked about the overview, objectives and characteristics of the activities of UCS, to which he is affiliated.

He then reported on US nuclear strategy and the US-Japan relationship, which is the reason why he started to live and research in Japan. He pointed out the fact

that Japan has urged the US to strengthen extended nuclear deterrence (the so-called nuclear umbrella) and ended up impeding nuclear disarmament by the US. The Nuclear Posture Review conducted by the Trump administration led to the decision to promote the development of lower-yield and easier to use nuclear weapons under a "modernization program," and he emphasized the point that since this plan is also supported by Japan this expanded nuclear deterrence might heighten the risk of the use of nuclear weapons.

The highlight of this special citizens' seminar was an examination of the viability of "nuclear deterrence," based on a detailed review of China's nuclear strategy and analysis of the Korean War and Taiwan Strait Crises. The basis of China's strategy is "maintenance of the minimum nuclear force necessary for defense," and "no preemptive strikes under any circumstances." These points are not explicitly recognized, but this analysis unique to Dr. Kulacki, who is fluent in Chinese, drew attention. In the case studies of the Korean War and Taiwan Strait Crises, "the risk of nuclear war was high-

er than in the Cuban Missile Crisis,” according to Prof. Thomas Schelling, but fortunately the Chinese side requested talks and the U.S. side acquiesced, somehow abating the danger.

As became clear from these examples, “the US (and Japan) believe China will back down when threatened by use of nuclear weapons.” but “China believes it can retaliate and that the US threat is a ‘paper tiger,’” with the conclusion that “the US ‘nuclear deterrence’ has not necessarily been demonstrated against China.” Furthermore, Dr. Kulacki claimed that “the US (and Japan) believe China won’t retaliate if they are attacked with low-yield nuclear weapons,” but this too has not been verified, and though the advent of the Trump administration raises the risk, Japanese supportive policy was analyzed in critical terms.

Finally, Dr. Kulacki noted the following about Japanese government problems and roles of civil society. To suppress communism, the US could even have support Japan armed with nuclear weapons. The Japanese government’s stance on how to strengthen nuclear deterrence is critically important for reducing tensions in Northeast Asia and its nuclear disarmament, he said.

Not only in Northeast Asia, the risk of nuclear war has become extremely high. At the end of the lecture, Dr. Kulacki brought up the fact that at the Carnegie International Nuclear Policy Conference hosted by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace experts were asked if the use of nuclear weapons could ever be justified and 43 % of them answered “yes.” He therefore concluded that the US nuclear experts were no longer capable of adequately implementing nuclear disarmament and non-



Dr. Gregory Kulacki at the Seminar
(Nagasaki National Peace Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims Lounge, January 11, 2020, photo by PCU-NC)

proliferation policies. The most important element in achieving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation is the bombed sites of Nagasaki and Hiroshima and the hibakusha. The presentation ended with a plea for hibakusha-centered “civil society” to play an important role.

Following the seminar, Dr. Kulacki also participated in the “Talk with RECNA” session for an off-the-record exchange of views, and engaged in fruitful exchanges of opinions with the seminar participants and RECNA staff. In addition, prior to the seminar, he attended a roundtable dialogue with the RECNA staff as well as dialogue with the students.

* A video of the lecture and handouts are available [here](#).

Promulgation of Japan-ROK proposal for a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone (NEA-NWFZ) (Japanese, English)

Fumihiko Yoshida (Director, RECNA)

In our previous newsletter issued on September 30, 2019, we made note of a joint ROK-Japan workshop entitled, “From Peace on Korean Peninsula to Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone,” held on June 1–2, 2019 by RECNA and the Sejong Institute, an influential South Korean thinktank. We also reported that, referring to the debate at the workshop, RECNA and the Sejong Institute, in conjunction with the two co-chairs of the PSNA, compiled and made public a policy proposal on the basic theme of “From Peace on the Korean Peninsula to a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone.”

RECNA thereafter had the English version translated, and in December of that year prepared and published a proposal document entitled, “Policy Proposal: From Peace on the Korean Peninsula to a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone.” An English language version and Japanese language version are available. This is a lengthy proposal of about 90 pages, and can be downloaded from Nagasaki University’s Academic Output SITE. (See the endnote **)

In March 2015 RECNA published a proposal entitled, “A Comprehensive Approach to a Northeast Asia Nuclear

Weapon-Free Zone.” In order to achieve the establishment of such a zone, we pointed out the necessity of such comprehensive approaches as peaceful termination of the Korean War, establishment of a permanent Northeast Asia Security Council, and assurance of rights to access all forms of energy, including nuclear energy. In the proposal, we adopt a stance where these approaches will give even more reality toward the establishment of a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone.

The December 2019 policy proposal followed on the basic concept. Not only that, this policy proposal clearly incorporates the real situations including the agreement made at the 2018 Inter-Korean Summit, and the US-DPRK Summit and US-DPRK working-level talks based on the aforementioned agreements. With regard to the Korean War that ended in a truce, for example, with a view to moving toward a peace treaty, the proposal strongly urges the steady fulfillment of the Panmunjom Declaration, and Agreement on the Implementation of the Historic Panmunjom Declaration in the Military Domain agreed between the South and North Korea along with the Pyongyang Joint Declaration of September 2018. To contribute to the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula, a change in the North-South conventional

force structure, specific measures to reduce mutual threats and other measures were also proposed.

Diplomatic talks toward denuclearization are highly unpredictable, but we hope our policy proposals and future

research activities to contribute to the process.

** An [English language version](#) and [Japanese language version](#) of the proposal are available from Nagasaki University's Academic Output SITE.

RECNA Holds “Nagasaki Atomic Bombing and Postwar History Research Society” Symposium

Taeko Kiriya (Visiting Researcher, RECNA)

RECNA held an open symposium titled “What should our inheritance be? Findings from the study of Nagasaki's atomic bombing and postwar history” on Saturday, February 15, 2020, at Nagasaki University's Bunkyo Campus. This symposium was held as part of the compilation Nagasaki Atomic Bombing and Postwar History Research Society, which has been hosted by RECNA since 2017, and it was that society's first open symposium. The event was a success, with as many as 75 people participating.

At the beginning, Dr. Taeko Kiriya, a visiting researcher at RECNA, who has been working as a founding member of the society, explained the intent behind and purpose of the society's establishment. Next, she gave an introduction to the society, which has met five times, and finally, she stated the objective of the comprehensive symposium. The objective of this symposium was to consider the question of “What should we preserve?” when considering the inheritance of the atomic bomb/atomic bombing experience with a view to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Past discussion of inheritance has tended to focus on “how” we should do so, and you could say that this was a new point of view.

In the first part, four researchers gave lectures on the theme of “inheritance.” First, Dr. Chie Shijo of Nagasaki University, gave a report titled “Inheritance: From an archival perspective.” She pointed out the historical fact that postwar historical materials were scattered and ultimately lost in Nagasaki, talked about the importance of collecting, preserving and utilizing materials related to

the atomic bombing, and said that it was also necessary to consider the materials when considering “inheritance.” Next, Dr. Naohiro Fukaya of Fukushima University gave a report on “The practice of passing down and the formation of an ideology of the atomic bomb experience in Nagasaki.” Dr. Fukaya pointed out that what should be inherited and what memories are recalled or valued vary depending on the times. Touching on the fact that there are parts that cannot be retrieved in the social context, he reported that what is important in a legacy is not creating a manual or standardization, but the personality of the speaker, and that through this personality, the receiver will empathize with the speaker and they will be able to sense what they must pass on to others. The third reporter, Dr. Masaya Nemoto of Meijigakuin University, reported on “What has not been inherited,” which can be seen from the results of a survey of atomic bomb victims conducted by the Japan Confederation of A- and H-Bomb Sufferers Organizations in 2015, the year that marked the 70th anniversary of the atomic bombings. Dr. Nemoto pointed out that when he asked atomic bomb survivors “What are you dwelling on?” many answered that they were concerned that “Japan will become a country that can go to war again.” What atomic bomb survivors are expressing is not only that they are opposed to nuclear weapons, but also to war. It is necessary to think about what is not inherited and what should be inherited, he added. Finally, Kiriya presented a report titled “What can be seen from the study of Nagasaki's atomic bombing and postwar history.” Kiriya pointed out that during her inter-



Panelists at the Symposium (Nagasaki University Bunkyo Campus, February 15, 2020, photo by RECNA)

views with hibakusha in Nagasaki and Okinawa over the past few years, she came across an “inheritance problem.” She pointed out that beyond the history of those people in a position to have their stories recorded, there are still many people who should be able to tell their stories, and she said it is important to dig up those stories. She also said there is history that should never be painted with a single color.

In the second part of the symposium, two commentators, Mr. Takeshi Shinki and Ms. Satomi Tominaga, commented on atomic bombing testimonies, interviews and the inheritance of experiences. The four panelists from the first part responded to the discussion topics

before moving on to discussion with the audience. People working on the practice of “inheritance” in various settings were gathered in the venue, and many questions were asked and lively discussions were held based on their issues and interests.

Finally, Professor Tatsujiro Suzuki, RECNA Vice Director, proposed that the Nagasaki Atomic Bombing and Postwar History Research Society should be developed into a Nuclear Heritage and Nuclear Policy Research Society to analyze the interaction between nuclear policy and social practices related to nuclear weapons. This brought the symposium to an end.

Does the Chair’s Report of the Group of Eminent Persons Build Bridges to Nuclear Disarmament?

Masao Tomonaga (Visiting Professor, RECNA, Member of Group of Eminent Persons)

Introduction

In 2017, Japanese Foreign Minister Fumiko Kishida set up the Group of Eminent Persons for Substantive Advancement of Nuclear Disarmament because he was concerned about the criticism from many countries of the Japanese government for refusing to sign and ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and the dissatisfaction of the Japanese people. The Group held a total of five meetings and delivered the results to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the form of a report by Professor Takashi Shiraishi, the Chair, at the final meeting in November 2019.

Originally, the Foreign Minister Kishida had asked the Group to propose a “bridge building” policy to overcome the gap regarding nuclear disarmament. It is necessary to explain to the public, who are strongly opposed to the government’s rejection of the treaty, how the output became a Chair’s Report instead of a policy proposal. The Group first aimed at making a proposal and wrestled with a number of issues, but as the debate progressed, the more issues to be resolved in the stagnation and division over nuclear disarmament were discussed, the more difficult it became to converge on one policy proposal.

Subsequently it was proposed and agreed that the report should consist of the Chair’s faithful record of all committee members’ anonymous comments on each of the following six hard questions they had converged on. This is the result of everyone’s belief that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ thorough consideration of a number of hard questions in international nuclear disarmament diplomacy would be most helpful in overcoming the gap. Regarding the hard questions that are the reason for the divide, the Group wanted to advance discussion and deepen mutual understanding between nuclear states (including nuclear umbrella allies) and the non-nuclear states (including civil society) in accordance with the mutual respect and decorum that the Group places the greatest importance on and to give the Ministry of Foreign Affairs an opportunity to take the lead in discussing common policies that could be agreed upon in the future.

Since receiving the report from the Group, the min-

istry has not announced how it will deal with and advance future nuclear disarmament policies, including the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. This form of discussing international policy issues over which there is conflict is called track 1.5 meetings, and it includes representatives from civil society and experts in addition to government representatives from opposing countries. While differing positions sometimes lead to serious conflicts of ideas, it is important to first build a foundation for understanding each other’s positions, deepen mutual understanding of the points of conflict accurately, and search for future policy compromises that will enable calm dialogue and lead to the realization of bridge building. Dialogue and confidence-building, which are emphasized by the Group, serve as the most fundamental basis for overcoming hard questions. I have heard that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is currently considering holding the conferences in Hiroshima and Nagasaki I suggested in the meetings’ kick-off talk as track 1.5 meetings, and I am quite hopeful about this.

Hard questions

The Group formulated the following major agenda items to build a bridge between the proponents of deterrence and proponents of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. For details, see Chair’s Report [here](#).

1. The right to self-defense with nuclear weapons: Is the use of nuclear weapons by a state in a crisis threatening its survival illegal or not? (a hard question on which the 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) failed to reach a conclusion)
2. The Role of Nuclear Weapons: Should the only remaining role of nuclear weapons be to deter the use of other nuclear weapons? (Seeking a security policy to overcome the argument of nuclear deterrence and the nuclear umbrella)
3. Connection to international humanitarian law: If there is a threat which, in theory, could justify the threat of and use of nuclear weapons against it, is there a possibility that the use of nuclear weapons would comply with international humanitarian law?

4. Nuclear risk reduction and confidence-building measures: How can we identify and reduce the risks associated with nuclear deterrence policy (nuclear war, unexpected explosions)? What transparency measures (against nuclear states and non-nuclear states) by nuclear states can contribute to improving the security environment leading to confidence-building for nuclear disarmament?
5. The process of nuclear disarmament without undermining international security: Are there any effective benchmarks for ensuring progress in nuclear disarmament (the number of nuclear warheads, etc.)? To what extent can non-nuclear military capabilities be alternatives to nuclear deterrence? How can non-NPT states be brought into nuclear disarmament discussions and processes (Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea)?
6. Maintaining a world without nuclear weapons: How can the international community maintain peace and stability after eliminating nuclear weapons? How would monitoring and enforcement work in a world without nuclear weapons? How can the international community ensure and, if needed, enforce compliance by states (effective cessation of nuclear proliferation)?

All of the above six hard questions must be resolved in the end in order to advance nuclear disarmament. The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is based on a premise that denies many of these hard questions, and the main cause of the current division is the failure to obtain the consent of nuclear states. As long as this division continues, total abolition of nuclear weapons will be impossible.

In this article, I would like to consider a concrete plan of how to overcome the policy of nuclear deterrence, which is one of the largest among these hard questions. The strategies of the United States and the Soviet Union, which maintained their nuclear deterrence policies and overcame the Cold War era, did not result in a nuclear war that began with a third nuclear explosion. Many researchers believe the policy of nuclear deterrence is effective, but some believe its effectiveness was a matter of luck. On the other hand, the nuclear deterrence theory

of the Cold War era will not necessarily be effective today. The destruction of military targets by low-yield sea-launched cruise missiles (SLBMs), which the United States and Russia are aiming for with their nuclear postures, while avoiding inhumane explosions, is far from the mutually assured destruction of the Cold War era. In this way, nuclear disarmament itself is changing, and there is a possibility that the form of security between opposing countries will naturally change. Consequently, the theory of nuclear deterrence, which is a prerequisite for international security, may change in the future. The multilateral security framework, including the United States, Russia and China, needs to be re-examined, including the reduction in yield and modernization of nuclear weapons and the evolution of conventional weapons (prioritization of small hypersonic missiles). The situation is likely to continue where all these hard questions cannot be solved if we think they will be solved all at once if the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is ratified and enters into force.

With regard to these hard questions, given that the Group's primary mission is to make policy recommendations to advance substantive nuclear disarmament, it is necessary to consider a new level of nuclear disarmament based on a review of the current conditions of nuclear weapons, in response to the development of a new phase of nuclear disarmament, including the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Under these circumstances, we cannot be optimistic about a world without nuclear weapons, and nuclear states must seek a new multilateral disarmament regime and a new treaty. Non-nuclear states must also work hard to expand the coverage of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZ) and negative security assurance. The Chair's Report of the Group of Eminent Persons discusses in detail hard questions such as whether a country facing a crisis threatening its survival has the right to defend itself with nuclear weapons. The report is full of essential information not only for the Japanese government but also for building a multilateral scheme for the world for nuclear disarmament in the next stage. The ultimate task of human security, the survival of humanity, cannot be forever influenced by the division between those possessing and not possessing nuclear weapons.

Nagasaki Youth Delegation Activities up to now

Nagasaki Youth Delegation

From their appointment in December 2019 to the present, the Eighth Nagasaki Youth Delegation members have been obtaining a range of knowledge via study sessions with RECNA faculty members and peace activists in Nagasaki. More specifically, we have learned about the reality of the radiation exposure by the atomic bombing in 1945 the history of nuclear weapons development, Nagasaki's atomic bomb remains, the present world situation related to nuclear weapons, war history, treaties including NPT and TPNW, citizen groups for nuclear weapon abolition, nuclear power plants, and others. We'll have study

groups until our New York visit, continuing deepen our knowledge.

Over a 3-day period in mid-February, we heard talks by Hiroshima Peace Institute faculty members and visited the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, which was among the five sites we visited during the period. The people we encountered at those locations were taking initiatives for denuclearization by various means and with a variety of concepts. Though our objective of "realizing a world without nuclear weapons" was shared, we understand there's no single correct path to its attain-

ment. We're also thinking through what kind of the action we want to take to abolish nuclear weapons every day. The various initiatives we encountered in Hiroshima gave us wider options for actions, thereby making us think more flexibly.

Including hearing to the proceedings of the NPT Review Conference, we are presently formulating plans for activities in New York. Here we introduce the two possibilities we now have in mind. The first plan is creation of a forum where governments, NGO groups and young people can hold dialog. One of the benefits to be dispatched to the NPT Review Conference is that we can see things with our own eyes and hear things with our own ears. We hope to have a real-life experience of the international situation through direct dialogue with government representatives of nuclear states, non-nuclear states and nations under the nuclear umbrellas

Further, interaction with NGOs and young people seeking abolition of nuclear weapons is planned. Despite

differences in nationality, language and culture, to meet and connect with people sharing same aspiration is important for everyone to have a sense of ownership of nuclear weapons issues; in other words, to make them global issues. The second plan is convening a side event at United Nations Headquarters, an event that governments, NGOs and others can sponsor. Conducted in parallel with the NPT Review Conference, the side events would be held at New York's UN headquarters. We're now discussing the side event concept further at regular meetings. What we currently understand is that the atomic bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 caused irreversible damages to the lives of every victims, and that the lives of every one of us living at this moment are threatened with the global inventory of approx. 14,000 nuclear weapons which are more powerful than before. Based on the above current understanding, we hope the side event will focus on "the lifetime of a person" and "humans as living things."



**Members of the Nagasaki Youth Delegation during their study tour in Hiroshima
(February 14, 2020, photo by Nagasaki Youth Delegation)**

(Unfortunately, due to the global pandemic of Corona Virus, the NPT Review Conference scheduled for April and May this year is postponed and the planned visit to New York by the Nagasaki Youth Delegation is cancelled. We are now considering possible alternatives for the cancelled visit to the NPT Review Conference.)