

# **From Workshops and Forums in Nagasaki (August 8)**

## **Forum: Dialogue between Government Representatives and Grass-Roots Movements -- For a Nuclear Weapon-Free, Peaceful and Just World (Nakabe Auditorium, Nagasaki University)**

### **Panel Presentation:**

#### **Mohd Arshad Mansoor Hussain Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the UN in Vienna**

Thank you Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am privileged to be here to share my thoughts with you. I have prepared a written text, but as this is a discussion and I am a panelist, I want to share my view with you in a very frank manner. This is my first experience coming to a conference of this nature. In fact this is the first time that I come to Japan, and I am impressed with the number of people are aware and are fighting, struggling for an end to nuclear weapons we have in this world.

While I must congratulate everyone who is involved in this noble objective, it seems to me that there is still a long long way to go. It is 62 years since the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In there 62 years, what have we achieved? Well, one thing for sure what you have achieved is that you have prevented another bomb. That result, if you ask me, is a very big achievement. But is that our ideal? I think that's only 50% of our ideal. The most important thing is that we abolish all nuclear weapons from this world. And on that score, I, regretfully, can only give you half the mark, because the success story -- what you have achieved and what the world has achieved -- is nothing compared to what you want. That's the sorry state of our facts today.

And whom do we blame? Well, it is easy to point your finger at everyone. But if would have a referendum on this issue in the world today -- given the whole world's population and if you have a referendum where everybody gets a chance to vote, I am sure the overwhelming answer of the majority of the people of this world will be "No to nuclear weapons." But unfortunately that's not the way that the world is, and we are consisting of 170 or 180 odd governments, and it is governments that have a role, that have a say in what ordinary people like you and me can think about, can decide. And this is where the crux of all the problems lies.

Even in Japan, I see a majority of people saying NO to nuclear weapons. The Japanese Government, too, is as a matter of policy, says NO to nuclear weapons. But when you come to the U.N. or the IAEA and all that, -- I've been frank and I am speaking as an ordinary individual, not as a representative from Malaysia -- and how does Japan vote? Japan votes together with the West. And in this case, it is mostly with the nuclear weapons states. So there is a long way for you to go. And the mindset of the people need to be changed. There are five nuclear weapons states plus another three -- India, Israel and Pakistan -- now, that become eight nuclear weapons states.

We need to talk of the five, while other three are undeclared. Now these five more or less control the thinking in all these international agencies. Whether in the IAEA or in the U.N., wherever this issue comes up, they are FOR the status quo. Nobody wants to change the status quo. And 9.11 has made it even worse. After 9.11, some governments, particularly, the only superpower left in the world, thinks that nuclear weapons is a MUST -- no longer a deterrent, it is a necessity.

So, how do we go from here? While you are all in the right path, and you have to carry on what you are doing, I must say there is a long, hard, rocky way ahead. And I can say from my own experience -- I've been one year now in Vienna and I have attended a number of Board of Governors meetings and number of IAEA conferences --, and I can tell you that when it comes to, for example, Israeli nuclear capabilities -- now everybody knows that Israel has got nuclear weapons -- when NAM and other states members want to take up this issue for discussion, just to discuss the issue, -- you know that the prime minister of Israel publicly admitted that they have nuclear weapons -- when you are to take this up at the IAEA for discussion, there is a big "NO". You can't even discuss it. And who is behind all this? The West. Developing countries like Malaysia, we are FOR this global ideal. NAM is for this global ideal. We also stand for peaceful uses of nuclear energy. But in the same time, we stand for nuclear disarmament,

for non-proliferation. But when the matter is brought up for discussion, or put on the agenda, they straightaway get together and decide not even to discuss the issue, putting the wood on the issue. So this is how the things are in the U.N., and the IAEA. They just want to push things under the carpet -- "Let's not talk about it."

Now, is this how we want? Obviously this is not what is required. What is required is for governments to change the idea, the whole setup, the whole thinking about nuclear weapons. This is only a part of your objectives. Persuasion, peaceful demonstrations, exhibitions, and when more and more people join, hopefully one fine day -- maybe I will live long enough to see that day -- disarmament is seriously pursued. Right now, disarmament in the world is only given a lip service. And lip service -- well, everybody says, "Yes, we are doing disarmament", but out of 10 if you take only 1, that is not disarmament. There should be verifiable disarmament among all the nuclear weapons states. That's not happening.

As I said, my theme today, my message to you ladies and gentlemen, is that you've got a long long way ahead. And with that, I think I should stop here, and I will come back later if I have any questions. Thank you very much.

**Walid Ahmed Haggag**  
**First Secretary, Embassy of the Arab**  
**Republic of Egypt in Japan**

It is a great honor for me to be in Nagasaki. This is actually my second time to participate in the World Conference. I participated in the World Conference in Hiroshima two years ago, which was really a major event, because it coincided with the 60th anniversary of the attacks, and therefore, it was really a very honorable event, and I thought extremely privileged to participate in it, as I do here today. Especially I consider myself very lucky to be sitting here in such a distinguished panel, given my junior rank and relatively young age, so I really appreciate being here, and having a chance to speak with you.

I just have a few points to make, and there is really not much to add after the ambassador of Malaysia spoke, but if you allow me to just a few brief points.

First of all, I would like to really talk about you. You are gathering here at this World Conference. Many of you have come last year and years before, and I expect most of you will come next year and years after that again, again, and again, until we have no jobs to accomplish. I suspect we will be here for many more years. But you may ask yourselves, I'm sure, like how tangible is the job you are doing. It IS very tangible. Many of you may think that the decision always lies with the

governments or the member states. Perhaps it does. The way the world is set up between nation states, the governments are the ones who have the executive power to make decisions. But you as the NGOs, as the activists, as the advocates, believe me you are playing very tangible role, and your efforts and your conferences and rallies do make a difference. So I just want to voice my admirations for all of you for what you are doing. I'd really let you know that we as friendly governments stand behind you 100%, and we will continue to do so.

I think another important point that we have to do is that when we talk about nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament, we should really try and understand the NPT, because the NPT, Egypt believes, is and will always be the cornerstone of our efforts in the international community to achieve the goal of complete nuclear disarmament. The NPT is the primary international regime that addresses this issue. And we should always say it again, again and again, that the NPT never, ever, ever designed to allow the five nuclear powers to maintain their nuclear capabilities and remain as nuclear weapon states. When we all designed the NPT, it was set up as a transitional arrangement, whereby everyone else would forswear the rights to acquire nuclear weapons on the condition that the nuclear weapon states would reduce their arsenals with the view to their total abolition. So this is the grand bargain that we all agreed to. And we can't come now and only seek to achieve nuclear disarmament as if it is a favor we are asking of the nuclear weapon states. It's not a favor; it's not a request. It's not even something that we seek from them in return for something else. "No, we are very sorry, this is something that you pledged to do when we all acceded to the NPT. And you as nuclear weapon states have a legal obligation to disarm, to take practical steps to reach that goal. So you are not doing as a favor. You are implementing what you promised to implement, and what we all agreed to in a legally-binding instrument." So that's the first point to understand that this is not a favor we are seeking from them. This is something they must do by themselves legally in front of the whole international community.

The second point is that we are at a very important crossroads, especially again since 9.11, but actually even before that. Before 9.11, there have been attempts by the nuclear weapon states to backtrack on their obligations and to backtrack on implementing what we expect of them under the NPT. This has especially been evident in the last one or two NPT Review Conferences, where not only were the nuclear weapon states reluctant and refusing to go forward in the process, because the review process means reviewing and moving forward. They even didn't want to agree to their past commitments. So even they refused to

remain static and acknowledge that they do have commitments to the NPT that are legally-binding and there are obligations that they must implement. Again this is something else we have to understand, and I think we have to nip it in the bud before it's piled out of control, because it becomes harder and harder not only to move forward, but actually to maintain the position where we are now, and to have them abide at least on paper with their previous commitments that were entered into in previous review conferences, especially the 1995 Review Conference and the 2000 Review Conference. So we do have an opportunity again as we begin the 2010 Review cycle to really make this point known that backtracking and backsliding is not acceptable. On the contrary, a review process is something that should move forward. It shouldn't remain static or regress backwards.

Another point that I would like to make is that again, actually after 9.11, the focus by some nuclear weapon states has shifted dramatically on the issues of non-proliferation, and putting on the side on the backbone of the issues of nuclear disarmament. Again, with all due respect, and we believe that of course non-proliferation is very important. But it's not everything. Non-proliferation is only one pillar of the NPT. You should not focus on that especially at the expense of the primary pillar, which is disarmament, because at the very end of the day, you cannot proliferate something that does not exist in the first place. You get rid of nuclear weapons, and then nobody would be able to be a threat or a concern, possible source of proliferation. The logic has to be reversed. And this is again a fundamental, very simple straightforward point that we should never get bored of repeating again, again and again that it's not all about nuclear proliferation or potential threat of terrorists acquiring weapons of mass destruction, or Iran, or North Korea or anybody else. That's very important, but with all due respect, if you do not have nuclear weapons to begin with, nobody else can proliferate them in the future.

So, it's important to disarm the nuclear weapon states ideologically, as it is important to disarm them of their ICBMs, their warheads and Trident submarines and all that. Of course, that is the goal, but to do so you disarm them ideologically of these ideas and fallacies that they perpetuate, which make it easier and more comfortable for them to maintain their nuclear arsenals. Disarm them ideologically, morally and show them that this is unacceptable and untenable.

Ambassador Hussain spoke of the situation in the Middle East, and without wanting to repeat him, but as a representative of Egypt I feel I must. The Middle East is a very important region for all of us. It is my region, it is my home. We have serious nuclear issues in our region. Israel is the

only country that has not acceded to the NPT that has a nuclear arsenal that refuses the IAEA to inspect its nuclear facilities and so forth. This again is a very immediate concern for myself and for my country. So I ask you to support us and join your voice with us. Whenever we talk about nuclear disarmament, please speak about the Middle East. Please support our goal of having a nuclear weapon-free zone in the Middle East. And just a very interesting point here is that, when we think of the Middle East, people immediately seem to think of Iran, before that maybe Iraq, is the main source of concern in the Middle East. That is not so. Israel is the only country that is not a member of the NPT, and it has nuclear weapons. And just as a very small footnote to this -- Egypt has been calling for the establishment of a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Middle East since 1974. We launched a campaign to do so with another primary co-sponsor at that time. That country was Iran. So ever since 1974, Iran and Egypt, surprisingly so, have been working together on the record for that goal.

My last point is that, I was blessed to have a son -- he is not even one year old. But when I talk about nuclear disarmament, it all of a sudden became much real that this is my son's future. And like I said I know all of you would be very keen to come back to Hiroshima and to Nagasaki in the many years to come, but really, if we reach the 100 anniversary of the bombing in 2045, and my son at that time is going to be 38 years old, if we still have the same situation that exists today, that is really unacceptable. We cannot allow that to happen. I cannot imagine 100 years after Hiroshima and Nagasaki where nuclear weapons still exist. Thank you very much for your time.

**Mohamed Ezzeldine Abdel-Moneim  
Special Advisor on Disarmament and  
Strategic Affairs, League of Arab States**

Thanks to the Japan Council against A & H Bombs for the kind invitation. To be in Nagasaki at this time of the year is a great source of inspiration -- to think of issues, which are of the immediate significance for the activities of the peace movement, in Japan and outside.

I will briefly tackle with two issues of immediate concern, which came to the attention of the press or public opinion in Japan and abroad in the last few weeks.

The first relates to a news published three days ago, or as I have read, that there was Japanese aid to U.S. on nuke terrorism. The news says that there is A-bomb data used to develop nuclear weapons. It says that a U.S. anti-nuclear terrorism laboratory has received data from Japanese specialists, who researched at Atomic

bomb survivors and victims of U.S. nuclear testing in the 1950s. This will be done, according to the news, at the Oak Ridge nuclear facility, which was a key site for the Manhattan Project which developed the bombs which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Very important news in fact, but the question is: This comes within the study on the effects of atomic radiation in the broad sense. Why only, the effects of atomic radiation from supposed terrorist activities? Why it came all of a sudden now? Why it was not thought of ten years ago, 15 years ago, 20 years ago? -- Very important question.

Secondly, are the effects of atomic radiation, in the sense of which came in this news two days ago in the Japanese newspaper which I have read in English, are these confined to such devices which might be in the hand of terrorists if ever that happens, or can they also be related to whatever nuclear device, and whatever nuclear explosion? This is a matter of immediate concern, and we have to take it seriously, and we have to contemplate on this issue. Because, the effects of atomic radiation might come at any time, but why now? Is somebody contemplating using bombs as small as they think in the strategic area, as the two bombs dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Why is it now? A very point of important suspicion, but it is a suspicion founded on scientific facts.

The amazing thing now is why should it be outside the context of the United Nations. If we want to that, we negotiate disarmament in the United Nations, if we want that we negotiate non-proliferation on the context of the United Nations. Why not effects of atomic radiation? In fact, one of the committees in the context of the General Assembly of the United Nations has been working, many, many years ago, on an item for long -- I think it's the special political committee --, the effects of atomic radiation. So, there must be comprehensive study, and the study must in the context of the United Nations. The study should not be confined to only two countries. All concerned should participate, and the concern is for all mankind. This is a contemplation to be seen, to be thoroughly studied by the peace movement, where civil society activity can generate government activity, to be translated into United Nations action. That is the first issue.

The second issue is the safety of nuclear reactors. We have read, before coming here, what the earthquake has done. Some damage happened to one major reactor, and this damage actually led some sort of leakage. Once you speak about safety of reactors, you don't only remember what happened in Japan. You remember Three Mile Island, you remember Chernobyl. Very interesting thing about Chernobyl in fact is what Hans Blix, former

Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna revealed, maybe several years after Chernobyl disaster took place. What Blix said was that the problem was the faulty design of the reactor. There was some fault in the design of the reactor, from which he did not anticipate such leakage, which took place upon the fire, which broke out on the reactor.

Some of us -- and this is very justified - might bring the issue of "capitalism and human safety". Because, when you are a capitalist and when you have a project, your religion, your commitment is actually cost-benefit. Now, when you construct a reactor, if you want it more safe, -- this applies not only to reactor but applies to an aircraft, ship or anything--if you want it to be more safe, it is more costly. And in terms of capital game, the question is there. Are you going to pay, and have less benefit? Or are you going to sacrifice humanity's sake, for the sake of capital, which you invest? Very important theme. This does not only apply to nuclear reactors, but it applies to many fields of technology, and finally, it comes to nuclear reactors.

But the important thing that I want to draw on is what Hans Blix says, that it was a faulty design. There might be a faulty design, by mistake, by the limitation of technology available. There might be a faulty design because of the cost-benefit analysis as I talked about. But I think here, there is a gap in the system of the IAEA. If you read the statute that is the basic document, the charter of the IAEA, you will find that there is no distinction between what we call nowadays Agency (IAEA) Safeguards on the one hand, and nuclear safety on the other. The Safeguards regime of the IAEA, from its conception, was designed only for the political purpose of the non-diversion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy into other purposes or military or whatever. But it was designed to seek the human safety in the first place. What happened was that the political consideration prevailed over the human factor. Political prevailed over the human and we know what is behind political, and we know what is for human. And the price, simple people pay. Had the IAEA itself, its international structure -- bureaus, offices, sections and so on -- acted in conformity with its statute, where there should be no distinction at all between the human safety aspect and political non-diversion aspect, the Chernobyl disaster would have been avoided. But in fact, when you have a project of a reactor, you give the design of your reactor to the agency. But you give it to whom? This is the Safeguards Department. The Safeguards Department wants to make sure that there is no possibility of diversion to other purposes, military purposes. They say, "OK, thank God, now we are happy." But what happens at the safety level? That's

another thing.

If this bureaucratic structural gap were not there, certainly, the Chernobyl disaster would have been avoided. Because the agency expressed, it would not have allowed it from the standpoint of human safety in the design of Chernobyl, and said, "No, there is a fault in the reactor. Take care from now. We are not going to put it under the Agency safeguards, we are not going to supply materials for it, we are not going to guarantee for it, unless it is perfectly designed for the sake of human safety. Potentially, this is the area for actions to be contemplated by the peace movement. How can we generate world opinion to support it, and how can we convince governments to act in favor of these actions?"

Actually these are the two points, which I wanted to bring to your attention. Or already you have in your mind is how could we translate into action in the year to come and months to come: but not more than that, action by the peace movement. Other things we can tackle in the discussion. Thank you.

### **Tomas Magnusson International Peace Bureau**

Nuclear abolition is the aim of our meeting here in Nagasaki. But how to reach nuclear abolition, that is the question?

I will give you some of my ideas, to discuss with you and with the governmental representatives that are here today.

But before going into the issue of nuclear abolition – let's remember: there are many inter-locking problems facing the planet – climate change, mass poverty, inequality, conflicts over resources, unilateralism instead of international cooperation between nations, domestic wars in many places.

These problems are interconnected. If we are to create a large-scale public mobilization for nuclear disarmament, we must relate that issue to environmental, development and human rights concerns.

What we as peace activists can bring to all the other important issues is the knowledge of the military spending, of all the resources that are kept from solving urgent needs, but instead spent on military purposes. The military spending, the military waste is at the unbelievable level of 1 204 billion dollar annual. That is an incredible amount of money! If only a small portion of the money used for military spending could be transferred into useful needs in the world, like achieving the millennium goals, we would be able to reach those goals.

### **TERRORISM**

Furthermore, we need to deal with the problem of terrorism – terrorism from suicide bombers, terrorism from political and religious fanatics – which have given birth to so many new much more violent reactions by governments waging new wars in many parts of the world.

Terrorism cannot be defeated by war, because war is an obsolete and ineffective way of dealing with human conflicts. 'War on terrorism' is a contradiction. War is no solution to fear, war is no solution to revenge. Security, instead, must be cooperative and common!

And when using the term terrorism, we must always have in mind that the worst form of terrorism, is to possess, stockpile and test nuclear weapons. Not to mention the planning and the threat of use of nuclear weapons against nations and people – that is terrorism in its worst interpretation.

### **ABOUT IPB**

I am here as representative of the International Peace Bureau, and I would like to take a little while to present this organisation. International Peace Bureau is an old organisation, established over one hundred years ago, to be the permanent bureau to organize peace conferences. Nowadays there are many organisers of peace conferences, like the Organising committee behind the 2007 World conference here in Nagasaki.

So the International Peace Bureau has grown into the role of being a global network of peace organisations, today representing 282 member organisations in 70 countries, as well as individual members. One of the most important members is Gensuikyo from Japan. Yayoi Tsuchida, of Gensuikyo is a board member of International Peace Bureau.

In 1910 the International Peace Bureau got the international recognition of getting the Nobel Peace Prize. It is long ago, but it is still interesting, because a small portion of the Nobel Peace prize money is still kept in the bank and we can use the interest of the Nobel Peace Prize every year as a basic finance for some of our activities – it is not enough but it is a start!

### **HIDANKYO FOR PEACE PRIZE**

Another thing that is nice with having got the Nobel peace prize is that we have the right to suggest every year a candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize. For three years we suggested the Hidankyo – the a bomb sufferers organisation – for the peace prize, it was very close to succeed, we were almost able to convince the Norwegian prize committee to give the prize to Hidankyo but we failed in the end.

Well, we will not fail with the goal that the International Peace Bureau and Hidankyo and all

of us here have in common - the nuclear abolition. I am optimistic. But we need to concentrate our efforts, and be very effective in our work. That is why I want to discuss method and strategy for the abolition work for the coming 2 or 3 years. Without a clear method every popular movement will fail.

### **The DC METHOD**

The method I propose for the peace work is called the DC-method.

We, who have gathered at this International Conference, have all our different agendas and priorities. The movement for nuclear disarmament, for nuclear abolition, the general peace movement is a mixture of people and programs. Diversity is our way of working. Diversity is our strength.

So the method I propose for achieving our goal within the three-year time limit must be based on diversity. Diversity means we will all continue the peace work that we find most fruitful, and most adjusted to our own abilities, whether it is to organise and motivate our neighbours or collages, do peace marches, do signature campaigns or any of the things we have heard reporting from at the opening of the conference yesterday.

But to reach our goal within a time limit of three years, we need also to find a common approach – a peak for our work, a concentration on something we can have in common. That is why I suggest the adoption of a “DC-method” where “D” stands for “Diversity” and “C” stands for “Concentration”.

I would like to suggest for the years to come that we all together concentrate on one of the 60 recommendations from the “Weapon of Mass Destruction Commission”, the one calling for a World Summit on Disarmament, Non-proliferation and Terrorist Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction, and especially nuclear weapons, recommendation nr 59.

### **A METHOD THAT HAVE PROVED SUCCESSFUL**

The Weapon of Mass Destruction Commission, the so called Blix Commission, gives those recommendations to the governments, to the UN but we all know the weakness of the UN system. It controlled and dominated by the nuclear states, and especially the United States, not willing to voluntarily change their nuclear policy.

So the “concentration” part of the DC-method means that we have to organise ourselves Civil Society Summits on Nuclear Weapons during the coming two or three years all over the world– with the purpose to lead up to an UN and governmental Summit.

This is the same method and strategy that the Ban the Land mine Convention came around, as

an initiative driven by the civil society, until the way was paved, and the door was opened – and finally could get incorporated in the institutional system. The Ban the Land mine Campaign was a success of our peace movement, and we need to do that inspiring work again in order to get rid of nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction.

### **ILLEGALITY OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

I would like to mention also an example of success we have had in the struggle against nuclear weapons.

Today we all know that nuclear weapons are illegal. Ten years ago the International court of Justice made a ruling, with the meaning that the use and threat of use of nuclear weapon is illegal under International law.

The illegality of nuclear weapon was an early issue for IPB, and we spend a lot of efforts to get other organisations interested in the issue. Some 20 years ago we started the campaigning of bringing the issue of the illegality of nuclear weapons to the international court. The world court project was a campaign run by IPB together with its member organisations in many countries, as well as the International physicians movement for the prevention of nuclear war and the IALANA, the lawyers organisation against nuclear weapons.

The initiative of bringing the case of illegality of nuclear weapon to the international court of justice came from the peace movement, before in the end the issue was formally brought to the court by some courageous governments.

My own country, Sweden, had at that time a new government, a conservative government, and the government of Sweden was from the beginning not keen to support the issue at the World Court. It took a lot of campaigning in Sweden to get the Swedish government to change its position, and finally give a statement to the International court of justice, in support of the illegality of nuclear weapons.

### **FINALLY**

Finally, I would like to tell you the story about the Swedish atomic bomb. We had in Sweden after the Second World War the same type of military and scientists, that many other countries, impressed by the atomic bombs, and interested to get every new type of weaponry that was possible to get without thinking of the illegality or the inhumanity of those weapons of mass destruction.

And Sweden was a very wealthy country directly after the second world war, because we had managed to stay out of the war.

Shortly after the war a scientific military program started in Sweden to develop its own atomic bomb program. This was kept as a secret

for the Swedish Public, no one should know, other than a number of scientists and a number of military, and a few politicians in the Swedish government.

But the secret plans were disclosed, and the opposition started. From the beginning it was small, the peace movement together with some women organisation together with some artists and writers who started the campaign against Swedish Atomic Weapon.

1957, when the plans for atomic bomb became publicly known, the general public was in favour, so strange was the situation at that time. Gallup was made, that showed that the plans for atomic bomb had about 80 percent support in the general public of Sweden. The women, the peace movement, the artists and writers managed to change the public opinion completely within three years - and the support went down to under 20 percent.

It was so low support that the government never dared to bring the issue to a decision in the Swedish parliament. For a few years the secret plans continued, before they were dropped completely. So Sweden had no decision in the parliament neither for nor against a Swedish atomic bomb, until it many years later signed the Non Proliferation Treaty and officially became a non-nuclear country.

This was before my time in the peace movement, but I once met with the Swedish prime minister from that time, after he had left his office and become an old and a little bit wise. I invited him to speak at a peace movement meeting like this - and he spoke, and he said, "I want to thank the peace movement that you managed to stop the plans for a Swedish atomic bomb. Now I know that you were right and I was wrong."

Dear Japanese friends, I wish that you one day will have you prime minister Abe to come to a meeting and say, "Thank you for all your work, thank you for defending the article nine in the Japanese Constitution, thank you for your work against United States bases in Japan, thank you for your hard work for nuclear abolition! I was wrong and you were right."

### **Hiroshi Taka Japan Council against A & H Bombs**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak as a member of the panel.

First of all, I would like to express my deepest regret for the death of Mr. Ito Ichio, Mayor of Nagasaki. In 2003, the year that saw the waves of popular actions opposing the war on Iraq sweep over the world, Mr. Ito, addressing the representatives of the world's peace movements in August said: "I want to see popular mobilizations

for the elimination of nuclear weapons just like those we have seen against the war in Iraq" and he became one of the first signers of the petition "Abolish Nuclear Weapons Now" to initiate the signature campaign towards the 2005 NPT Review Conference.

I am sure that all of us are determined to honor the will of Mr. Ito and of Nagasaki citizens by translating it into actions and conveying faithfully the message of the Hibakusha: "humans cannot coexist with nuclear weapons."

This year's World Conference bears a very important significance for the realization of a total ban on nuclear weapons.

First, because this year's World Conference will be our starting point to build a powerful public opinion and movement towards the 2010 NPT Review Conference to demand a world set free of nuclear weapons.

In May 2000, the countries of the world agreed on the abolition of nuclear arsenals as their "unequivocal undertaking." However, the following NPT Review Conference held five years later, in 2005, did not produce any progress and failed.

In the meantime, the U.S. leaders claimed that "nuclear disarmament is no more an issue," that "the threat comes from terrorism and proliferation" and that "preemptive war and usable nuclear weapons are the solutions." They forcibly launched the war on Iraq, repeatedly threatened Iran, covered the world with a web of U.S. military bases and "missile defense" and pressed Japan to exercise the 'right' to collective self-defense and to give a perilous twist to its Constitution. And what do we see as a result today?

Nuclear weapons are still there. No peace, no security has been brought about. In Iraq, 75,000 Iraqi civilians and 3,700 American soldiers have died and 27,000 more have been wounded. Despite this, the threat of nuclear proliferation continues to exist. Ironically, the only progress that has been made so far is in the Six Party Talks on denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula that is trying to solve the problem through negotiations rather than by coercion as Bush is doing.

As the Declaration of the International Meeting pointed out, the fallacy and the failure of the claim by the nuclear powers that their force and nuclear weapons "protect peace and security" are evident.

This understanding is now shared by not only the peace movements of the world and the governments of a large number of countries including those members of the New Agenda Coalition and the Non-Aligned Movements, but also by some NATO members and those who were once responsible for diplomacy or the armed forces of nuclear powers. They all call for the initiative to advance towards a "nuclear-free world".

We must not allow the repetition of the fiasco of the 2005 NPT Review Conference in the next Conference in 2010. We must impose instead the start of a real process for nuclear abolition. And for this, we need to build worldwide opinion to say loudly “down with nuclear weapons.” Let us discuss together what the Japanese movement can do for that.

However, the elimination of nuclear weapons cannot be realized unless the governments worldwide decide so in the arena of international politics. In this regard, the United Nations that was given the mission to “save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war” should play an especially important role. We shall therefore strongly urge those governments that are in favor of a nuclear-free world to cooperate together to reaffirm at the U.N. General Assembly that a total and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons is a pressing vital task to be achieved and to adopt a resolution calling for the commencement of the consultations for this.

Secondly, I think this year’s World Conference puts to the test the commitment of the Japanese movement. Every year, the government of Japan introduces to the U.N. General Assembly a draft resolution ostentatiously entitled “Renewed Determination Towards the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons”. However, this document does not include any positive measure for its stated goal except for the title. In Japan, we call this type of resolution a “dummy” resolution.

The reason for this hypocrisy is obvious: Japan is dependent on the U.S. “nuclear umbrella.” When turning to the international community, the Japanese government speaks of “Japan being the only A-bombed country” and of how much it is “committed to nuclear abolition”, but in reality, it relies on the American “nuclear umbrella”. It did not hesitate to conclude a secret agreement with the U.S. to allow the bringing-in of its nuclear weapons. Although Japan has adopted the Three Non-Nuclear Principles that are “not to possess, not produce and not allow the introduction of nuclear weapons,” it has never dared to say to the U.S.: “Do not bring them into Japan.”

This is also the main reason why Japan was unable to take any efficient diplomatic action when North Korea conducted nuclear tests. How can the Japanese government persuade North Korea to abandon its nuclear programs when Japan remains dependent on the “nuclear umbrella” and approves of Japan’s own nuclear armament?

What the Japanese government is required to do is to apply the Three Non-Nuclear Principles as they are, without any change, and to implement the Constitution as it is now without revising it.

More important is this is what the majority of the Japanese people want. In April this year, together with a wide range of people representing

different fields in Japan, we launched a campaign demanding the Japanese government that it take the initiative in promoting the elimination of nuclear weapons at the U.N. General Assembly and declare the strict observance by Japan of the Three Non-Nuclear Principles. This is called the “Non-Nuclear Japan Declaration” campaign. Within three months since its start, the Declaration already enjoys nationwide support: 207 municipal mayors and 149 chairpersons of local assemblies have expressed their support, and many local assemblies across the country almost all unanimously adopted resolutions urging the national government to implement the “Declaration.” In this connection, I wish to call on the Japanese delegates to initiate and spread this campaign simultaneously around the country through the local assembly sessions this coming September.

Lastly, the World Conference is important for preserving Article 9. The core idea of the current campaign for constitutional revision is “the Constitution has become outdated”. In reality, however, the campaign had already started when the Constitution was not so old. In fact, it was soon after the promulgation of the Constitution when it was still very fresh that the U.S. already began to pressure Japan to revise it on the pretext of the need for a “Cold War”. At its founding in 1955, the Liberal Democratic Party announced its resolve that the party would strive for the revision of the Constitution to advance on the path towards war. Whether the Constitution is outdated or not does not matter at all. What we should note however is the power of the peace loving Japanese people who for more than half a century have succeeded in preventing the Constitution from being changed.

Three years ago, Prime Minister Abe, then LDP Secretary General, paid a visit to an American neoconservative institute (AEI) to boast that he had in his hands the golden opportunity to revise the Constitution so that Japan could join the U.S. by exercising the right to collective self-defense. It was a time when, thanks exclusively to the “North Korean threat” communication campaign in typical Bush style and the small-constituency election system, the constitutional revisionists had won a majority in the Diet. Nevertheless, Mr. Abe did not even imagine that three years later, his own government would face a vital crisis before it could succeed in scrapping the Constitution.

The Declaration of the International Meeting identified the actions needed to achieve a “world of peace and justice without nuclear weapons”. Now that Japan and the rest of the world are making an about-face from the order based on strength and nuclear weapons to a non-nuclear order of peace, I would encourage every one of you to discuss extensively these topics so that here

in Japan, an A-bombed nation, the movement against A and H Bombs can play its true role as a

grass-roots movement.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **Contribution to Workshop 2: For a Nuclear-Free and Peaceful Asia (Seihi Agricultural Co-op Building)**

**Kang Byeongcheol and Kang Jaenam  
Department of Political Science, College of  
Law and Political Science, Cheju National  
University, ROK**

### **Nuclear Free North East Asia: The Future Depends on Your Choice**

#### **1. Introduction**

In North East Asia, especially Korea and Japan, we all need to start urgent discussions for keeping a Nuclear Free Zone. It is time we were set free from the ever-present threat of nuclear technology and invested in a Nuclear Free North East Asia and hopefully in a Trouble Free North East Asia. With State cooperation and NGO activists protesting against nuclear weapons and technology, we have taken the initiative and started the debate.

In whatever context you use, nuclear weapons technology is a threat to the environment, to people, and to peace. First, let's review North Korea's nuclear crisis. We can get some lessons from the North Korean nuclear crisis issue. For most people, the very mention of 'North Korea' conjures images of megalomaniacal militaristic dictators scheming to build a nuclear arsenal as part of a master plan to reunify the Korean peninsula by force. Such a view is perhaps understandable. However North Korea is not solely a traditional security threat to be deterred, but one that involves non-traditional security issues as well, or what is referred to as 'human security'- the security of people from famine and political persecution by their own government.

It is better to achieve denuclearization of the North East Asia through dialogue and negotiation, rather than through confrontation and coercive diplomacy.

#### **2. Understanding of North Korea's Nuclear Policy**

There are more than 50 years of history to North Korea's attempt to gain a nuclear weapon, triggered in part by threats from President Harry S. Truman. President Harry Truman threatened to use all weapons in the U.S. arsenal against North Korea. The following month, General Douglas

MacArthur requested permission to use 26 nuclear weapons, a request that was renewed several times but ultimately denied. <sup>(1)</sup> He threatened use of the atomic bomb, saying the US might use any weapon in its arsenal. <sup>(2)</sup> Nuclear technologies will neither offer any state within the region protection nor will they meet anyone's energy needs. All it brings is more fear, more tension and increased escalation in an area that is synonymous with war and conflict.

Many states try to gain nuclear weapons for National security. In 1957, the United States placed nuclear-tipped Matador missiles in South Korea. In the late 1970s President Jimmy Carter's administration removed some of the hundreds of nuclear weapons that the United States maintained in South Korea. In 1991, the first Bush administration removed the remaining nuclear weapons from South Korea. North Korea obtained a small research reactor from the Soviet Union. By the mid-1970s, North Korean technicians had increased the capability of that reactor and constructed a second one.

Pyongyang agreed in 1977 to allow the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to inspect the first reactor. In 1985 U.S. intelligence discovered a secret reactor. Under pressure, North Korea agreed to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Five years later, U.S. intelligence discovered through satellite photos that a structure had been built that appeared to be capable of separating plutonium from nuclear fuel rods. In January 1993, IAEA inspectors were prevented from going to two previously unreported facilities. In the resulting crisis, North Korea attempted to withdraw from the NPT. The resulting talks led to the 1994 Agreed Framework, under which North Korea would freeze and eventually dismantle its nuclear weapons program.

In 2001, intelligence analysts at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory completed a highly classified report that concluded North Korea had begun construction of a plant to enrich uranium. In 2002 the North Koreans confirmed they were following another path to a nuclear weapon using enriched uranium. Soon thereafter, the United States ended its participation in the

1994 agreement. The Bush administration then embarked on a new approach, developing a six-nation strategy based on the idea that bilateral U.S.-North Korea negotiations did not work. In 2003, North Korea said it would consider the imposition of economic sanctions an act of war. North Korea walked out of the nuclear treaty, and the US warned that a strike was possible. In 2004, another round of six-party talks in Beijing brought no results, with US officials saying North Korea again threatened to conduct a nuclear test. In 2005, North Korea announced that it possessed a nuclear weapon, saying this was necessary for "self defense" against Washington's aggression, and that it would not participate in nuclear talks.

Further talks in Beijing saw North Korea agree to end its nuclear weapons program and rejoin the international non-proliferation treaty. The apparent breakthrough was short lived after North Korean officials subsequently demanded a civilian light-water reactor in exchange for a pledge - something the US and Japan dismissed as unacceptable. North Korea vowed to abandon its nuclear weapons project. In 2006, North Korea test-fired a series of missiles, one just hours before the UN was due to meet to discuss a response to the first of the tests. Among the missiles launched was a long-range Taepodong-2 device, capable of hitting the US mainland. The missile failed 40 seconds into its flight. Defiant North Korea fired a seventh missile test. The UN Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution imposing diplomatic and economic sanctions on North Korea. The Nuclear test sparked international condemnation. In 2007, US and North Korea envoys met in Berlin, raising hopes that North Korea would return to the six nation talks. The US claimed credit as North Korea softened its line on nuclear talks. The talks reached a tentative deal - North Korea would agree to shut down its Yongbyon reactor in return for 50,000 tons of fuel oil or economic aid of equal value. Washington was poised for climb down as North Korea agrees to nuclear deal. <sup>(3)</sup>

### **3. Conclusion: A Nuclear-Free East Asia**

This nuclear crisis was triggered by security dilemma. A state tried to increase its security, decreasing the security of others.<sup>(4)</sup> Think about the looming threat of a 'nuclear weapon' North East Asia should step back and reject this expensive, outdated and dangerous nuclear technology for power or weapons. Please, spare North East Asia from the deadly path of nuclear escalation and the threat of mutually assured destruction. Bigger weapons do not bring about peace, negotiations do, and nuclear power only makes matters worse. Nuclear weapons will not bring national security. We warned that nuclear weapons in any country will provoke proliferation

and undermine security region-wide. The challenge is to reach an agreement to rid the entire North East Asia of all nuclear technology and weapons; to recognize that nuclear technology is a threat to everybody's security. We suggest that dialogue and exchanges of diplomatic assurances show that strategic engagement and negotiation are a viable and effective alternative to coercive diplomacy in seeking the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. We will continue to try and find ways to engage the government and people of North East Asia about a Nuclear Free North East Asia. Let's make sure countries in North East Asia don't join the Nuclear Club.

Fear and suspicion are inherent in all nuclear developments, often coalescing into a terrible and vicious cycle of virtual proliferation. And even if a country's current intentions are simply to develop a program to meet the future energy needs of the people of this region, any nuclear energy program can all too easily support real proliferation and nuclear weapons escalation at a later date. By using the bounty of nature's winds and the sun, countries in the North East Asia can meet their energy needs without courting nuclear oblivion. The option exists to create a sustainable future, without the certainty of a deadly legacy of radioactive waste or the possibility of nuclear weapons proliferation. Instead of threatening the safety of all with more nuclear power, the option is available to increase the security of all by using energy already on hand. A brighter future for North East Asia is possible. A nuclear Free North East Asia can be achieved by vigilant, caring individuals. We may choose nuclear weapons. We may choose to be indifferent. Remember the future depends on your choice. Negotiating a nuclear Free North East Asia, which rejects all nuclear weapons, is how to get there.

=====

#### **NOTES**

1. Bruce Cumings, "Korea: Forgotten Nuclear Threats," *Le Monde Diplomatique*, December 2004. Available at:

<http://mondediplo.com/2004/12/08korea>.

2. See: *New York Times*, 30 November and 1 December 1950.

3. Staff and Wire, 'North Korea's Nuclear Program, A timeline on missile development in North Korea,' *Washington Post*, February 13, 2007.

Available at:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/04/AR2006100401067.html>

4. Robert Jervis, "Cooperation under the security dilemma," *World Politics*, 30(2), 1978:167-214.