

Peace building toward “a Nuclear Weapons-Free World” -Working with the citizens of the world-

Public lecture in the Chinese University of Hong Kong 2009/10/22

Masayoshi HAMADA

**Member of the New Komeito Party
the House of Councilors, Japan**

Synopsis;

The United Nation Security Council Summit on nuclear disarmament unanimously passed Resolution 1887 last month. This Resolution refers to Resolution 984 (passed in 1995), in which Nuclear Weapon States "give security assurances against the use of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear weapon States that are Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons." In the meeting, President Hu Jintao of China made a remarkable statement on abandoning the nuclear deterrence policy based on first use of nuclear weapons and establishing a legally-binding international instrument towards this end. On the other hand, there are new movements for disarmament where the citizens of the world play a key role. Such movements include the Ottawa Process, the Oslo Process, the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol, and the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Declaration. Keeping in mind these resolutions, statements and new movements, I would like to propose a "New Hiroshima-Nagasaki process," and suggest options for immediate action.

Title:

President Lawrence Lau, distinguished professors and scholars, and ladies and gentlemen; it is a great honor to be here to lecture at the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

First of all, I must express my gratitude to President Lau for giving me such a wonderful opportunity and at the same time, congratulate former president Prof. Charles Kao on receiving the Nobel Prize in Physics.

Today, I would like to talk about peace building, a process to which I am devoted; particularly peace building toward “a Nuclear Weapons-Free World.” I would like to invite all the citizens of the world to work together toward this end.

Before starting my lecture, I would like to give a little background on myself.

0. Introduction

Until two years ago, I was the vice-Minister for Japanese Foreign Affairs.

It was during this time that I first met President Lau, who was visiting Japan.

In my office, we talked about a variety of topics, such as my political party, peace building, economic policy on Japan, and prospects for Hong Kong's economy. This talk was very stimulating, due to the experience I had been working in the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (now the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry) for 23 years before entering the world of politics.

When I wrote to Professor Lau about my resignation from my position as vice minister two years ago, he replied that "since you are leaving your position, you will have time to come to the Chinese University of Hong Kong to deliver a lecture." Since I did not have the knowledge needed to deliver a lecture in front of such leading figure in economics, this put me in an awkward position. I finally answered by saying that, although the task of giving a lecture on the economy is quite beyond me, I might be able to share some of my thoughts on the topic of my aspiration to engage in international peace building, which is why I am here.

Another reason is the wonderful relationship with the Chinese University of Hong Kong. As President Lau introduced, the New Komeito party to which I belong, was established in 1964 by members of the largest Buddhist group in Japan, Sokagakkai. President of the Sokagakkai International, Dr. Ikeda has a friendly and close relationship with this university. For example, he delivered a lecture here in 1992 on the theme of the tradition of Chinese humanism. Dr. Ikeda has also published a dialogue with Dr. Henry Jao Tsung-I, a Professor Emeritus at this very university. I have read the book, and have been deeply impressed by Dr. Jao's statement that "non-violence might be considered a sign of weakness, but that is not the case. The spirit of non-violence must include the spiritual strength to overcome violence."

Indeed, I would like to maintain this wonderful relationship with your university.

As for my political party, the New Komeito pioneered a new political approach based on consensus and people, rather than confrontation and ideology. The Diet "resolution concerning non-nuclear arms and scaling-down of U.S. military bases on Okinawa" was a product of this approach. It put our national policy of three nuclear-free principles on a statutory basis. The New Komeito party also dealt head-on with the issue of proper diplomatic actions, insisting that Japan adopt global peace as its goal, rather than peace limited to its own territories. Regarding the ban on indiscriminate weapons such as cluster bombs, the New Komeito party played a key role in persuading then-prime minister Fukuda to change Japan's stance on the treaty. Accordingly, the commitment of the New Komeito to peace is well-known in Japan, including its commitment to the total abolition of nuclear weapons.

Now, I would like to move on to my main topic.

1. The UN Security Council Summit on Sep. 24

A monumental event in the history of nuclear weapon abolition took place last month; the United Nation Security Council Summit on nuclear disarmament, chaired by US President Barack Obama. The 14 heads of state, including 5 nuclear weapon states under NPT, unanimously approved Resolution 1887. This resolution covers specific 29 items. Most of them cover nuclear proliferation, but one of the most significant in my view is Item 9, which states: "*Recalls* the statement by each of the five nuclear-weapon States, noted by resolution 984 (passed in 1995), in which they give security assurances against the use of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear-weapon State Parties to the NPT, and affirms that such security assurances strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime." This is referred to as "Negative Security Assurance." The final report published by the 2000 NPT review conference recognized the meaning in making negative security assurance legally binding, and requested deliberation of this matter in 2005. However, the 2005 NPT review conference itself was a failure. Keeping these consequences in mind, this could be another attempt to make negative security assurance legally binding.

A remarkable statement was made in the summit on the topic by President Hu Jintao of China. His statement covered the following 3 points; the first was to abandon the nuclear deterrence policy based on first use of nuclear weapons. The second was unequivocal commitment to unconditionally not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states or nuclear-weapon-free zones, and conclude a legally-binding international instrument to this end. The third was for nuclear-weapon states to negotiate a treaty on no-first-use of nuclear weapons against one another in the meantime. These are very concrete and comprehensive proposals for "a nuclear weapons-free world."

The first point is particularly significant, in that it gives a theoretical basis to "a nuclear weapons-free world" via abandonment of the nuclear deterrence policy. However, the decision on whether to take a nuclear deterrence policy is left to the 5 nuclear weapon states. On the other hand, nuclear-weapon-free zones were established through the initiative of non-nuclear weapon states. In any case, these statements by President Hu Jintao deserve much praise for referring to "a legally-binding international instrument" or "treaty," especially when considering that UN Security Council Resolution 984 on negative security assurance has not been sufficient to hold back new nuclear developments in actual international society.

In fact, some Japanese people were frightened by the scale of events shown in news reports on the military parades at the ceremonies for the 60th anniversary of the foundation of the People's Republic of China, which included the first display of ICBNs. However, I believe these statements by President Hu Jintao deliver a message to Japanese citizens that China is one of the most peaceful countries in the world, with a strong commitment

toward a nuclear weapons-free world.

Bearing in mind these resolutions and statements, I have found new movements toward a nuclear weapons-free world.

2. New movements toward “a Nuclear Weapons-Free World”

The first one is “national security without nuclear deterrence.” Underlying recent heightened discussions on the “nuclear weapons-free world” is the common consensus that the “demerit” of risk of terrorists obtaining nuclear weapons outweighs “merit” from peace through nuclear deterrence.

Furthermore, as the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the suffering of their victims prove, nuclear weapons are too devastating to use from the standpoint of keeping the world peace.

In order to realize national security without nuclear deterrence, the most effective and essential method is establishing an international moral consensus that “nuclear weapons are evil.” This is the second movement. As you may remember, the Ottawa Process and the Oslo Process led by the citizens of the world resulted in the banning of 2 indiscriminate weapons systems (i.e. landmines and cluster bombs). The international moral consensus that “indiscriminate weapons systems are evil” was the key factor in achieving these notable treaties.

The third one, which was also addressed by President Hu Jintao in his statement, is the creation of a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone treaty by non-nuclear weapon states. This is a means for non-nuclear weapon states to take the initiative for nuclear disarmament. The “NWFZ treaty” requires the nuclear weapon states to pledge against using nuclear weapons by ratification of protocol, which gives it legally binding force. Countries in 6 regions have already agreed to sign, have signed, or ratified this treaty. The regions being: 1) Central and South America; 2) The South Pacific, including Australia and New Zealand; 3) Africa; 4) Southeast Asia; 5) Central Asia; and 6) the Antarctic. This effectively places nearly all of the southern hemisphere into the NWFZ. This expansion of the NWFZ places restraints on the nuclear weapons possessing countries, which reduces the “merits” of possessing nuclear weapons, and thus becomes a reckoning force toward the realization of global nuclear abolition.

The last movement toward a nuclear weapons-free world is the increasing and active role of non-nuclear weapon states and the citizens of the world toward this goal. This is understandable if you consider the second and the third movements in this slide.

Riding on these new movements, we can propel ourselves through a new process called the “New Hiroshima-Nagasaki process.”

3. The "New Hiroshima-Nagasaki process"

As I stated earlier, the Ottawa Process and the Oslo Process were led by the citizens of the world and resulted in the banning of landmines and cluster bombs.

Campaigns led by the citizens of the world against nuclear weapons have just started.

The Hiroshima-Nagasaki protocol introduced to me by Mr. Tadatoshi Akiba, Mayor of Hiroshima City, was announced by the Mayors for Peace at the meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva during the April of last year.

As of October 2009 now, the Mayors for Peace consist of mayors from 3,147 cities worldwide. 7 cities in China are members, which are Beijing, Changdu, Chongqing, Fuzhou, Hangzhou, Wuhan and Dairen.

The Mayors for Peace seek the adoption of the protocol at next year's NPT Review Conference.

I give high praise to this Protocol in that it: (1) defines a series of processes up to the elimination of nuclear weapons; (2) sets a target year for achieving the elimination of nuclear weapons - before or by 2020; and (3) takes a gradual approach that does not require the simultaneous participation of all 5 nuclear weapon states.

Another citizen-led campaign is the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Declaration, headed by 17 Nobel Prize laureates. This was issued in May 2009 and initiated by Northern Ireland peace activist Máiread Corrigan-Maguire, a 1976 Nobel Peace Prize co-recipient.

The Declaration calls on the citizens of the world to "grasp the peril of inaction and summon the political will to advance toward nuclear disarmament and abolition."

It deserves praise for reaffirming that the citizens of the world can exercise their initiative in disarmament negotiations, rather than countries that own indiscriminate weapons systems. This is also seen in the Ottawa Process and Oslo Process.

The third citizen-led campaign is the "Hiroshima-Nagasaki Process," proposed in the July 2008 general conference of the International Peace Research Association, held in the Belgian city of Leuven. The proposal was made by Professor Katsuya Kodama, son of a victim of nuclear bombing. The proposal is well thought-out and comprehensive, simultaneously deploying steps for chronological progress from the convention to controlling nuclear use/threats to one for eliminating nuclear weapons, along with one for expanding the area covered by a global nuclear weapon-free zone.

On October 3 of last year, the New Komeito Party Acting Chief Representative Toshiko Hamayotsu became the first person to use the phrase "Hiroshima-Nagasaki Process." In the Diet Japan She used the phrase during an extraordinary session of the House of Councilors, calling on the government to advocate and promote the Nuclear Weapons Convention.

The Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol, Hiroshima-Nagasaki Declaration and Hiroshima-Nagasaki Process all use the name "Hiroshima-Nagasaki", as it is no longer an

emotionally charged phrase symbolizing the sites of atomic bombings. Just as the names "Ottawa" and "Oslo" became more than place names, coming to symbolize the campaigns to ban landmines and cluster bombs, the name "Hiroshima-Nagasaki" has come to represent realistic and specific campaigns for eliminating nuclear weapons. The campaigns come in a variety of forms, including "protocols," "declarations," and "processes," with no need to lump them into a single format. Each initiative can be loosely associated with each other, following different paths to reach the goal of a "nuclear weapons-free world." "Hiroshima-Nagasaki" can be the slogan for "mountaineers of the world," who would chant the phrase as they keep their climbing pace at a sudden sharp slope, or to invigorate themselves at the sight of a steep cliff.

I would like to move on to the collective characteristics of their "New Hiroshima-Nagasaki process."

4. Characteristics of the "New Hiroshima-Nagasaki process"

The "New Hiroshima-Nagasaki process" attaches a great importance to abandonment of a nuclear deterrence policy based on first use of nuclear weapons. This is nuclear disarmament that enhances national security, rather than disarmament that goes against the nation's security policy. It is meaningless to maintain the age-old confrontational approach between "activists" demanding disarmament and nuclear arms elimination, and the "government" who cannot shift its focus from the "nuclear umbrella." We should adopt the perspective that scaling back the roles of nuclear weapons across the world would enhance the security of the world. The goal we work toward must be realistic, in order to mobilize not only anti-nuclear activists, but also as many citizens of the world as possible. A philosophy of nuclear arms elimination that conflicts with national security would no longer provide motivation for a continuous and universal campaign.

The second characteristic is a consistent and continuous process focusing on "what must be done to eliminate nuclear arms," as opposed to "starting from what can be done" - in other words, "no first use before total elimination."

President Obama's speech in Prague had a major impact on the world, because it was not based on the concept of "starting from what can be done," but expressed his commitment to the goal of "nuclear arms elimination." For this, he indeed deserves the Nobel Peace Prize. It is important to examine what our generation must do to reach the goal.

The third characteristic is nuclear disarmament which focuses on establishing an international moral consensus among the citizens of the world that "nuclear weapons are evil," rather than conventional nuclear disarmament pushed by diplomatic authorities which emphasizes "verification."

Some diplomats insist on verification or inspection, but we must leave such dated ways of

thinking behind. This is not acceptable to bureaucrats who are obsessed with the "doctrine of precedents. Therefore what we need now are political decisions made by politicians in tandem with the citizens of the world.

The fourth is that the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Declaration and Hiroshima-Nagasaki Process are highlighting the move toward accelerating the process of nuclear arms elimination by both countries without nuclear weapons and the citizens of the world. This is exactly how they won the ban on landmines and cluster bombs; by acting of their own accord, rather than leaving the negotiations up to the government of the nuclear weapon states. The countries that signed the Oslo Treaty may not own even 10% of cluster bombs around the world. Yet, turning the cause into an international treaty will accelerate the negotiations among countries that owned the remaining 90%. This is why the New Komeito party places emphasis on the unity of people around the world, including those in countries without nuclear weapons.

Now I will move on to the last slide, "Possible immediate actions."

5. Possible immediate actions

I would like to propose the following as for options for immediate action:

1. Organize citizen's conference on the New Hiroshima-Nagasaki Process at the same time as "International Conference on Nuclear Disarmament" the Japanese government has scheduled for early next year.
2. Adopt a declaration at this conference calling countries that try to withdraw from NPT to own nuclear weapons the "enemies of mankind."
3. Organize a campaign to have "no first use" declaration adopted onto a legally binding protocol among NPT signatories at the NPT Review Conference next May, as a step toward eliminating nuclear weapons.

There have always been arguments about the advantages for countries like India, Pakistan and Israel in signing NPT. There are also debates on what sanctions should be applied to countries like North Korea that try to abandon the treaty. On this point, I would like to suggest that NPT signatories declare their commitment to no first use of nuclear weapons against any other signatories, and turn the framework into a legally binding protocol next. This is in line with statements by President Hu Jintao, and would pave the way toward a "nuclear weapons-free world," where the five nuclear powers under NPT (P5) are not only forbidden from using nuclear weapons on non-nuclear countries, but also first use among P5 nations.

4. Develop a common consensus among the US. allies of Japan, South Korea, Australia and the NATO nations on a "no first use" principle that does not conflict with U.S. extended deterrence such as the "nuclear umbrella." If Japan is to promote a "nuclear weapons-free

world," it is unthinkable that only Japan should stay under the "nuclear umbrella." It is time for Japan to make a "political decision."

There seems to be a misunderstanding worldwide on the relationship between the "nuclear umbrella" and the "no first use" policy. They seem to think nuclear weapons should be available as a means of extended deterrence, even against conventional strikes on non-nuclear weapon states. However, the term "extended deterrence" is the opposite of "basic deterrence" (meaning "deterring strikes on one's own country"). Therefore, extended deterrence means exercising deterrence capacity on allied countries, taking a strike on them as a strike on one's own country. In light of the situation, I proposed development of a common consensus on a "no first use" principle that does not conflict with extended deterrence among the U.S. allies of Japan, South Korea, Australia, and NATO nations. This means expecting the US to counter conventional strikes on allies with conventional strikes, and nuclear strikes on allies with nuclear strikes.

These kinds of debates on extended deterrence among the U.S. allies must be explored before we can give our opinions on the DPRK-China Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance signed by Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai and North Korean President Kim Il Sung in July 1961. It stipulates that China will use its full military might to assist North Korea if it is invaded or involved in a military conflict.

Personally, I wish to seek the possibility of unique diplomatic negotiations by the Japanese government toward guiding the United States into declaring "no first use" of nuclear weapons on North Korea, and prompting China to make the DPRK's abandoning nuclear weapons and returning to NPT a condition for their bilateral Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance with North Korea.

I firmly believe these to be stepping stones on the road to a nuclear weapons-free world. As US President Obama has said, "this goal may not be reached within our lifetime." Even if this is the case, achieving the intermediate goal will allow us to pass the torch to future generations. It will allow us to rest assured that the final goal has been brought within reach, like the serenity felt watching a sunset after a hard day's work.

Finally, my closing remarks.

6. Closing remarks and references

On the wall of my office, I have a calligraphy scroll of a Chinese poem by Chang Tsai, a present from Professor Lau. It was written by his grandfather, Professor Yu Youren. It reads in Japanese, "為天地立心、為生民立命、為往聖繼絕學、為万世開太平" (in English: open your heart for the good of humanity and the good of heaven and earth; put your life on the line for the living; learning must be passed down through generations for your ancestors; bring about peace for all eternity). Is this not the departure point for the politicians of the world?

Thank you for listening.