

2014 NPT Preparatory Committee NGO Forum

**Time for Action to Establish a Northeast Asia
Nuclear Weapon Free Zone**

UN Headquarters in NY, NGO Room C

Wednesday 30 April 2014, 3pm - 5:50pm

Co-sponsorship

Blue Banner (Mongolia), Peace Boat (Japan), Peace Depot (Japan), Peace Network (ROK),

People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy (ROK)

Cooperation

International Peace Bureau, Nautilus Institute, Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation

and Disarmament, Religions for Peace, World Council of Churches

Programme

Opening 15:00-15:05

Ms. Maria Kim, Peace Depot **and** Mr. Akira Kawasaki, Co-representative of Peace Boat

Introductory Speeches by Experts 15:05-16:05

NEA-NWFZ: a Regional Approach toward Nuclear-weapon-free World

Ms. Keiko Nakamura, Associate Professor of RECNA, Nagasaki University

How to solve the Nuclear Weapon Problem on the Korean Peninsula: Civil Society Perspectives

Ms. Mihyeon Lee, Coordinator of PSPD

Mongolia's Position on the Issue of Establishment of a NEA-NWFZ

Mr. Jargalsaikhan Enkhsaikhan, Director of Blue Banner

Q and A

NGO Presentations 16:05-16:45

Report on the Activities of Japanese Civil Society

Mr. Ichiro Yuasa, President of Peace Depot

Efforts and Visions of Local Authorities in Japan

Mr. Tomihisa Taue, Mayor of Nagasaki, National Council of Japan Nuclear Free Local Authorities

Mr. Kazumi Matsui, Mayor of Hiroshima, Mayors for Peace

Support for a NEA-NWFZ by Religious Community

Mr. Jonathan Frerichs, Programme Executive for Peace-building and Disarmament, WCC

Mr. Kyoichi Sugino, Deputy Secretary General of Religions for Peace

Essential Role of Parliamentarians

Mr. Alyn Ware, Global Coordinator of PNND

Comments and Discussion 16:45-17:45

Comments

Mr. Randy Rydell, Senior Political Affairs Officer in the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs

Mr. István Gyarmati, Chair of the 61th session of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters (skype)

Delegates of the Six Party Talks Nations

Open Discussion with All Participants

Close 17:45-17:50

Publication of a Joint Statement on NEA-NWFZ

Closing remarks

Profiles

Moderators

Ms. Maria KIM works at Peace Depot, doing research and coordinating international partnerships. Before, she worked as a coordinator for Peace Network and Civil Peace Forum in Seoul, Korea. She is also PNND NEA Assistant Coordinator and a member of Ban All Nukes generation (BANg).

Mr. Akira KAWASAKI is an Executive Committee member of Peace Boat, and Co-Chair of ICAN. In 2009-2010, he served as an NGO Advisor to Co-Chairs of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament. After the 11 March 2011, he initiated Peace Boat's activities to help children of Fukushima and organized Global Conference for a Nuclear Power Free World in January 2012 as the Conference Director. He lectures at Keisen University, Tokyo, and frequently writes in Japanese newspapers and journals on nuclear disarmament.

Speakers

Ms. Keiko Nakamura is Associate Professor, Research Center for Nuclear Weapons Abolition, Nagasaki University (RECNA). She also serves as Japanese Coordinator of PNND. In 2001, she joined Peace Depot and served as secretary-general from 2005-2012. She has written numerous articles on "Nuclear Weapon & Nuclear Test Monitor" and "Yearbook: Nuclear Disarmament and Peace." She is a member of the Japan Association of Disarmament Studies and Japan Association of Peace Studies.

Ms. Mihyeon Lee is Coordinator of center for Peace and Disarmament at People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy (PSPD), a NGO based in South Korea. PSPD has worked on democratization of security sector and monitored government's decision-making process to guarantee people's participation in that process. We are also a coordinator of Parliamentarians Network for Nuclear Disarmament in South Korea and a coordinator for Civil Peace Forum in Seoul, Korea.

Amb. Enkhsaikhan Jargalsaikhan is Mongolia's diplomat and scholar, the founder of the Blue Banner-Mongolian NGO devoted to promoting the goals of non-proliferation and disarmament. He has been active in the fields of promoting international peace and security, especially nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. He is lawyer by profession. He served as Foreign policy advisor to the first democratically elected President of Mongolia and as Executive secretary of Mongolia's National Security Council. In the latter capacity he coordinated negotiations and the adoption by the State Great Hural (parliament) of three basic policy documents of the country's post cold war period: the national security concept, foreign policy concept and the basis of Mongolian state military policy. As Ambassador he served as Mongolia's Permanent Representative to United Nations and to its Vienna office and represented his country in USSR/Russia, Austria, Italy and Croatia. He is the coordinator/focal point for

Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

Mr. Ichiro Yuasa is President of Peace Depot. Born in 1949 in Tokyo. Tohoku University Graduate and Former Researcher of National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology Chugoku Center. Doctor of Science. Physical oceanography and marine environmental studies. Ban Seto Inland Sea conference adviser. Publications: "Radioactive contamination of the Sea" (2012), "Ask the Peace City Hiroshima" (1995).

Mr. Jonathan Frerichs is Programme executive, peace-building and disarmament, for the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, based in Geneva. His work experience includes advocacy and communication responsibilities with humanitarian, relief and development, public health and religious organizations dealing with various aspects of human security.

Rev. Kyoichi Sugino is Deputy Secretary General, Religions for Peace. He was appointed as Deputy Secretary General at the International Executive Committee meeting in Marrakesh, Morocco in November 2011. He coordinates Religions for Peace affiliated interreligious councils, women and youth networks in more than 90 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Middle East. He has been directly engaged in multi-religious diplomacy and track-II negotiations in Iraq, Sri Lanka, and other conflict zones. He also served as Policy Research Officer at the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Geneva. He is a member of the US State Department Working Group on Religion and Foreign Policy, a member of the Non-Official Group of Friends of Sri Lanka, as well as a trustee at the RK International New York Center for Engaged Buddhism.

Mr. Alyn Ware is a Global Coordinator of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament. He was active in the campaign to ban nuclear weapons from New Zealand, establish peace studies as part of the New Zealand school curriculum and was instrumental in the International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat and Use of Nuclear Weapons. He also serves as a member of the World Future Council and Consultant for the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms.

Commenters

Mr. Randy Rydell is Senior Political Affairs Officer in the Office of Ms. Angela Kane, the UN's High Representative for Disarmament Affairs. He is Team Leader of the office's Strategic Planning Unit. He served from January 2005 to June 2006 as Senior Counsellor and Report Director of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission and Senior Fellow at the Arms Control Association in Washington, D.C. He joined the UN secretariat in 1998, where has served as an adviser to Under-Secretary-General Jayantha Dhanapala and his successors, Ambassadors Nobuyasu Abe and Nobuaki Tanaka, and Sergio Duarte. He

has also served as Secretary of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters in 2001 and as a Visiting Lecturer at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School.

Amb. István Gyarmati is Chair of the 61st session of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters. He is Chairman of the Budapest Centre for Euro-Atlantic Integration and Democracy, Senior Political Adviser of the Director of the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, partner in the European Advisory Group. He is a member of the Advisory Board of International Diplomats, Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Belgrade fund for Political Excellence, Executive Vice President of the Advisory Board of the Szeged Security Policy Centre, and a member of the International Commission on the Balkans. He is also an associate professor at Corvinus University and the National Defense University in Budapest. He is a member of the foreign and security policy Advisory Board of the Prime Minister of Hungary.

Delegates of the Six Party Talks Nations

Mr. Il-hoon Kim

First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations

Mr. Michiru Nishida

Special Assistant for Disarmament and Nonproliferation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

Ms. Lv Xin

Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations office at Geneva and other International Organizations in Switzerland

Mr. Gleb Maslov

Attache to Department for Nonproliferation and Arms Control, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

Mr. John G. Fox

Director of Multilateral Nuclear and Security Affairs, United States Department of State Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation

Introductory Speeches

NEA-NWFZ: a Regional Approach toward Nuclear-weapon-free World

Ms. Keiko Nakamura, RECNA Nagasaki University

Since the launch of the Research Center for Nuclear Weapons Abolition, Nagasaki University (RECNA), we have focused our attention and emphasis on efforts toward establishing a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (NEA-NWFZ). We firmly believe that through our efforts we are creating a practical and effective path that will lead not only to achieving denuclearization of this particular region but also to achieving a nuclear weapons free world. Today I would like to provide an overview on the importance of such an initiative and explore what we can do to move forward. I would also like to touch upon a new initiative regarding efforts to establish a NEA-NWFZ.

Significance of NWFZs

In order to understand the significance of establishing a Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone, I would like to briefly provide an overview of NWFZs around the world. There are currently five NWFZ treaties, namely, the Treaty for the 1967 Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco), the 1985 South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Rarotonga), the 1995 Southeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Bangkok), the 1996 African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba) and the 2006 Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia (Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty). There are more than 100 countries within these regional NWFZs. In addition, Mongolia is well known for its internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free status. In addition, efforts to establish new zones in other parts of the world have been vigorously made, most notably, in the Middle East.

These existing NWFZs vary in many aspects due to differences in their historical and geopolitical contexts; however, there are important characteristics in common. The first is the “nonexistence of nuclear weapons.” In these zones, the acquisition, possession, deployment, testing and use of nuclear weapons are prohibited. Secondly, in concept, security assurances from nuclear weapon states are provided by the nuclear weapon states. This means that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against countries within the zones is prohibited. This is why NWFZ is often described as a “Non-Nuclear Umbrella.” A NWFZ enables countries within the zone to be free from reliance on nuclear weapons for their national security. Moreover, regional organizations established in conjunction with NWFZ treaties can contribute to strengthening mutual confidence by solving regional disputes and problems such as

non-compliance with the treaty in a rational and peaceful manner. This could pave the way to building a broader collective security mechanism in the respective region. Such a course is particularly meaningful in regions with mistrust deeply imbedded among the countries in the region, such as Northeast Asia.

The establishment of a NEA-NWFZ has been increasing in importance in a global context as it will contribute to contemporary global nuclear disarmament efforts. Unfortunately, the majority of countries in Northeast Asia currently take the position that nuclear weapons are necessary and this plays an important role in their security policies. As explained in the next section of this paper, their reluctance in advancing nuclear disarmament has been seen as a great obstacle in the global effort toward nuclear abolition. If these countries can move toward reducing the role of nuclear weapons in their security policies and pursuing the possibility of regional peace and security without reliance on nuclear weapons, this will lead to a significant impact on international debate regarding nuclear weapons.

Humanitarian Approach and Nuclear “Umbrella” Countries

Although the Japanese government has repeatedly manifested its recognition on the significance of NWFZ in general, it is quite reluctant to put the NEA-NWFZ issue on the political agenda, saying that “the time is not yet ripe.” Of course, the root cause is its long-standing policy of dependence on the extended nuclear deterrence of the United States. Government officials have repeatedly elaborated that there is no contradiction between Japan’s intention to contribute to global nuclear disarmament efforts and its policy of dependence on nuclear deterrence. However, it is obvious that its dependence on nuclear deterrence has been an obstacle in Japan fulfilling its moral obligation as “the only nation which suffered from atomic bombing during the wartime.”

The recent increasing attention on the humanitarian aspect of nuclear weapons has reemphasized such unfaithful attitudes of the so-called “nuclear umbrella states.” Since the outcome document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference expresses deep concern on the catastrophic consequences of nuclear weapons use, a wide-range of governmental and non-governmental efforts have been taken in order to strengthen this momentum. So far, two very important international conferences focusing on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons have been held. In addition, four joint statements have been released led by countries such as Norway, Switzerland, Mexico, South Africa, New Zealand and Austria.

In spite of this momentum in international discussion over nuclear disarmament, very little progress has been seen in terms of support on the part of umbrella states. The Japanese government, which refused to sign the first three joint statements, finally decided to sign the fourth statement delivered by New Zealand during the last UN General Assembly First Committee, largely because of strong pressure from

civil groups, especially from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Its fundamental policy to oppose linking the focus on inhumanity to an argument on legal framework to prohibit nuclear weapons is unchanged.

It has been announced that the next Oslo follow-up conference is to be held in Austria before the end of this year. There has been growing expectations among civil groups and like-minded governments to seize this opportunity and move forward in support of a new legal instrument to outlaw and eliminate nuclear weapons. Nuclear umbrella states, on the other hand, have expressed contrary concerns and remain wary of demonstrating any willingness to take part.

From April 11-12, the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI) ministerial meeting was held in Hiroshima. It was truly meaningful that high-ranking officials from twelve countries (among them, seven countries depend on nuclear deterrence) gathered in this A-bombed city, the world's first to have eye-witnessed the devastation of nuclear weapons, and affirmed collectively that any use of nuclear weapons would have catastrophic humanitarian consequences. However, against the expectations of voices of civil groups, they failed to commit themselves in any concrete manner to reduce the role of nuclear weapons within their own security strategies. If these nuclear umbrella states continue to place high political and military value on nuclear weapons, they will lose their power to persuade others to not possess such weapons.

NEA-NWFZ and Japan

Since the mid-1990s, a number of different schemes in shaping the NEA-NWFZ according to various arrangements have been proposed by scholars and NGOs. Among such proposals, the "three plus three" NEA-NWFZ was introduced by Hiromichi Umebayashi in 1996. This is a proposed trilateral NEA-NWFZ treaty among Japan, the ROK and the DPRK, including a special protocol with provisions including negative security assurances by the three neighboring nuclear weapon states, namely, China, Russia and the United States.

There has been growing recognition among Japanese government officials with regard to this "three plus three" NEA-NWFZ initiative. However, it has not been included in any official political agenda as of yet. The government's basic attitude and stance has always been that there should be improvement in the security environment. In particular, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) should abandon its nuclear program and aspire to and achieve denuclearization, before any action is taken regarding a NEA-NWFZ.

Proposal of Comprehensive Approach

So how should we overcome this deadlock and make progress in shifting the policies of these nuclear umbrella countries?

Given the fact that the DPRK conducted a third underground nuclear test in February 2013 and has shown continued bellicosity, even including reported preparations for a fourth nuclear test, it seems as if there is little if any light at the end of the tunnel in making any meaningful progress toward a NEA-NWFZ.

However, if we see this situation from a different angle, it is possible to conclude that a need exists for a new comprehensive approach in solving the current stalemate regarding nuclear issues in Northeast Asia.

In 2011, a new proposal made by Dr. Morton H. Halperin, a well-known U.S. foreign policy expert, caught the public's attention. His proposal is based on the development of a comprehensive agreement that includes the establishment of a NEA-NWFZ, suggesting pursuing a "Comprehensive Agreement (or Treaty) on Peace and Security in Northeast Asia," covering all current outstanding issues affecting relations with North Korea.

It is important to note that the term "Comprehensive Agreement" in this conceptual approach is used in a limited context so as to be strictly relevant to solving the current stalemate and not in a general context for broader regional security. This avoids a situation where the concept of comprehensiveness is unnecessarily broadened and goes beyond the original intent of the agreement.

Six key elements in the comprehensive agreement he proposed include;

- Termination of a state of war
- Creating a permanent council on security
- Mutual declaration of no hostile intent
- Provisions of assistance for nuclear and other energy
- Termination of sanctions/response to violation of the treaty
- A nuclear-weapon-free zone

The fundamental structure of the zone is the same as that of the "three plus three" arrangement; however, it is open to modification, such as expansion to include Mongolia into the zone.

The Way Ahead

Inspired by this proposal, RECNA launched a research project entitled “Developing a Comprehensive Approach to a NEA-NWFZ” in cooperation with other institutes in this region as well as in other parts of the world. Our purpose is to provide further deliberation based on the Halperin proposal, including consideration of “Elements to be included in the comprehensive agreement,” “Modalities of the general agreement” “Ideas on treaty provisions of a NEA-NWFZ,” “Steps for preparatory diplomatic work,” and “Mongolia’s potential critical role.” In order to discuss these issues, since December 2012, RECNA has been organizing a series of international workshops. The first one was held in Nagasaki in December 2012, the second was held in Seoul in June 2013, and we are preparing to hold the third and final workshop in September of this year in Tokyo. Using the outcomes from these workshops, we prepare and submit a final report including concrete policy recommendations to the relevant governments and the United Nations.

We have spent nearly last two decades discussing the question of whether a NEA-NWFZ might even be a possibility and, if so, what kind of scheme it would encompass. Now it is the time to move on to the next stage. As the Halperin proposal suggests, the framework of the discussion has already shifted to focus on what approach might be taken to actually realize a NEA-NWFZ. We believe our new endeavor will fracture many fixed ideas and stereotypes about establishing a NEA-NWFZ.

Introductory Speeches

How to solve the Nuclear Weapon Problem on the Korean Peninsula:

Civil Society Perspectives

Ms. Mihyeon Lee, Coordinator of PSPD

I would like to emphasize that today's presentation is not my personal opinion, but a collective view from "The Policy Report of Peace on the Korean Peninsula" which has been prepared by several South Korean peace NGOs including PSPD.¹

Early this year, there was a slight expectation that North and South Korean relationship would be improved. Even though ROK-US joint military drill was enforced, the meeting of separated families from the two Koreas was held. However, dialogue between two Koreas has not yet started afterwards and relationship has not yet improved. The military tensions in the Korean Peninsula have been mounting again. In March 2014, North Korea launched ballistic missile towards the East Sea and the UN Security Council issued a press statement to give warning to North Korea. In response, North Korea fired several artillery shells in West Sea and South Korean army fired back. In addition, North Korea recently announced that it will conduct 'new type of nuclear test' which implies the fourth nuclear test. Vicious cycle of crisis and conflicts in the Korean Peninsula still continues.

The main reason of this vicious cycle is that the U.S. and South Korea has concentrated on imposing sanctions against North Korea instead of holding a dialogue. Policy towards North Korea by Park Geun-hye administration is similar from the previous. However, the U.S. government's "Strategic Patience" to impose sanctions against North Korea has not been effective in encouraging North Korea to change their attitudes. Instead, North Korea used this situation to further develop their nuclear weapons and missile launching capabilities.

It is now time to review current policies of the South Korean and the U.S. governments, which we believe have been based on unrealistic expectation to end this vicious circle and establish foundation for peace on the Korean Peninsula and denuclearization. It is crucial to review whether these policies have been based on unrealistic expectations, prejudices and stereotypes toward North Korea, and move on to realistic expectations and balanced perspectives. The South Korean and the U.S. governments should take anticipatory and active measures to break out of a vicious circle of conflicts and crises on the Korean Peninsula.

¹ "The Policy Report of Peace on the Korean Peninsula" is prepared by Civil Peace Forum, PSPD Center for Peace and Disarmament, and Peace Network. The final version has published on 14 April 2014, in English and Korean.

What are the problems of Park Geun-hye administration's policy towards North Korea?

In early 2014, President Park Geun-hye presented 'unification' as a major agenda in the Korean society by announcing 'Unification Bonanza' and suggesting creation of a preparatory committee for reunification. However, it was meaningful only because she reemphasized importance of unification but missed specific plans to solve North Korean nuclear issues and current issues between two Koreas. In fact, Park Geun-hye administration follows 'sanctions and limited dialogue' to change North Korea which is similar to previous administration while talking about unification on surface.

These double standards on North Korea are also clear from Park Geun-hye administration's New Year announcement on its diplomatic, unification and national defense plans. The Ministry of National Defense declared to 'establish bases for peaceful unification' while missing ways to build military trust. The Ministry of National Defense seeks 'tailored deterrence strategy' to respond North Korea's provocation and announces its plan to enhance ROK-U.S. defense system. In addition, Ministry of Foreign Affairs said that it will pursue peaceful unification and diplomacy based on trust while assessing uncertainty of North Korean regime. It also seeks to establish strong deterrence system in response to North Korea's provocation. The Ministry of Unification also lay out unrealistic plans such as creation of DMZ World Peace Park and Eurasia Initiative which cannot be implemented without North Korea's agreement while cannot provide specific plans on how to reach an agreement. President Park Geun-hye's Dresden speech which was made during the official visit to Germany raises doubts on 'absorption unification'.

South Korean government has not reviewed its previous policies towards North Korea, which was imposing sanctions on North Korea, and only focused on economic benefits from unification.

Sanctions and containment is not a solution.

Looking back at 20 years of nuclear crises on the Korean Peninsula, the nature of the current aggravated situation is a result of the interactions between South Korea, North Korea and the U.S., rather than simply the unilateral actions of one party. In this sense, not only DPRK but also ROK and the US should be responsible for the nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula. ROK and the US has been stick to the hard-line policy based on the conventional perception of and prejudice against DPRK while DPRK does not determine the nuclear renunciation. Whether DPRK is recognized as a nuclear state or not, a new approach to the matter is now required in order to solve the nuclear crisis. The crisis can be solved through shifts in the policy toward DPRK.

The major reasons of these repeated crises of North Korean nuclear issues are based on below prejudices. First, the cause of North Korean's provocation is found from the internal causes of the North

Korea, such as the instability of the Kim Jeong-Eun regime; second, North Korean provocation intends to bring more economic support; third, China holds the key to resolve the North Korean issue, but it does not play its role; fourth, engaging in dialogue in return for North Korea's provocative behaviors means getting caught by North Korea's pattern; fifth, negotiating with North Korean is waste of time. It is hard to say that these five biases are absolutely wrong, however, it is obvious that they make it difficult to carry the balanced and practical North Korean policies forward, but make it avoid the essence of the issue.

Although someone insists that DPRK may have struggle with instability of its system, the major assessment points that the Kim, Jeong-Eun's regime becomes quickly stabilized, which is proven through the improved economic situation, bold shift in generations of the military chief executives, and cabinet-oriented effort for the state normalization. The lesson from the past 20 years of history in regards to the North Korean nuclear issues is that dialogue and negotiation is more effective than sanctions and coercion in inducing North Korea to prevent worsening situation.

Classic examples of resulting in changing behavior of North Korea related to nuclear issue through dialogue are as below: the DPRK-U.S. High Level Talk and the DPRK-U.S. joint press statement on 19 July 1993 during Clinton administration which suspended North Korea from withdrawal from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty(NPT), the Geneva Agreement Framework of 1994 which resulted in freezing North Korean nuclear program, Bush administration's efforts to open an dialogue such as agreement made on 13 February 2007 and 3 October 2007, which eased heightened tensions from Banco Delta Asia sanctions on North Korea.

On the other hand, heightened tensions such as 2nd and 3rd rocket launch by North Korea, adoption of the UN Security Council resolutions, crisis of 2nd and 3rd nuclear test by North Korea all happened during the time when hardline stance and sanctions against North Korea heightened.

The U.S. government's "Strategic Patience" and the Lee Myung-bak administrations' continual sanctions against North Korea only resulted in North Korea improving its nuclear capabilities, rather than abandoning them. At least, North Korea did not test missiles and nuclear weapons when it was engaged in practical dialogue. This is why Park Geun-hye administration should put its best efforts to restart dialogue with North Korea.

How to solve North Korean nuclear issues?

Even though sanctions and containment did not solve vicious circle of nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula in the last 20 years, Park Geun-hye administration has not abandoned military deterrence and coercive diplomacy. Since the 3rd nuclear test by North Korea last year, Park Geun-hye administration

seeks various military strategies for 'reinforcing deterrence against North Korea'. Both ROK and U.S. governments chose 'tailored deterrence strategy' which allows preemptive attack once any symptoms of North Korea's use of nuclear weapons are sensed. In this context, South Korea accelerates the establishment of a preemptive defense operation system, the so-called "Kill Chain." The U.S. government is also committed to maintaining and reinforcing the extended deterrence that consists of a nuclear umbrella, a conventional armament, and a Missile Defense. Furthermore, Seoul, Washington, and Tokyo accelerate consultation on the establishment of a MD system between the three countries. Thus, they increase the number and intensity of joint military exercises.

However, it is doubtful whether these measures will bring peace to the Korean Peninsula or make North Korea abandon its nuclear power. Enhancing deterrence against North Korea with armed protest is likely to cause an accidental armed conflict and war. In addition, if an arms race is continued, to enhance deterrence capability against North Korea, solving the North Korea nuclear issue will be more difficult. We should realize that the motivation and strategic background of Pyongyang's decision to develop nuclear weapons capabilities, is to countervail its conventional military inferiority to the ROK-U.S. alliance.

In addition, a MD system aggravates strategic distrust between the U.S. and China and, thus, discourages China from playing a constructive role. Some in the U.S. argue that a MD system would arouse China's security concerns, by which Beijing would be impelled to participate in imposing pressure and sanctions on North Korea. Therefore, they insist that the U.S. should reinforce the role and capacity of the ROK-U.S. alliance and the U.S.-Japan alliance and also accelerate military cooperation between both alliances. However, this type of coercive diplomacy raises concerns that the U.S. is using North Korea threats as a justification for its "Pivot to Asia" policy or "Rebalancing" strategy, whose actual purpose is to monitor China. In addition, as the U.S. requires South Korea to participate in a MD system and sign a General Security of Military Information Agreement with Japan, this would arouse criticism of the U.S. in Korea.

In conclusion, the current situation based on the armistice system is likely to make the Korean Peninsula more unstable, so as to make the system unsustainable. Therefore, the 'Strategic Patience' of the Obama administration and the 'Korean Peninsula Trust-Building Process' of the Park Geun-hye administration, while likely to maintain the status quo on the Korean Peninsula in the long term, should be closely reconsidered. Without conversion of the current armistice system to a peace system, it will be impossible to permanently solve the North Korean nuclear issue, because this mechanism is the fundamental cause of the crises on the Korea Peninsula. Therefore, newly issued policies toward North Korea should be based on active and peaceful efforts to change the status quo that is the peaceful conversion from the current armistice system to a permanent peace system.

Suggestions from Korean civil society for peace on the Korean Peninsula and Denuclearization

In establishing new policies for denuclearization and permanent peace on the Korean Peninsula, the first step is to follow and maintain the direction of the erstwhile agreements and develop their content. Namely: the Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula in 1992; the U.S.-DPRK Joint Communiqué in 2000; the September 19th Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks in 2005; and the October 4th Joint Declaration of the Inter-Korean Summit in 2007. In particular, the South Korean and U.S. governments should pay attention to the position that the September 19th Joint Statement took, because the statement handles the North Korean nuclear issue in a comprehensive fashion. It specifies the necessity of solving the North Korean nuclear issue, improving U.S.-DPRK and Japan-DPRK relations, and establishing a permanent peace-security system in Northeast Asia by all participating states in the talks.

First, the South Korean and U.S. governments should consider the September 19th Joint Statement as a basic premise and develop the ideas of the statement into a fundamental, comprehensive and balanced principle in dealing with the North Korea nuclear issue. The denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula stipulated in the statement should be formalized and developed into the establishment of NWFZ on the Korean Peninsula. Even though the statement approached the nuclear issue by separating denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula from the establishment of a NWFZ on the Korean Peninsula, the new policy should approach the issues by regarding these separate goals as goals that we should simultaneously achieve. In new rounds of dialogue, we should comprehensively discuss the issue of delivery vehicles (rockets), which are not included in the statement, and economic cooperation in the statement.

Second, South Korea and the U.S. should start Four-Party Talks between South Korea, North Korea, the U.S. and China to discuss a peace treaty for establishing a permanent peace system on the Korean Peninsula, while resuming the Six-Party Talks to resolve the nuclear issue. The issue of a peace system is a mutually-agreed term of the September 19th Joint Statement in 2005. South Korea, North Korea, the U.S. and China should, therefore, regard the initiation of Four-Party Talks for discussing a peace system as fulfilling one of the principles of the Joint Statement while resuming the Six-Party Talks. In order to make smooth progress in the Four-Party Talks, in regard to the discussion of a peace system, we need to refer to the previous Four-Party Talks that South Korea and the U.S. simultaneously proposed to North Korea and carried forward in 1996. If South Korea, the U.S., and China begin to consult with North Korea based on the agendas and main issues that were discussed in the previous rounds of the talks in 1996, they will be able to create a favorable atmosphere for resolving the nuclear issue.

Third, the U.S. Government should resume bilateral and direct dialogue with North Korea about improving the comprehensive relationship between the U.S. and North Korea at the same time that it resumes the Six-Party Talks. The direct talks between the two governments should aim to normalize

their diplomatic relations. First of all, the U.S. should institutionalize a conversation in which the U.S. and North Korea gradually discuss a range of items from lifting economic sanctions to ending their hostile relations. In these rounds of talks, the U.S. needs to reaffirm its promise that the U.S. president will visit North Korea, which was agreed and stipulated in the US-DPRK Joint Communiqué in 2000.

Fourth, stable improvement of the inter-Korean relationship is an indispensable condition for achieving the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and establishing a peace system. The South Korean government should not force North Korea to abandon its nuclear capabilities before resuming inter-Korean cooperation, because this attitude does not help Seoul solve the nuclear issue and improve inter-Korean relations, but simply motivates North Korea to reinforce its nuclear capabilities and exacerbates inter-Korean relations. A favorable and stable inter-Korean relationship is essential for facilitating the process of solving the North Korean nuclear issue and peace on the Korean Peninsula. In this context, the South Korean government should put considerable effort into improving the current worsening inter-Korean relationship. This can be done by carrying out cooperative measures, such as the resumption of humanitarian assistance (e.g., food and fertilizer), restarting Mt. Kumgang tours, and lifting the May 24th sanctions. Furthermore, Seoul should respect and acknowledge mutually agreed terms (e.g., the Inter-Korean Basic Agreement, the June 15th Joint Declaration of the Inter-Korean Summit in 2000, and the October 4th Joint Declaration of the Inter-Korean Summit in 2007) and consult responsibly and positively with Pyongyang about how to ease tensions and establish peace in the Yellow Sea.

Based on these four strategies, we can think of new approach for peace on the Korean Peninsula and denuclearization. At the core of the new policy, this report proposes the declaration of peace by four countries (South Korea, North Korea, the U.S. and China) in exchange for North Korea's pledge to eliminate its nuclear capabilities and return to The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). This would be the initial step in a simultaneous exchange of reciprocal actions. This is to first provide North Korea with a transitional status for its return to the NPT and then later the complete destruction of nuclear weapons, as in the Ukrainian case. In order to build trust, a precondition for open negotiations should be the Four-Parties' declaration of an end to the Korean War and a pledge to transit to a permanent peace regime.

It has been already more than 20 years since North Korea withdrew from the NPT and nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula has become more serious. We cannot avoid North Korean nuclear issues which have worsened in the last 20 years while preparing 2015 NPT review conference. We should transform military hostility and arms race to peaceful dialogue and cooperation. We also refrain ourselves from conducting aggressive ROK-US joint military exercise and armed protest, while use social expenses which are wasted under the name of national security to build economy, economic democratization and establish social safety net. As you all well aware of, South Korean people are in the deepest grief

because of the recent Sewol ferry tragedy. In 2011, we witnessed Fukushima nuclear crisis brought threats and fear on radiation to not only Japanese people but also all people living in the Asia-Pacific. Threats that we face in our daily lives can be the most serious fear and threats in our society. Now, it is time to build peace based on people's perspective and use national budget to remove threats in our daily lives rather than pursuing nuclear umbrella and arms protests under the name of national security. We do hope that South Korean civil society's suggestion on peace will be a leverage to create 'Nuclear Free World' that every world citizen wishes for. We hope all peace movements in the world to stand in solidarity with us to make year 2015 to bring new turning point for establishing permanent peace in the Korean Peninsula and solving North Korean nuclear issues. (*)

Introductory Speeches

Mongolia's Position on the Issue of Establishment of a NEA-NWFZ

Mr. Jargalsaikhan Enkhsaikhan, Director of Blue Banner

First of all I would like to thank the co-sponsors of the NGO forum for organizing this important event, especially on the margins of the NPT preparatory committee. I fully agree with the previous speakers about the importance of establishing a NEA-NWFZ in promoting mutual trust and non-proliferation in the region and vice versa.

Need to talk about NEA-NWFZ

Mongolia is a state party to the NPT, article VII of which states that “Nothing in this Treaty affects the right of any group of States to conclude treaties in order to ensure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories.” Mongolia is a Northeast Asian country, a region that has both nuclear-weapon and nuclear-capable states. It believes that establishing of a NEA-NWFZ is a political imperative due to the situation in the region. Everybody would agree that the geopolitical situation in the region is not stable, mutual suspicion is still felt. Almost seven decades ago nuclear weapons have been used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Also in the past, including in the recent threats of the use of nuclear weapons had been made in the region. The cold war thinking is still felt at times in this region. The real dilemma is that despite this disturbing situation, no government in the region, for the short term political reasons, has officially proposed to consider the issue of establishing a NEA-NWFZ.

Separately, the non-nuclear-weapon states of the region support policies of nuclear non-proliferation and strengthening of nuclear security. Japan’s three non-nuclear principles of not possessing, not producing and not permitting the introduction of nuclear weapon is a sound basis for such a policy. Adoption in 1992 by the two Koreas of a joint declaration on the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula also provides an opportunity for ridding the Korean peninsula and, hopefully, the Northeast Asian region, of nuclear weapons. With enough political will these two policies can form the basis of discussing the issue of establishing a NEA-NWFZ.

Informal proposals made so far

The idea of establishing a NEA-NWFZ has been seriously discussed at the academic and expert levels, especially since early 1990s. Thus John Endicott of Georgia Tech has proposed to look into the

possibility of establishing a limited NWFZ in Northeast Asia (LNWFZ-NEA). Limited meaning both in respect to geography and weapons system. Thus it would apply to tactical nuclear weapons and to some parts of the nuclear-weapon states of possible parties the zone – China, Russia and the U.S. And as such it would be a transitional zone until the issue of NWFZ is fully addressed and agreed upon. It was seen at that time as a transitional measure, instead of adopting a rigid all-or-none approach. It had its merits. Since then a number of variations of LNWFZ-NEA have been discussed at different fora.

Then in mid 1990s a proposal was made to establish a NWFZ between Japan and the two Koreas (the so-called Trilateral treaty with NSA proposals), which later became known as the 3 + 3 arrangement of proposed by Dr. Hiromichi Umebayashi of Peace Depot. With some modifications this proposal is now known as the Model Treaty of 3+3 arrangement. Also at that time a proposal for a Tripartite NWFZ (TNWFZ) was made by Dr. Seongwhun Cheon and Tatsujiro Suzuki, whose idea was to involve the nuclear-weapon states especially at some later stage of negotiations, when the sensitive issues of redeploying or dismantling of nuclear weapons would be discussed in earnest. In 1995 Andrew Mack of Australian National University proposed to establish a NWFZ involving not only the two Koreas and Japan, but also Taiwan. A year later Dr. Kumao Kaneko of Japan has proposed the so-called circular NWFZ consisting of a circular area with a 2000 kilometer radius from the DMZ and in which non-nuclear-weapon-free and nuclear-weapon states would have different commitments to be agreed upon. It is not the purpose of my statement to assess the strengths and weaknesses of these proposals. All need joint careful consideration.

Lately there have also been some talks about addressing this issue as part of a broader approach to security in Northeast Asia that could include termination of the state of war on the Korean peninsula, ending hostile intents and taking simultaneously some other confidence-building and cooperative measures. All the above mentioned clearly demonstrate that in the academic circles and at expert level there is a rich diversity of ideas and proposals to work on or work with. The alternative to this approach is continued mutual suspicion, high tension and a possible regional nuclear arms race with all its devastating consequences, if not tragic unintentional use of nuclear weapons.

Looking at the larger picture, i.e. at the Asia-Pacific region, it is clear that politically NEA-NWFZ is an imperative whose time has come. The South Pacific, South-East Asia and Central Asia have already established NWFZs. Thus there is broad agreement among the states parties to these zones not to acquire nuclear weapons; they have on compliance and verification mechanisms. Moreover, the P5 have pledged not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons and not to contribute to any act that would violate these zones. And this is exactly what is needed in Northeast Asia, bearing in mind, of course, the regional specifics.

Last year the report of UN Secretary General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters has recommended, inter alia, that the Secretary General consider appropriate action for the establishment of a NEA-NWFZ.

Mongolian President's suggestion

In line with such recommendation, President Ts. Elbegdorj of Mongolia, when addressing the High-level meeting on nuclear disarmament last year, has said that Mongolia was prepared, on an informal basis, to work with the countries of Northeast Asia to see if and how a nuclear-weapon-free zone could be established in the region. Though we know well that that would not be easy and would require courage, he continued, with political will and perseverance, it is doable, if not right away. In the meantime, steps should be taken to promote greater confidence.

A logical question can be asked, why Mongolia?

President Ts. Elbegdorj's proposal is based on the country's aim to ensure its security through strengthening regional confidence and security. In Mongolia we have a saying that when the lake is peaceful, the ducks are at ease. At present no country of the region, except for Mongolia, is in a position to make such a proposal due to their allied commitments or some other political reasons.

Mongolia is an active member of the NEA-n region. It is committed to promoting mutual understanding and cooperation in the region. It has no unresolved territorial or even border issues with its neighbors. It also maintains good relations with all other countries of the region and pursues a policy of ensuring its security primarily by political and diplomatic means. In that sense it has accumulated some experience in promoting common interests that resulted in recognition by the P5 of its unique nuclear-weapon-free status. As a result of such a policy, in September 2012 the P5 have signed a joint declaration whereby they not only recognized Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status, but also declared to respect it and not to contribute to any act that would violate it. To promote further understanding and confidence among the states of the region, last year Mongolia has called for a 1.5 channel regional security dialogue such issues as economic cooperation, environmental issues or some other non-traditional security issues. Such an informal dialogue is not intended to compete with the Six Party Talks, but on the contrary, it is intended to support the talks by addressing non-controversial 'soft' issues of common interest and promote thus regional confidence. The first such meeting is scheduled to be held in June of this year in Ulaanbaatar.

The devil is in the details

We can all agree that establishing a NEA-NWFZ, whereby the non-nuclear-weapon states would pledge not to acquire, possess or allow placing nuclear weapons on their territories, and whereby the nuclear-weapon states would pledge not to threaten or use nuclear weapons against the zone or states of the zone, is highly desirable. The question, however, is whether it is feasible or doable at this stage. The devil is always in the details. In that sense there are many issues that need to be properly addressed, starting with increasing trust and confidence, zone of application, the degree of inclusiveness, the role of nuclear doctrines and of the extended deterrence policies, the excess plutonium issues, the content of the security assurances to be provided by the P5, port calls, transit of ships, existence of unresolved territorial issues, verification, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, etc. The mere enumeration of these issues shows that time would be needed to address them. In short it means that it is necessary to move from the mindset of collective security to cooperative security, from merely talking to jointly thinking of how to materialize this noble goal; from turning a potential nuclear threat to a practical peaceful application of the atom. The zone could also serve as an important element of future regional security structure.

As the experience of the NPT demonstrates, the role of civil society and the academia could be important, especially at the stage of informal consultations and outlining the framework of the future agreement.

Conclusion

Due to the complex nature of the political situation in the region, establishing a NEA-NWFZ will take a long-time, would need enormous efforts and out of the box thinking. Nevertheless, or should I say because of this, it is important to start practical discussions, at least informally, of the issue and how to move it forward. There is more than enough ideas and material to work on or work with. So let us all embark on this challenging journey.

Presentations

Report on the Activities of Japanese Civil Society

Mr. Ichiro Yuasa, President of Peace Depot

Importance of a Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (NEA-NWFZ)

Even now that 20 years has passed since the end of the Cold War, begun by the fall of the Berlin Wall, it is difficult to say that the world is now free from Cold War thinking. Especially in Northeast Asia, the Korean War has not ended. The DPRK nuclear development consistently pursuing the perpetuation of the regime continues, military cooperation between Japan, the U.S. and the ROK in response to this is being strengthened, and China and Russia are advancing the modernization of their military forces. The vicious cycle which could be called the "security dilemma," brought about by mutual distrust, is leading to further nuclear and arms race. We cannot see the road to peace and security as long as this structure is maintained. Only now, an inclusive frame of "common security" through multilateral dialogue and cooperation is required to make it out of the vicious circle of this "security dilemma".

This stalemate cannot be resolved through only the existing concept of the Six-Party Talks, which seek the "verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula." If considered from the perspective of the DPRK, this is seen as an unfair pressure for only the DPRK to pursue its denuclearization, coming from the US – a nuclear weapon state, and Japan and the ROK - reliant upon US nuclear deterrence. In order to overcome this impasse, it is necessary to create an environment in which the DPRK will feel secure enough to completely discard its nuclear weapons. The proposal of a treaty for a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone is the only answer to break down this wall.

In 2013, there were new attempts to move forward the denuclearization of Northeast Asia. On 26 July, the report of the UN Secretary General on the work of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters was submitted to the General Assembly. In the report, the Board recommended that the Secretary General consider appropriate action for the establishment of a nuclear weapon free zone in Northeast Asia (NEA-NWFZ). On 26 September at the High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament, Mr. Elbegdorj Tsakhia, President of Mongolia, expressed the country's readiness to work with countries of the region to see if and how a NWFZ could be established in the region. It is now strongly necessary to take advantage of this new environment.

To promote the cooperation of Mayors, Religious People, Parliamentarians and Citizens

I would like to introduce efforts in Japan to support the realization of a NWFZ.

1. NGO Groups

Firstly, as like-minded NGOs in Japan and the ROK, sharing the belief that a NEA-NWFZ can greatly contribute to achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world, have since 2003 continually convening joint workshops on the issue of a NEA-NWFZ in Seoul, Tokyo, Shanghai, New York, Geneva and Vienna. Through the workshops, we have broadly expanded the support of mayors, the religious community, parliamentarians and peace NGOs. In 2004, we announced a Model NEA-NWFZ Treaty called the “3 +3” Initiative, drafted in cooperation with activists and scholars. It is a driving force to form public opinion as civil society to support the actions of Mayors and Parliamentarians. In March 2009, groups of Japanese and ROK NGOs (Peace Depot, Peace Boat, Peace Network and People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy) launched a campaign calling for endorsement of the ‘Statement of Support for a NEA-NWFZ’.

2. Mayors of Local Authorities

The second point is the support of Mayors, who assume responsibility to protect the lives and safety of residents. In Japan, efforts in this field are underway. The National Council of Japan Nuclear Free Local Authorities (JNFLA) is a network of 289 local authorities, which within its major themes clearly includes the creation of a NEA-NWFZ, and has worked on the petition of mayors from local authorities in support of the international statement launched on our call. There are now 543 signatories of this petition, and on April 28, 2014, Mayor Tomihisa Taue of Nagasaki and Mayor Kazumi Matsui of Hiroshima presented these signatures to the UNODA. These signatures had been presented to the Japanese Government three times in the past.

The idea to utilize sister city relationships will also be useful to promote the idea of a NEA-NWFZ. As of today, 129 local authorities in Japan have entered a sister city agreement with local authorities in the ROK. We would like to establish cooperation between local authorities from Japan and the ROK. The first step could be a joint declaration by mayors in Japan and the ROK calling for the promotion of a NEA-NWFZ. The cities of Daegu and Hiroshima will be a good example.

3. Religious People

Third, we would like to begin work to broaden support from the religious and legal communities. We are hoping for further communication with WCC, which signed a Joint Appeal¹ at the workshop in Geneva in

¹ <http://www.peacedepot.org/e-news/2013NPTWS.pdf>

April 2013. On November 8 2013, the WCC Assembly in Busan resolution included language on the denuclearization of Northeast Asia. In addition, "Religions for Peace" is a cooperation organization of this forum, and Mr Sugino is participating as a speaker. Taking this opportunity, we hope to be able to start gathering signatures from religious leaders to support a NEA-NWFZ.

4. Parliamentarians

Fourth is the necessity to expand the support of Parliamentarians, who have direct influence to governments. Although unfortunately developments in this regard have quietened due to the Abe administration, in May 2012, PNND Japan launched a working team on NWFZ, which is now beginning its activities.

While in this way continuing to broadly expand voices in support of a NEA-NWFZ, we are also aiming to build further multi-layered cooperation with civil society in the ROK, another related country. And, today, I want to report the actions calling for a NEA-NWFZ by civil society to all members of the UN Department of Disarmament Affairs and related government officials and representatives present. I want to strongly urge that the UN should make concrete the recommendations for "appropriate action towards the establishment of a Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone" of the United Nations Disarmament Advisory Committee report, as well as strongly urge related governments including member states of the Six-Party Talks to cooperate with these efforts. I believe that it is possible to position the initiative for a NEA-NWFZ as an official agenda of the fifth working group of the Six-Party Talks. I think that if the legally binding denuclearization of Northeast Asia can be realized, this would be a major breakthrough in building the peace process in Northeast Asia. At the same time, I believe that it would also be a significant contribution toward "a world without nuclear weapons".

Presentations

Efforts and Visions of Local Authorities in Japan

Mr. Tomihisa Taue, Mayor of Nagasaki, National Council of Japan Nuclear Free Local Authorities¹

- Tensions in the Northeast Asian region are heightening, including because of DPRK missile launches and nuclear testing, with urgent challenges which need resolution.
- It is thus of deep significance that within this situation NGOs from Japan and the ROK, as well as the single state nuclear weapons free zone of Mongolia, come together to organize this forum on the establishment of a Northeast Asian Nuclear-Weapons Free Zone.
- The City of Nagasaki is conducting various efforts towards the establishment of a NEA-NWFZ. The “Nagasaki Peace Declaration” appeals for the creation of such a zone, and has been translated into 9 languages and disseminated globally through the homepage etc. At the Nagasaki Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons held last year, a session on the theme of a NEA-NWFZ was held, and through active discussion there the “Nagasaki Appeal” was adopted, calling for joint efforts by the Japanese and ROK Governments to work towards the realization of a NWFZ.
- The National Council of Japan Nuclear Free Local Authorities, of which I am President, includes the NEA-NWFZ in its annual Assembly Declaration, and continually appeals for the necessity of the establishment of a nuclear-weapons free zone through informational pamphlets, lectures and so on. The signature campaign held in cooperation with Peace Depot supporting a NWFZ has been spreading nationally, with 543 signatory local authorities, and on three occasions we have conducted direct appeals with these petitions to the Japanese Government.
- Currently, about 90% of local authorities in Japan have made nuclear-free, peace declarations. We pledge to continue to expand this network of nuclear-free local authorities, and work together with civil society for the realization of a world free from nuclear weapons.

¹ Activities of the National Council of Japan Nuclear Free Local Authorities: study sessions, parent and child journalists, travelling exhibitions of the atomic bombings, mini exhibitions, distribution of seeds from tree which survived the atomic bombing, etc.

Presentations

Efforts and Visions of Local Authorities in Japan

Mr. Kazumi Matsui, Mayor of Hiroshima, Mayors for Peace

Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you for inviting me to this forum again. I am Matsui Kazumi, mayor of Hiroshima and president of Mayors for Peace.

Mayors for Peace, composed of 6,000 member cities in 158 countries and regions worldwide, in collaboration with the United Nations and like-minded NGOs, has been promoting the 2020 Vision, seeking to abolish nuclear weapons by 2020.

In this context, we highly praise your efforts in recognizing that the Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone is one of the important approaches towards realizing world peace. The Hiroshima Appeal, which was adopted at the Mayors for Peace General Conference last August, states that “Concrete policies, frameworks and confidence-building measures to promote international and regional peace and security must be put in place - in particular, in regions such as the Middle East, North East Asia and South Asia, where nuclear tensions are on the rise.” Furthermore, in the Peace Declaration that I delivered on August 6 last year, I appealed to the world that “for the peace and stability of our region, all countries involved must do more to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free North Korea in a Northeast Asia nuclear-weapon-free zone.”

Nuclear weapons used by the policy-makers of the time indiscriminately stole the lives of innocent people, permanently altering the lives of survivors, and stalking their minds and bodies to the end of their days. Such weapons are the ultimate inhumane weapons and an absolute evil. Even with their average age surpassing 78 years, the atomic bomb survivors, who know the hell of an atomic bombing, are still continuously fighting for abolition so that no future policy-makers will ever use such weapons again.

Even now, after a quarter of a century has passed since the end of the Cold War, there still exist more than 17,000 nuclear warheads around the world. We are still living under the risk of destruction through nuclear weapons. We cannot deny the great difficulty of our work towards realizing a world free from nuclear weapons. Let us look at the state of international community – while globalization continues to accelerate, a sense of belonging to the one human family has not yet been sufficiently developed. This combination tends to create fragmentation, distrust and misunderstanding. The persistence of conflict is the unfortunate reality of our world. Differences in race, nationality, language, and religion tend to cause misunderstandings and distrust, and amongst a situation where mutual distrust reigns, humans

are tempted to threaten others in order to protect themselves, and rely on means of violence in order to gain an upper hand against others. The epitome of this is the absolute evil of nuclear weapons.

Mayors for Peace, with the aim of creating a peaceful world free from nuclear weapons and in recognition of these weapons' inhumanity, is campaigning for a nuclear weapons convention. In order to construct a basis for peace, we are working to spread the sense of belonging as members of the same human family to the wide international civil society on all levels, and striving for the realization of a society where differences are not the cause of disputes, but can be respected as a source of diversity that enriches human society. If the world works earnestly for the realization of this kind of society, we can break away from the system of "nuclear deterrence", which uses the threat of massive indiscriminate killings to preserve peace, finally making it possible to create a more humane security system. However, on the way to this goal, nuclear weapons should never be used again.

In a stage of transition, where nuclear weapons still exist, it is therefore essential to put in place policies, systems and confidence building measures to make sure that their use are not allowed, and to secure the road towards their abolition. As one of these systems, the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones can play an important role.

Furthermore, I would like to highlight one of the very important facts that have made the reconstruction of Hiroshima possible. It is the truth that Hiroshima has not been involved in any wars or armed conflicts throughout the 69 years following the atomic bombing. Efforts to create a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone echo this history of reconstruction and resonate deeply with unshakable humanitarian conviction of the atomic bomb survivors that "no one should ever again suffer as we have."

The City of Hiroshima and Mayors for Peace support the Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. I earnestly hope that the joint efforts by all the countries involved, the United Nations, as well as concerned citizens and NGOs can accelerate the pace of achieving peace in Northeast Asia.

Presentations

World Council of Churches' Support for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Northeast Asia

Mr. Jonathan Frerichs, Programme Executive for Peace-building and Disarmament, WCC

Thank you to the organizers of this event and all participants. We are here, in a sense, to tend the flame of hope for peace in Northeast Asia. It is a privilege to do so again, with people and organizations from different sectors of society.

The World Council of Churches is an association of churches whose common concerns are often shaped by regional challenges. The 345 member churches' collective attention has turned repeatedly toward Northeast Asia, often over threats to peace. Last November the WCC's 10th worldwide Assembly met in Northeast Asia. 800 delegates and 3000 other participants came from 140 countries to Busan, South Korea. The warmth, the witness and the passion of our hosts were a wonderful sign of how precious peace is in every region.

The Assembly addressed the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Northeast Asia in three ways. Two of them bore good fruit in Busan. The third way did not work out, but it taught an important lesson.

The first way put the NEA-NWFZ in the context of regional trends which pose a challenge to all regions. It was during a plenary on the theme "God of life, lead us to justice and peace". It looked at current history in the region and said that, to arrive at peace, three related journeys are needed—journeys into a new peace, a new light and a new earth. A South Korean professor described them as journeys of "exodus".

The first journey is an "exodus into new peace". It is an exodus for a divided Korea, for a Korea where the Cold War has not ended and fear of a new Cold War looms. An exodus for a Korea that now finds itself part of a US pivot to contain China, caught up in a new regional arms race that includes nuclear weapons. An exodus from the four largest armies in the world deploying forces in and around the Korean peninsula. An exodus from anxiety that war can break out again. An exodus from 60 years of armistice and 60 years of "pseudo peace". A US Defense Department estimate was cited which says a new war in Korea could result in 1.5 million casualties within the first 24 hours and 6 million casualties within the first week. Korea and all of Northeast Asia need an exodus from an unfinished war to a permanent peace.

The second journey is an “exodus into new light”. It was described as “an exodus from the blinding flash of nuclear bombs and the deadly glow of nuclear reactors to a world free of nuclear weapons and power plants”.

This second exodus is necessary because Northeast Asia has become the “global ground zero” of nuclear dangers: It is the only place in the world where nuclear weapons have actually been used; more than 1,000 nuclear tests were conducted, without local consent, in adjoining areas of the Pacific and central Asia; and now all states in Northeast Asia either possess nuclear weapons or are protected by the nuclear weapons of an ally.

One previous WCC Assembly was held in Asia (in New Delhi) in 1961. Since then, the number of states with nuclear weapons has more than doubled. Today Asia is the home of six of the nine states with nuclear weapons. In 1961 there were no nuclear power plants in Asia at all. In East and South Asia today, there are 117 in operation with many more planned. South Korea has the highest geographic density of nuclear power plants in the world.

In order to be free from the dangerous light outside us, it was said, “we must liberate ourselves from a nuclear culture based on our own greed and fear. In order to see the light inside us, we need to turn off the deadly nuclear light outside us.” The electricity powering the Assembly was coming in part from South Korea’s most accident-prone nuclear power plant, the Kori plant, near Busan. So the lights were turned off, the speaker lit a candle, and 4000 participants listened in darkness. “Lighting a light inside you is the spiritual awakening which frees us from our greed and illusion,” the speaker said.

The final exodus is an “exodus to new earth”. It is an exodus from the industrial age to an ecological age. An exodus which the challenge of climate change brings into sharp focus. An exodus from a civilization base on fossil-fuels and nuclear energy. The Fukushima nuclear catastrophe is a clarion call alerting humanity to the urgency of such transformation. An exodus to a new earth means human cooperation in the face of climate change, in building peace and in enhancing life.

The Assembly dealt directly with the NEA-NWFZ as part of an official *Statement on Peace and Reunification of the Korean Peninsula*. It recognized that churches have worked for decades for peace and reconciliation as well as denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. These initiatives continue, involving North and South Korean church leaders, churches from Asia, North America and Europe, and Christian-Buddhist cooperation.

“On the Korean peninsula, shared human security and human rights must become a greater priority than divisive, competitive and militarized national security,” the Assembly noted. “The threat of nuclear weapons has long been recognized, and now serious questions are raised concerning all nuclear energy. With many in the world, the churches share the conviction that a world without nuclear weapons is both necessary and possible. Our shared hope for a nuclear-free world would not only be for the people of

the Korean peninsula but for all people in the world, renouncing nuclear weapons and working together for their complete dismantling.”

The statement denounced military build-ups in the region including the stockpiling of nuclear weapons. It called for “fresh and decisive action” on a peace treaty agreed by countries related to the Armistice Agreement. It reminded participants in the Six-Party Talks of their promise to hold peace forums. It “strongly urged” the US and Japan to stop blockades and sanctions against North Korea and called China to act in its facilitator role so dialogues can resume.

The statement main recommendations for church advocacy and government action include: “Ensure the complete, verifiable and irreversible elimination of all nuclear weapons and power plants in North East Asia, taking steps to establish a nuclear-free world and simultaneously joining the emerging international consensus for a humanitarian ban on nuclear weapons in all regions of the world, so that life is no longer threatened by nuclear dangers anywhere on earth.”

Related recommendations are to lift the existing economic and financial sanctions imposed on the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, halt all military exercises on the Korean peninsula and reduce military expenditures in the region. It also called for both Koreas – with international cooperation – to maintain “a truly Demilitarized Zone and transform it into a zone of peace”.

A third approach to the NWFZ came in a proposal to set some ambitious new policy. In the lead-up to the WCC Assembly and the aftermath of Fukushima, nine ecumenical and inter-religious conferences had issued a variety of calls for either the elimination of nuclear weapons or the phasing-out of nuclear power plants from Northeast Asia, or both. The WCC as a whole had not explicitly linked these issues before. In Busan, 88 delegates from 35 member churches signed a proposal for the Assembly to respond with a statement addressing the issue of a nuclear-free world. There was intensive networking and debate. A document was prepared. Brought to the floor, it garnered solid support and met some strong resistance. Supporters from every region felt that Northeast Asia is precisely the region from which to address global nuclear dangers in a comprehensive ethical and humanitarian framework. The main critique was to deny linkages between nuclear power and nuclear weapons, and to defend nuclear power as a necessary and manageable energy source. It was clear from the critical voices that basic rationalizations of the nuclear age are still at work. There was not time to reach a consensus. Delegates from the region were deeply disappointed. The issue was referred for governing body action later this year

Perhaps a fourth way was also born in Busan. Follow-up to the Assembly has now begun. At a press conference in Seoul this month, the WCC general secretary announced that an international consultation on peace, reconciliation and reunification of the Korean peninsula will be held in Geneva in

June 2014. Representatives from the Korean Christian Federation in North Korea, churches in South Korean and concerned churches in other regions will be invited.

Surely peace in Korea and peace in Northeast Asia will have to be nuclear-weapon-free.

Presentations

Religions for Peace's Support for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Northeast Asia

Rev. Kyoichi Sugino, Deputy Secretary General of Religions for Peace

1. World's Religious Communities and Nuclear Disarmament: *The Official Launch at the United Nations of the Resource Guide on Nuclear Disarmament for Religious Leaders and Communities*

- While world's religious communities have always been an important part of the global nuclear disarmament movement, renewed efforts to strengthen their engagement through multi-religious collaboration at all levels from the senior religious leadership to the grassroots levels are underway.
- On the occasion of the High-level Meeting of the UN General Assembly on 26 September 2013, H.E. Laura Chinchilla Miranda, President of Costa Rica, Dr. William F. Vendley, Secretary General, *Religions for Peace* and Ambassador Eduardo Ulibarri of Costa Rica officially launched the *Religions for Peace Resource Guide on Nuclear Disarmament for Religious Leaders and Communities*. The principal author of the Resource Guide was Mr. Alyn Ware, Global Coordinator for the Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament and a member of the *RfP* International Standing Commission on Disarmament and Security.
- The Resource Guide was then introduced to, and endorsed by, more than 700 religious leaders and practitioners representing the world's major faith communities from more than 100 countries in Vienna, Austria at the *RfP* 9th World Assembly.
- Religious communities' advocacy and action for nuclear disarmament are further strengthened through their action-oriented multi-stakeholder partnerships with parliamentarians and other civil society actors. (*e.g. Parliamentarians, religious and civil society leaders gathered together for the launch of the Japanese version of the resource guide. Tokyo, Japan | December 2013*).

2. Multi-religious Dialogue and Cooperation among China, ROK, DPRK, and Japan: *Building necessary conditions for the Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone*

- The most recent multi-religious six party talks on peace and security in Northeast Asia was conducted in Vienna, Austria during the *RfP* 9th World Assembly in November 2013. Representatives of *RfP* affiliates: Korean Council of Religionists (KCR, DPRK), Korean Conference of

Religions for Peace (KCRP, ROK), *Religions for Peace* Japan (Japan), China Committee on Religion and Peace (CCRP, China), *Religions for Peace* USA (USA), and the Interreligious Council of Russia (Russia) held parallel meetings during the Assembly. The participants expressed their commitment to maintaining and further strengthening interreligious mechanisms for dialogue and cooperation to advance peace and security in Northeast Asia, building upon more than 20 year history in harnessing multi-religious confidence building and common action through interreligious councils in the región.

- In August 2006, interreligious councils in five countries (ROK, China, Japan, US, Russia) held a 5 party consultation on peace and security in Northeast Asia, followed by multiple interreligious engagements, including a) North-South dialogue, b) DPRK, ROK, China, Japan interreligious consultations, as well as c) DPRK's participation in the anual meeting of the Asian Conference of *Religions for Peace* (*Religions for Peace* Asia).

3. *Religions for Peace* Advocacy and Action for the Establishment of the Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone

- A realistic scheme for the NEA-NWFZ remains 3+3 arrangement, in which the ROK, the DPRK and Japan become the principal parties to the zone and the neighboring nuclear weapon states (China, Russia and the US) support it through the provision of security assurances, as this would build upon the 1992 Inter-Korean Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of Korean Peninsula and Japan's Three Non-Nuclear Principles.
- Building upon our work in the región through affiliated interreligious councils, *Religions for Peace* will continue to strengthen its three pronged approach:
 - ✓ Conduct national and regional multi-religious and multi-stakeholder consultations and trainings base d on the *RfP* Nuclear Resource Guide. Trainings and workshops will be led by *RfP* interreligious councils in partnership with relevant political and civil society leaders.
 - ✓ Maintain and strengthen ROK-DPRK and ROK-Japan bilateral multi-religious dialogue.
 - ✓ Maintain and strengthen China, ROK, and Japan three party multi-religious dialogue, as well as other forms of multilateral consultations which include DPRK.
- *Religions for Peace* is currently working towards a posible multi-religious consensus on the NEA-NWFZ at the General Assembly of the Asian Conference of *Religions for Peace* (ACRP) in August 2014. The DPRK delegation will be present in the Assembly.

Presentations

Essential Role of Parliamentarians

Mr. Alyn Ware, Global Coordinator of PNND

1. Why are parliamentarians important?

2. Parliamentary support for a North East Asian NWFZ – Statements

- a. October 2006: Parliamentary statement opposing North Korean nuclear tests also called for a NE Asian NWFZ
- b. April 2009: Peace Depot Statement of Support for a NE Asian NWFZ. Supporters included 7 Japanese parliamentarians (cross-party)
- c. July 2009: DPJ Disarmament Group releases a Model NE Asia NWFZ Treaty (based on 3+3 model proposed by Peace Depot)
- d. October 2009: Presentation of proposal to UNSG Ban Ki-moon by PNND Korea and Japan
- e. Feb 2010 and July 2011: Joint Statement by Parliamentarians of Japan and the Republic of Korea on Denuclearization of Northeast Asia

3. Parliamentary support for a North East Asian NWFZ – events and meetings

- a. South Korean Parliament: Cross-party events in March 2012 (Japan and Korean parliamentarians) and June 2013
- b. Japan: Parliamentary meetings in February 2010 (Japan and Korean Parliamentarians) and December 2012
- c. China/North Korea: PNND delegation in November 2010.
- d. IPU: Meetings with North Korean delegation in 2013
- e. Parliamentary participation in events at NPT and UNGA

4. Parliamentary support from North East Asia for reducing the role of nuclear weapons and achieving a nuclear weapon free world

- a. Katsuya Okada – towards sole purpose
- b. Parliamentary Endorsement of a Nuclear Weapons Convention – Japanese endorsers

Comment

Remarks by Mr. Randy Rydell

Senior Political Affairs Officer in the UNODA

I would like to thank the President of Peace Depot Mr. Ichiro Yuasa, for inviting UNODA to speak at this event today. I also wish to recognize the co-sponsors—Blue Banner, Peace Boat, Peace Depot, Peace Network, and People’s Solidarity for Participatory Democracy—and the five cooperating groups supporting this event, and to welcome all the guests who have travelled far to join us today.

These groups are noted for their determined efforts in nuclear disarmament, and for their work in elaborating a vision for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in their region and a strategy to achieve it. Included among these efforts was a signature drive started in 2009 under the auspices of the mayor of Nagasaki, Mr. Tomihisa Taue. Last Monday, the Secretary-General received the signatures of 543 mayors supporting such a zone. That signature drive is significant. It symbolizes the extent that this nuclear disarmament-related issue is being taken seriously at the domestic levels in Japan.

Second, while the humanitarian approach to disarmament is gaining increased attention worldwide, these signatures come from a country that witnessed the horrific consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. This initiative reminds us that all of the regional nuclear-weapon-free zones are connected with the longer term goal of achieving a world free of such weapons.

Largely for this reason, the UN has long supported the establishment of such zones. In 1999, the UN Disarmament Commission adopted guidelines for establishing them. Two are especially relevant today—that the initiative should come exclusively from the States of the region concerned, and that when such a consensus exists, the UN and the international community should provide assistance.

In the case of the Northeast Asia zone, the initiative has come from like-minded NGOs from some States in the region—namely, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Mongolia. Their goal has been to raise public awareness of this initiative, to study the challenges that must be overcome, and to devise actions to promote its establishment. The reports, articles and workshops stemming from this effort are helping to demonstrate the feasibility of establishing such a zone. Its achievement would represent a victory for civil society and proof that bottom-up approaches can indeed produce concrete results.

The establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone is a progressive approach to advance global nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament norms and to strengthen international peace and security. These zones embody controls that surpass those found in the NPT. Members of such zones have legally binding security assurances from the nuclear-weapon States. Such treaties explicitly outlaw the basing of

nuclear weapons in the zone. They establish organizations to assist in implementing relevant commitments. They can address environmental issues and matters relating to physical security. They can provide mechanisms for resolving conflicts. They can adopt strict standards for executing treaty withdrawals. And like the Pelindaba Treaty, they can even ban research on nuclear weapons. These zones, in short, strengthen the global nuclear non-proliferation regime based on the NPT, while also advancing nuclear disarmament.

It is nevertheless true that the circumstances of this region present some formidable challenges to overcome. A climate of mistrust has accompanied the nuclear and missile tests by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea after it announced withdrawal from the NPT. The breakdown of the six-party talks was another casualty.

Some might argue that such developments make prospects for a Northeast Asia zone unrealistic. Yet this only begs the classic question: which must come first, peace or disarmament? Those who say peace must come first tend not to understand how progress in disarmament can contribute to peace, by serving as a confidence-building measure. Clearly, the path between peace and disarmament is a two-way street—progress in promoting political reconciliation can help in reaching an agreement to exclude nuclear weapons from the region. Yet progress in establishing such a zone can also improve the political climate.

The relationship between nuclear-weapon-free zones and regional and global security is very much on the minds of the members of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, which addressed this issue last year and made several recommendations to the Secretary-General. While the Board recommended that "the Secretary-General should also consider appropriate action for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in North-East Asia," some members also voiced their concerns that creating such a zone in this region would prove to be a difficult undertaking.

Here, the role of civil society indeed remains crucial. With your efforts and sense of common purpose, you continue to mobilize public opinion and to promote efforts that will contribute both to a region and a world free of nuclear weapons. And by asking and answering the tough questions—relating to verification, safeguards, geographic scope, the impact of alliance commitments, and other issues—you have the potential to overcome possible concerns or objections from the States in the region, States that must initiate the proposal to establish such a zone.

The United Nations has its own contributions to make. As the Secretary-General once remarked, "States make the key decisions in this field. But the United Nations has important roles to play. We provide a central forum where states can agree on norms to serve their common interests."

We at United Nations and the UNODA will continue to support and encourage you in your efforts. We view these regional zones as steps forward on the road to our final destination: a world free of nuclear weapons.

Joint Statement for the Promotion of a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Northeast Asia

A new environment for moving forward the denuclearization of Northeast Asia is now emerging. In July 2013, the report of the UN Secretary General on the work of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters made a recommendation that “the Secretary-General consider appropriate action for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in North-East Asia.” Also at the High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament in September 2013, President Elbegdorj Tsakhia of Mongolia announced the country's readiness to work, on an unofficial basis, with the countries of the region to see if and how a NWFZ could be established in Northeast Asia.

Meanwhile, the possible consequences of detonation of nuclear weapons show their inhumanity that can threaten the very survival of the human species. Hence the two thirds of UN member states have signed the 4th joint statement to that effect at the 68th UN General Assembly First Committee in October 2013. Japan, a country which had experienced the horrors of the atomic bombings during wartime, also joined the statement.

Since 2003, a group of like-minded NGOs from Japan, ROK and Mongolia have convened various meetings on the issue of a NEA-NWFZ in the belief that a NEA-NWFZ could greatly contribute to achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world. The voice of the civil society, the local authorities, the religious community and members of parliaments that call for establishing a NEA-NWFZ are increasing around the region. Thus 543 mayors in Japan have signed on to a statement in support of establishing a NEA-NWFZ.

Bearing the above in mind, the NGOs from Japan, the ROK, Mongolia and their supporters have organized an NGO forum entitled “Time for Action to Establish a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone” on the margins of the 3rd NPT Preparatory Committee meeting at the UN Headquarters in New York on 30 April 2014 so as to directly convey their strong conviction for the need to start to discussing the possibility of establishing a NEA-NWFZ. The forum heard reports and views of diverse representatives of Northeast Asia, including experts, local authorities, religious leaders, parliamentarians and citizens' peace organizations, and agreed on

a comprehensive approach to the issue that should include shifting from the current Korean War armistice agreement to a peace regime on the Korean Peninsula.

In order to realize a world free of nuclear weapons, it is the responsibility of all countries of the world to pursue a shift away from security policies based on the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. Like in other regions of the world, establishing a NEA-NWFZ could form the basis for such a security policy. Political initiatives to obtain such a policy could also complement the efforts of the governments of the region to address the issues within the framework of the Six-Party Talks.

We, the participants of this NGO forum strongly support the efforts to start discussing on an informal basis the possibility of establishing a NEA-NWFZ and declare our commitment to continue to work together in this endeavor. We call on politicians involved in local and national politics around the world, civil society groups, and individuals to express their support for a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone, and work together for its realization.

April 30, 2014

New York, USA

Organizers of the NGO Forum “Time for Action to Establish a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone” including,

Blue Banner

International Peace Bureau

Peace Boat

Nautilus Institute

Peace Depot

Religions for Peace

Peace Network

World Council of Churches

People's Solidarity for Participatory
Democracy

References

Statement of Support for a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone

We, the undersigned, express our support for the efforts to establish a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone in Northeast Asia (NEA-NWFZ). We believe it is an urgent and timely initiative both for strengthening the global tide toward a Nuclear Weapon Free World and for achieving regional stability and peace in Northeast Asia.

Setting the goal of achieving a NEA-NWFZ will create a new positive dimension in the on-going Six Party Talks among the Republic of Korea (ROK), Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (DPRK), Japan, China, Russia and the United States, by incorporating its goal of “verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula” (Six-nation Statement, 19 September 2005) within the broader regional vision.

Achieving a world free of nuclear weapons is an obligation not only of nuclear armed nations but of all nations, especially those whose security policy relies on a so-called nuclear umbrella. In this regards, all nations have the responsibility to find a path toward a security polity without nuclear weapons.

A NEA-NWFZ will provide such a path for relevant nations in the region, including Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK).

A realistic scheme for a NEA-NWFZ would be a 3+3 arrangement, in which the ROK, the DPRK and Japan would form the central parties of the zone and the neighboring nuclear weapon states (China, Russia and the US) would support it through the provision of security assurances, as this would build upon the 1992 Inter-Korean Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of Korean Peninsula and Japan's Three Non-Nuclear Principles.

We call upon political leaders, both national and local, citizen groups, and individuals throughout the world, to express their support for a NEA NWFZ and to work together to realize it.

<Mayors>

Hokkaido

Akitsu Sugawara, Mayor of Kimobetsu
Etsuo Fushimi, Mayor of Taiki
Haruichi Ogasawara, Mayor of Noboribetsu
Hiroshi Kudo, Mayor of Wakkanai
Hiroshi Nakamura, Mayor of Shimukappu
Hirotaka Sato, Mayor of Kushiro
Hiroya Ebina, Mayor of Kushiro
Hisao Inoue, Mayor of Oketo
Junji Honma, Mayor of Furubira
Katsuhiko Akutsu, Mayor of Ashoro
Katsumar Katsui, Mayor of Ikeda
Kazuharu Hamaya, Mayor of Esa
Kazuharu Kikuchi, Mayor of Kunneppu
Kazuhiro Mizusawa, Mayor of Urahoro
Kazuo Okada, Mayor of Makubetsu
Kazuyuki Sakashita, Mayor of Samani
Kenichi Kikukawa, Mayor of Tohma
Kiyoshi Ito, Mayor of Pippu
Masahito Nishikawa, Mayor of Asahikawa
Masami Ueno, Mayor of Kitahiroshima
Masao Takahashi, Mayor of Honbetsu
Masaru Murase, Mayor of Hiroo
Mikio Takahashi, Mayor of Bibai
Minoru Kobayashi, Mayor of Nakashibetsu
Mitsugi Takenaka, Mayor of Kamishihoro
Mitsuyoshi Tamura, Mayor of Nakasatsunai
Naomichi Suzuki, Mayor of Yubari
Norihisa Yonezawa, Mayor of Obihiro
Sadamitsu Takahashi, Mayor of Setana
Sadatoshi Takahashi, Mayor of Rumoi
Seichiro Sato, Mayor of Niki
Seiji Fukushima, Mayor of Kutchan
Shigehiro Kiyosawa, Mayor of Ashibetsu
Shigeru Kawamura, Mayor of Shikabe
Sumio Saito, Mayor of Urausu
Taichi Sato, Mayor of Tsubetsu
Takumi Sinmura, Mayor of Okushiri
Tamotsu Shima, Mayor of Yoichi
Tomoo Sasaki, Mayor of Kenbuchi
Toshiharu Maya, Mayor of Toyako
Toshiki Kudo, Mayor of Hakodate
Tsunehiko Kotani, Mayor of Kitami
Wataru Takasusuki, Mayor of Shimizu
Yasuhiro Funahashi, Mayor of Haboro
Yasukazu Nakamiya, Mayor of Nanae

Yasuo Kobayashi, Mayor of Shihoro
Yoshiaki Noto, Mayor of Furano
Yoshiharu Nakamatsu, Mayor of Otaru
Yoshihide Sakai, Mayor of Shinhidaka
Yoshiji Sato, Mayor of Kamikawa
Yoshinori Kanehira, Mayor of Numata
Yuji Makino, Mayor of Shibetsu

Aomori

Hisashi Oyamada, Mayor of Towada
Kiyoji Okawa, Mayor of Hirakawa
Masatoshi Hirayama, Mayor of Goshogawara
Mitsuru Yoshida, Mayor of Fukaura

Iwate

Masanori Yamamoto, Mayor of Miyako
Masayoshi Sugawawa, Mayor of Hiraizumi
Nobuhiro Mizukami, Mayor of Hirono
Takafumi Yamauchi, Mayor of Kuji
Takenori Noda, Mayor of Kamaishi
Toshihiko Takahashi, Mayor of Kitakami
Yuji Oda, Mayor of Noda

Miyagi

Hideo Sato, Mayor of Murata
Isamu Sato, Mayor of Kurihara
Katsuo Suzuki, Mayor of Rihu
Kisuke Ootomo, Mayor of Kakuda
Koetsu Sasaki, Mayor of Misato
Kunio Saito, Mayor of Watari
Satoshi Ise, Mayor of Ogawara
Shigeru Sugawara, Mayor of Kesenuma
Shigeru Takiguchi, Mayor of Shibata
Shuji Abe, Mayor of Wakuya
Takahisa Fuse, Mayor of Tome
Takuya Ito, Mayor of Shikama

Akita

Chuetsu Igarashi, Mayor of Yokote
Makoto Hasebe, Mayor of Yurihonjyo
Mitsuhiro Kadowaki, Mayor of Semboku
Mitsuyoshi Saito, Mayor of Yuzawa
Shigenobu Saito, Mayor of Noshiro
Tadanaga Yokoyama, Mayor of Nikaho
Tsugumi Kuribayashi, Mayor of Daisen

Yamagata

Akio Ichikawa, Mayor of Yamagata
Kiyoshi Sato, Mayor of Murayama
Kohei Goto, Mayor of Iide
Naoyuki Endo, Mayor of Yamanobe

Sanjyuro Abe, Mayor of Yonezawa
Seishichi Sato, Mayor of Shirataka
Shigeharu Uchiya, Mayor of Nagai

Fukushima

Hiroshi Zengo, Mayor of Inawashiro
Itsuo Suto, Mayor of Asakawa
Katsunobu Sakurai, Mayor of Minamisoma
Nobuhiro Takahashi, Mayor of Kori
Ryozo Shishido, Mayor of Ono
Shoichi Iseki, Mayor of Yanaizu
Sokichi Oya, Mayor of Minamiaizu
Tsutomu Sato, Mayor of Kunimi
Yoshihisa Meguro, Mayor of Tadami
Yoshinori Suzuki, Mayor of Miharu
Yuko Endo, Mayor of Kawauchi

Gunma

Kazuo Yasuraoka, Mayor of Tatebayashi
Kenji Tomioka, Mayor of Takasaki
Kinzo Chigira, Mayor of Katashina
Mikio Hoshino, Mayor of Numata
Nobuo Ichikawa, Mayor of Minamimaki
Ryu Yamamoto, Mayor of Maebashi
Sadaji Akutsu, Mayor of Shibukawa
Toshiaki Arai, Mayor of Fujitoka
Toshimitsu Okano, Mayor of Tomioka
Yoshihiro Okada, Mayor of Annaka

Tochigi

Fumio Saito, Mayor of Nikko
Hiroko Mase, Mayor of Nogi
Kazuya Kosuge, Mayor of Mibu
Kenji Akutsu, Mayor of Nasushiobara
Masahide Okabe, Mayor of Sano
Minoru Omamiuda, Mayor of Ashikaga
Shin Sato, Mayor of Kanuma
Takashi Ichimura, Mayor of Iwafune
Tomio Tsukui, Mayor of Otawara
Toshimi Suzuki, Mayor of Tochigi
Toshio Okubo, Mayor of Oyama
Yukuo Toyoda, Mayor of Haga

Ibaraki

Eiichi Yoshiwara, Mayor of Bando
Fujio Akutsu, Mayor of Shirosato
Fujio Amada, Mayor of Ami
Hideaki Mashiko, Mayor of Daigo
Joichi Shimada, Mayor of Omitama
Kazuo Hotate, Mayor of Kamisu
Kazuo Nakayama, Mayor of Ryugasaki

Kenichiro Kubota, Mayor of Ishioka
Mitsuaki Miyajima, Mayor of Kasumigaura
Morio Someya, Mayor of Goka
Norio Kobayashi, Mayor of Ibaraki
Sakae Nakajima, Mayor of Miura
Taichi Okubo, Mayor of Hitachiota
Tatsuya Murakami, Mayor of Tokai
Toru Takasugi, Mayor of Joso
Toru Umino, Mayor of Naka
Yasushi Takahashi, Mayor of Mito
Saitama
Hiroshi Takahata, Mayor of Fujimino
Kenji Ishizu, Mayor of Kitamoto
Kuniyasu Kuki, Mayor of Chichibu
Susumu Kojima, Mayor of Fukaya
Takao Komine, Mayor of Hatoyama
Yoshiaki Kawai, Mayor of Kawagoe
Chiba
Fumio Isawa, Mayor of Shirai
Hideki Matsuzaki, Mayor of Urayasu
Hideki Sugawara, Mayor of Tako
Hiroshi Ota, Mayor of Isumi
Hisao Saruta, Mayor of Katsuura
Hitoshi Sado, Mayor of Yotsukaido
Isao Mizukoshi, Mayor of Kisarazu
Junichiro Hoshino, Mayor of Abiko
Katsushige Aikawa, Mayor of shibayama
Kazunari Koizumi, Mayor of Narita
Kazuo Warabi, Mayor of Sakura
Kenji Hongoya, Mayor of Matsudo
Kiyoshi Deguchi, Mayor of Sodegaura
Magoichiro Tamagawa, Mayor of
Ichinomiya
Masanori Kanesaka, Mayor of
Oamishirasato
Naoharu Shiga, Mayor of Togane
Sanyou Yamazaki, Mayor of Inzai
Senshu Shiina, Mayor of Sanmu
Shinichi Koshikawa, Mayor of Chosi
Shinji Kitamura, Mayor of Yachimata
Shuichi Akiba, Mayor of Yachiyo
Takashi Nemoto, Mayor of Noda
Takashi Saito, Mayor of Yokoshibahikari
Toshio Ishii, Mayor of Chosei
Toshio Iwata, Mayor of Tohnosho
Yoshiharu Izaki, Mayor of Nagareyama
Yoshihiro Ishida, Mayor of Onjuku

Yutaka Ishii, Mayor of Minamiboso
Tokyo
Hiroyuki Abe, Mayor of Tama
Kazuhiko Baba, Mayor of Higashikurume
Masanori Kobayashi, Mayor of Kodaira
Morimasa Murakami, Mayor of Musashino
Yutaka Yano, Mayor of Komae
Kanagawa
Akio Oya, Mayor of Kiyokawa
Hisao Nakasaki, Mayor of Oiso
Katsuhiko Ochiai, Mayor of Hiratsuka
Kenichi Kato, Mayor of Odawara
Nobuaki Hattori, Mayor of Chigasaki
Nobuo Yamaguchi, Mayor of Hakone
Ryuichi Hirai, Mayor of Zushi
Shuhei Kato, Mayor of Minamiashigara
Takao Abe, Mayor of Kawasaki
Takeshi Aoki, Mayor of Manazuru
Toshio Kimura, Mayor of Samukawa
Tsuneo Suzuki, Mayor of Fujisawa
Tsuneyoshi Kobayashi, Mayor of Atsugi
Yoshiyuki Furuya, Mayor of Hadano
Yuichi Fukawa, Mayor of Kaisei
Niigata
Akira Nyumura, Mayor of Myoko
Akira Shinoda, Mayor of Niigata
Etsuko Odaira, Mayor of Uonuma
Hiroshi Aida, Mayor of Kashiwazaki
Kaoru Nikaido, Mayor of Shibata
Kazuo Yoshida, Mayor of Tainai
Kenji Kamimura, Mayor of Tsunan
Kiyotaka Kamimura, Mayor of Yuzawa
Kuniyoshi Sato, Mayor of Tagami
Tamio Mori, Mayor of Nagaoka
Tsutomu Suzuki, Mayor of Tsubame
Yasuo Yatsui, Mayor of Ojija
Yoshifumi Sekiguchi, Mayor of Tokamachi
Toyama
Morio Sakurai, Mayor of Oyabe
Shigeo Waki, Mayor of Asahi
Yasuo Horiuchi, Mayor of Kurobe
Yoshinori Sawasaki, Mayor of Uozu
Ishikawa
Bunpei Takemoto, Mayor of Nanao
Takaaki Awa, Mayor of Nonoichi
Fukui
Toshiyuki Nara, Mayor of Echizen

Yamanashi
Atsushi Tanabe, Mayor of Koshu
Hirofumi Nakagomi, Mayor of Minami-Alps
Hisao Tanaka, Mayor of Chuo
Hitoshi Mochizuki, Mayor of Minobu
Komei Yokouchi, Mayor of Nirasaki
Manabu Shimura, Mayor of Fujikawa
Mikio Sumino, Mayor of Showa
Shigeru Horiuchi, Mayor of Fujiyoshida
Shinichi Kubo, Mayor of Ichikawamisato
Toshikazu Ishida, Mayor of Nishikatsura
Yoshiyasu Watanabe, Mayor of
Fujikawaguchiko
Nagano
Akira Sugeno, Mayor of Matsumoto
Akito Hirabayashi, Mayor of Matsukawa
Genmei Ide, Mayor of Kitaaiki
Hiroki Ota, Mayor of Hakuba
Hiroshi Yamamura, Mayor of Sakai
Hisashi Matsumoto, Mayor of Otari
Itsuro Soga, Mayor of Nakagawa
Katsufumi Yamada, Mayor of Suwa
Katsumi Tanaka, Mayor of Kiso
Kazuo Okaniwa, Mayor of Achi
Kentaro Haneda, Mayor of Nagawa
Kiyoshi Shimizu, Mayor of Hara
Koji Sugimoto, Mayor of Komagane
Masamitsu Miyagawa, Mayor of Nagiso
Masanori Adachi, Mayor of Iiyama
Masao Taue, Mayor of Agematsu
Mitsuo Makino, Mayor of Iida
Motohiro Kumagai, Mayor of Takamori
Ryugo Imai, Mayor of Okaya
Satoru Aoki, Mayor of Shimosuwa
Seiichiro Kondo, Mayor of Chikuma
Susumu Fujimaki, Mayor of Karuizawa
Takashi Shirotori, Mayor of Ina
Takehiko Kikuchi, Mayor of Minamiaiki
Tokuya Kuriya, Mayor of Kiso
Toru Ushikoshi, Mayor of Omachi
Toshio Tomii, Mayor of Nozawaonsen
Yasuhiko Fujisawa, Mayor of Ikusaka
Yoshitaka Shimodaira, Mayor of Toyooka
Yoshitaka Takefushi, Mayor of Yamanouchi
Gifu
Hideo Muroto, Mayor of Kitagata

Hiromasa Hayashi, Mayor of Yamagata
 Kazuo Okazaki, Mayor of Ikeda
 Koji Mizuno, Mayor of Mizunami
 Masaaki Hiroe, Mayor of Kasamatsu
 Masanori Furukawa, Mayor of Tajimi
 Michimasa Ishikawa, Mayor of Mino
 Muneyuki Minamiyama, Mayor of Sakahogi
 Takamasa Hori, Mayor of Mizuho
 Toshiaki Hioki, Mayor of Gujyo
 Tsutomu Fujiwara, Mayor of Motosu
Shizuoka
 Hajime Mikami, Mayor of Kosai
 Hidetada Sudo, Mayor of Fujinomiya
 Hideyuki Harada, Mayor of Fukuroi
 Hiromi Tsukuda, Mayor of Ito
 Hiroshi Shimizu, Mayor of Yaizu
 Hiroyasu Kurihara, Mayor of Numazu
 Hisashi Suzuki, Mayor of Fuji
 Nobuhiko Mori, Mayor of Kannami
 Saburo Matsui, Mayor of Kakegawa
 Sakae Saito, Mayor of Atami
 Takeshi Toyooka, Mayor of Mishima
 Yohei Wakabayashi, Mayor of Gotemba
Aichi
 Akihiko Kamiya, Mayor of Higashiura
 Hideaki Ishikawa, Mayor of Toyoake
 Ikuo Hayashi, Mayor of Chiryu
 Keiichi Kataoka, Mayor of Iwakura
 Mitsuru Edo, Mayor of Fuso
 Sumio Sakakibara, Mayor of Handa
 Toshiaki Ono, Mayor of Inazawa
 Yoshiteru Momiyama, Mayor of Taketoyo
 Yukinori Tanaka, Mayor of Inuyama
Mie
 Akihito Iwata, Mayor of Owase
 Junichi Nakamura, Mayor of Watarai
 Kanejiro Tashiro, Mayor of Asahi
 Kenichi Suzuki, Mayor of Ise
 Takeyoshi Onoue, Mayor of Odai
 Toshikatsu Kamei, Mayor of Nabari
 Toshiyuki Tanaka, Mayor of Yokkaichi
 Yukimitsu Nakai, Mayor of Meiwa
Shiga
 Hisao Nishizawa, Mayor of Higashiomi
 Kazuhiro Miyamoto, Mayor of Moriyama
 Minegazu Izumi, Mayor of Maibara

Naohiro Fujisawa, Mayor of Hino
 Wataru Hashikawa, Mayor of Kusatsu
Kyoto
 Atsumi Ota, Mayor of Yosano
 Daisaku Kadokawa, Mayor of Kyoto
 Masaji Matsuyama, Mayor of Fukuchiyama
 Shoji Inoue, Mayor of Miyazu
 Toyoji Terao, Mayor of Kyotamba
 Yasushi Nakayama, Mayor of Kyotango
 Zenya Yamazaki, Mayor of Ayabe
Nara
 Gen Nakagawa, Mayor of Nara
 Hironori Mori, Mayor of Sango
 Hitoshi Hiraoka, Mayor of Koryo
 Kazuya Yamashita, Mayor of Katsuragi
 Kazuyasu Iwasaki, Mayor of Heguri
 Keisaku Minami, Mayor of Tenri
 Makoto Yamashita, Mayor of Ikoma
 Masakatsu Yoshida, Mayor of Yamatotakada
 Masatake Matsui, Mayor of Sakurai
 Mikio Takeuchi, Mayor of Uda
 Toshishige Kojo, Mayor of Ikaruga
 Yasuhiro Nishimoto, Mayor of Ando
 Yoshinori Ota, Mayor of Gojo
 Yoshiyuki Hirai, Mayor of Oji
 Yutaka Higashigawa, Mayor of Gose
Osaka
 Noboru Kamitani, Mayor of Izumiotsu
 Osamu Takeuchi, Mayor of Hirakata
 Seita Tanaka, Mayor of Yao
 Shinroku sakaguchi, Mayor of Takaishi
 Tomoyoshi Yoshida, Mayor of Sayama
 Toshihiro Fukuyama, Mayor of Hannan
 Toshiki Tada, Mayor of Tondabayashi
 Yasuaki Okamoto, Mayor of Kashiwara
 Yoshihiro Baba, Mayor of Neyagawa
Hyogo
 Fusaho Izumi, Mayor of Akashi
 Kazuhira Nishimura, Mayor of Kasai
 Ken Yamanaka, Mayor of Ashiya
 Masayoshi Shimada, Mayor of Fukusaki
 Takaaki Sakai, Mayor of Sasayama
 Tomoko Nakagawa, Mayor of Takarazuka
Wakayama
 Katsumasa Tashima, Mayor of Kushimoto
 Katsumi Hiura, Mayor of Inami

Taizo Imoto, Mayor of Katsuragi
 Takamichi Koide, Mayor of Kamitonda
 Tsutomu Iwata, Mayor of Susami
Tottori
 Akio Matsumoto, Mayor of Hokuei
 Isao Takeuchi, Mayor of Tottori
 Toshiro Takeuchi, Mayor of Kofu
Shimane
 Hiroki Kondo, Mayor of Yasugi
 Masuji Tanaka, Mayor of Gotsu
 Tetsuo Uzu, Mayor of Hamada
Okayama
 Akinari Takehisa, Mayor of Setouchi
 Chikao Yamasaki, Mayor of Kagamino
 Koichiro Ide, Mayor of Maniwa
 Masanori Yamamoto, Mayor of Kibichuo
 Masao Michiue, Mayor of Mimasaka
 Naoya Takagi, Mayor of Kasaoka
 Soichi Kataoka, Mayor of Sojya
 Susumu Kuroda, Mayor of Tamano
 Takashi Nishida, Mayor of Shoo
 Yasuhiko Kuriyama, Mayor of Asakuchi
Hiroshima
 Akira Hada, Mayor of Fukuyama
 Hiroaki Yamaguchi, Mayor of Sera
 Hiroshi Mimura, Mayor of Kumano
 Kanji Yamaoka, Mayor of Kaita
 Katsuhiko Shinno, Mayor of Hatsukaichi
 Kazumi Matsui, Mayor of Hiroshima
 Kazutoshi Masuda, Mayor of Miyoshi
 Kazuyoshi Hamada, Mayor of Akitakata
 Masahiko Takeshita, Mayor of Kitahiroshima
 Masashi Kosaka, Mayor of Takehara
 Suehiko Takiguchi, Mayor of Shobara
 Takayuki Yoshida, Mayor of Saka
 Yasuyuki Goto, Mayor of Mihara
 Yoshio Kurata, Mayor of Higashihiroshima
 Yoshiro Iriyama, Mayor of Otake
 Yoshiyuki Watari, Mayor of Fuchu
 Yukinori Takata, Mayor of Osakikamijima
 Yuko Hiratani, Mayor of Onomichi
 Yuko Makino, Mayor of Jinsekikogen
Yamaguchi
 Hirofumi Shirai, Mayor of Sanyo-onoda
 Kenichi Yamada, Mayor of Hirao
 Kentaro Ihara, Mayor of Yanai

Koji Nomura, Mayor of Hagi
Masato Matsuura, Mayor of Hofu
Sumitada Watanabe, Mayor of Yamaguchi

Tokushima

Hitoshi Hara, Mayor of Sanagochi
Koji Tamai, Mayor of Itano
Toshiaki Kono, Mayor of Ishii

Kagawa

Hideki Fujii, Mayor of Higashikagawa
Hideto Onishi, Mayor of Takamatsu
Hiroshi Aya, Mayor of Sakaide
Masanori Hiraoka, Mayor of Zentsuji
Seiji Shirakawa, Mayor of Kanonji
Shigeki Oyama, Mayor of Sanuki
Tetsuji Arai, Mayor of Marugame

Ehime

Hirohisa Ishibashi, Mayor of Uwajima
Hiroshi Shimizu, Mayor of Ozu
Ichiro Oshiro, Mayor of Yawatahama
Isao Takasuka, Mayor of Toon
Kazuhiko Yamashita, Mayor of Ikata
Masafumi Shimizu, Mayor of Ainan
Takumi Ihara, Mayor of Shikokuchuo
Tasuku Nakamura, Mayor of Iyo
Tsuyoshi Nakamura, Mayor of Tobe

Kochi

Akio Sugimura, Mayor of Tosashimizu
Hajime Shiota, Mayor of Ino
Hiroaki Oishi, Mayor of Niyodogawa
Hiroyuki Matunobe, Mayor of Toyo
Kenji Komatsu, Mayor of Muroto
Kenji Matsumoto, Mayor of Aki
Makio Kadowaki, Mayor of Kami
Masashi Kiyoto, Mayor of Konan
Masayuki Tokaji, Mayor of Hidaka
Mitsunobu Takase, Mayor of Shimanto
Seiya Okazaki, Mayor of Kochi
Takashi Kamiji, Mayor of Umaji
Toshio Okimoto, Mayor of Sukumo
Tomio Yano, Mayor of Yusuhara
Toshihito Hashizume, Mayor of Nankoku
Toyonori Sasaoka, Mayor of Susaki
Uzumasa Yoshioka, Mayor of Ochi
Yoshihiko Imanishi, Mayor of Motoyama
Zen Tanaka, Mayor of Shimanto

Fukuoka

Hiroshi Yasukawa, Mayor of Umi

Hisayoshi Shinozaki, Mayor of Kasuya
Kensuke Kamai, Mayor of Buzen
Kikumi Tagashira, Mayor of Chikuzen
Koichi Yatsunami, Mayor of Yukuhashi
Koji Urata, Mayor of Fukuchi
Masatomo Hirayasu, Mayor of Ogori
Morichika Saito, Mayor of Iizuka
Nobukatsu Ito, Mayor of Tagawa
Norio Takaki, Mayor of Ukiha
Shinji Tokushima, Mayor of Kurate
Shizuo Takeshita, Mayor of Koga
Shunsuke Morita, Mayor of Asakura
Susumu Matsuoka, Mayor of Kama
Tadashi Miura, Mayor of Sasaguri
Takeo Harumoto, Mayor of Akamura
Taketoshi Nagasaki, Mayor of Shingu
Tatsumi Nanri, Mayor of Shime
Tetsunobu Ariyoshi, Mayor of Miyawaka
Toshikazu Inoue, Mayor of Keisen
Tsuneyuki Mitamura, Mayor of Yame
Yukio Oda, Mayor of Kawasaki
Yushi Nakashima, Mayor of Sue

Saga

Hisatoshi Higuchi, Mayor of Kashima
Junichi Kobayashi, Mayor of Kiyama
Keisuke Hiwatashi, Mayor of Takeo
Masaaki Tashiro, Mayor of Arita
Masanori Egashira, Mayor of Yoshinogari
Shuji Eriguchi, Mayor of Ogi
Taichiro Taniguchi, Mayor of Ureshino

Nagasaki

Akio Miyamoto, Mayor of Isahaya
Fumio Yamaguchi, Mayor of Kawatana
Hirokazu Shirakawa, Mayor of Iki
Ikuhiro Tomohiro, Mayor of Matsuura
Ikuko Nakao, Mayor of Goto
Ken Hirase, Mayor of Togitsu
Kozo Nishi, Mayor of Ojika
Masata Ichinose, Mayor of Hasami
Naruhiko Kuroda, Mayor of Hirado
Satoru Watanabe, Mayor of Higashisonogi
Shintaro Okumura, Mayor of Unzen
Shuichiro Yokota, Mayor of Shimabara
Takaichi Tanaka, Mayor of Saikai
Takashi Matsumoto, Mayor of Omura
Tomihisa Taue, Mayor of Nagasaki
Tomoaki Hayama, Mayor of Nagayo

Toshiaki Inoue, Mayor of Shinkamigoto
Tsuyoshi Furusho, Mayor of Saza
Yasunari Takarabe, Mayor of Tsushima
Yoneyuki Fujiwara, Mayor of
Minamishimabara

Kumamoto

Daisei Kusamura, Mayor of Takamori
Hiromitsu Nakaitu, Mayor of Nagasu
Isao Ieiri, Mayor of Ozu
Jyunji Maehata, Mayor of Arao
Kanichi Morimoto, Mayor of Nishiki
Katsuaki Miyamoto, Mayor of Minamata
Kazunori Aiko, Mayor of Asagiri
Kazutoshi Fukushima, Mayor of Yatsushiro
Kensei Nakashima, Mayor of Yamaga
Kimihiro Yasuda, Mayor of Amakusa
Kosuke Kitazato, Mayor of Oguni
Masaomi Tokuta, Mayor of Sagara
Meguru Yokotani, Mayor of Yamae
Mitsuo Fukumura, Mayor of Kikuchi
Mitsuo Goto, Mayor of Kikuyo
Nobutaka Tanaka, Mayor of Hitoyoshi
Shigeki Motomatsu, Mayor of Uto
Shingo Hirose, Mayor of Mizukami
Shoji Tajima, Mayor of Reihoku
Teruhiko Matsumoto, Mayor of Taragi
Tetsuya Takasaki, Mayor of Tamana
Toshiya Nagano, Mayor of Minamiaso
Yoshiyuki Araki, Mayor of Koshi

Oita

Houbun Syutou, Mayor of Yufu
Katsuji Shuto, Mayor of Taketa
Kazuaki Sakamoto, Mayor of Kokonoe
Koji Yoshimoto, Mayor of Tsukumi
Syuji Korenaga, Mayor of Usa
Yoichi Sato, Mayor of Hita
Yusuke Hashimoto, Mayor of Bungoono

Miyazaki

Kazumi Hashida, Mayor of Saito
Kenji Kuroki, Mayor of Hyuga
Makoto Nagamine, Mayor of Miyakonojo
Masaharu Sudo, Mayor of Nobeoka
Masahiro Higo, Mayor of Kobayashi
Mitsuhiro Hidaka, Mayor of Takaharu
Osamitsu Nobe, Mayor of Kushima
Osamu Yasuda, Mayor of Kadogawa
Tadashi Tojiki, Mayor of Miyazaki

Tatsumi Iiboshi, Mayor of Gokase
Yoshiyuki Taniguchi, Mayor of Nichinan

Kagoshima

Arata Kumamoto, Mayor of Isa
Chikara Nagano, Mayor of Nishinoomote
Etsuo Toyodome, Mayor of Ibusuki
Hiroyuki Mori, Mayor of Kagoshima
Kanpei Shimoide, Mayor of Minamikyushu
Koji Araki, Mayor of Yakushima
Mitsunari Kawashita, Mayor of Nakatane
Nobuari Motoda, Mayor of Uken
Shuji Maeda, Mayor of Kirishima

Toshihiko Shibuya, Mayor of Izumi
Yasuhiro Higashi, Mayor of Osaki
Yoshihiro Sasayama, Mayor of Aira
Yoshihiro Shimada, Mayor of Kanoya

Okinawa

Akira Uema, Mayor of Nishihara
Denjitsu Ishimine, Mayor of Yomitan
Eicho Kawamitsu, Mayor of Taketomi
Haruki Gibo, Mayor of Tomigusuku
Hirotsune Uehara, Mayor of Itoman
Keishun Koja, Mayor of Nanjo
Keisuke Hamada, Mayor of Nakagusuku

Kunio Arakaki, Mayor of Kitanakagusuku
Masaharu Noguni, Mayor of Chatan
Mitsuko Toumon, Mayor of Okinawa
Mitsuo Gima, Mayor of Urasoe
Susumu Inamine, Mayor of Nago
Takeshi Asato, Mayor of Ginowan
Takeshi Onaga, Mayor of Naha
Toshio Shimabukuro, Mayor of Uruma
Toshiyasu Shiroma, Mayor of Haeburu
Yoshihisa Shimabukuro, Mayor of Ogimi
Yoshitaka Nakayama, Mayor of Ishigaki

<Organizations>

Mayors for Peace

National Council of Japan Nuclear Free Local Authorities

(543 mayors and 2 organizations endorsed as of April 21, 2014)

References

Joint Statement by Parliamentarians of Japan and the Republic of Korea on Denuclearization of Northeast Asia

The world now faces a critical juncture on the issue of nuclear weapons. On one hand, efforts are being made to resume the Six-Party Talks in order to achieve the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and the establishment of a regional peace regime in Northeast Asia. On the other hand, efforts towards “a world free of nuclear weapons” are gaining support worldwide, under the leadership manifested in the address by U.S. President Barack Obama in Prague in April 2009 and the five point proposal, including a call for negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, pronounced by U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon at the U.N. Headquarters in October 2008.

The denuclearization of Northeast Asia, where conflicts among states with and without nuclear weapons have long continued, is a test case for global efforts to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons. The history of Northeast Asia is paradoxical in that it is the sole region of the world to have suffered from the atrocity of nuclear warfare, while on the other hand, states in the region have continued to choose to rely on nuclear deterrence for their security.

Security based on nuclear deterrence will not bring real peace to the region. Rather, it will perpetuate insecurity rooted in arms races of distrust and never-ending confrontation. In order to liquidate the legacy of the Cold War and build peace in the region based on mutual trust, we, parliamentarians of Japan and the ROK, have agreed as follows:

1. We recognize the importance of solidarity and cooperation between Japan and the ROK in achieving the denuclearization of Northeast Asia, in which Japan, the ROK and the DPRK commit themselves not to possessing nuclear weapons, and the neighbor countries possessing nuclear weapons commit not to using or threatening to use such weapons against Japan the ROK and the DPRK, while striving for their own nuclear disarmament. Efforts by the Governments of Japan and the ROK, along with parliamentarians, local authorities, peace-loving citizens and NGOs in both countries, are critical to achieving this end.
2. We urge the Governments of Japan and the ROK to accelerate the normalization of relations with the DPRK through active dialogue and to seek solutions to the nuclear issues involving the DPRK through its return to the Six-Party Talks, as well as through credible measures taken by all the relevant countries to support its return.

3. We urge the Governments of Japan and the ROK to pledge and give support for medical care and compensation to the atomic bomb survivors including those from the DPRK and ROK and to second generation survivors, and to establish concrete systems for this as needed. The two governments should also raise public awareness regarding the importance of abolishing nuclear weapons by making the tragedy caused by the atomic bombing widely known, and should provide education based on the lessons learned from these experiences.

4. We recognize that a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapons-free Zone initiative will be effective for achieving the denuclearization of the region. We urge governments in the region, in particular those of Japan and the ROK, to fully discuss this proposal. We would also like to see various actors make continued efforts to gain international support. Especially, we call on the Governments of Japan and the ROK to advocate the establishment of a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-free Zone in the international fora, including the NPT Review Conference and the U.N. General Assembly.

5. We declare our unconditional support for efforts toward “a world free of nuclear weapons” laid out in the above-mentioned speeches by President Barack Obama and U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon, believing that such efforts have opened a window of opportunity for achieving the denuclearization of Northeast Asia. We pledge to continue our cooperative efforts toward the denuclearization of Northeast Asia by grasping all available opportunities. We also appreciate international support and advice for our efforts while valuing lessons of existing NWFZs.

May 2010

Signed by (as of July 2011):

ROK Parliamentarians

CHO Seung Soo CHOI Younghee KANG Gijung KWON Young-Ghil LEE Mikyung

PARK Eun Soo SHIN Nakyun

Japanese Parliamentarians

ABE Tomoko	AIHARA Kumiko	AMIYA Shinsuke	ARAKI Kiyohiro	CHUGO Atsushi	
DOI Ryuichi	DOKYU Seiichiro	FUJISUE Kenzo	FUJITA Kazue	FUJITA Yukihisa	
FUJITANI Koushin	FUKUDA Eriko	FUKUSHIMA Nobuyuki	HACHIRO Yoshio	HATA Tsutomu	
HATSUSHIKA Akihiro	HATTORI Ryoichi	HIRAOKA Hideo	HIRAYAMA Tairo	ICHIKAWA Yasuo	
IGARASHI Fumihiko	INAMI Tetsuo	INATOMI Shuji	INOUE Satoshi	ISHIDA Mitsuji	
ISHIDA Yoshihiro	ISHIGE Eiko	ISHII Toshiro	ITOKAZU Keiko	IZUMI Kenta	KAGAYA Ken
KAKIZAWA Mito	KAMIMOTO Mieko	KATO Gaku	KAWADA Ryuhei	KAWAGOE Takahiro	

KAWAGUCHI Yoriko	KAWASHIMA Tomotaro	KIUCHI Minoru	KOMURO Hisaaki	KONDO Shoichi		
KONNO Azuma	KONO Taro	KOORI Kazuko	KOYAMA Nobuhiro	KUSHIBUCHI Mari	MAKIYAMA Hiroe	
MATSUMOTO Daisuke	MATSUMOTO Ryu	MATSUNO Nobuo	MIMURA Kazuya	MIYAJIMA	Daisuke	
MIZUNO Tomohiko	MORIYAMA Hiroyuki	MUROI Kunihiro	NAKAGAWA	Masaharu	NAKANO	Kansei
OGAWA Toshio	OHKAWARA Masako	OKUBO Tsutomu	OKUMURA Tenzo	OKUNO Soichiro		
ONISHI Kensuke	ONISHI Takanori	SAITO Tsuyoshi	SAKAGUCHI Naoto	SHIBAHASHI	Masanao	
SHIGENO Yasumasa	SHINOHARA Takashi	SORAMOTO Seiki	SUGIMOTO Kazumi	SUTO Nobuhiko	TAKAKI Yoshiaki	
TAKAMURA Tsutomu	TAKANO Mamoru	TAKEUCHI Norio	TAKI Makoto	TAMAKI Kimiyoshi	TEZUKA Yoshio	
UBUKATA Yukio	WADA Takashi	YAMAGUCHI Kazuyuki	YAMAZAKI Maya	YATAGAWA	Hajime	
YOSHIDA Tsunehiko	ZUKERAN Chobin					

Contact:

PNND Japan, Tetsuo Inami Office, RM 524, Shugiin-Daini-Giinkaikan

2-1-2 Nagata-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 100-8982 Japan tel: +81-3-3508-7623, fax: +81-3-3508-3253

PNND Korea, Lee Mikyung Office, #630 National Assembly Bldg

1 Yeouido-dong, Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul, ROK tel: +82-2-788-2619, fax: +82-2-788-3630

Photos

Peace Depot Facebook Page <https://www.facebook.com/peacedepot.org>

Documents

2014 NGO Forum www.peacedepot.org/e-news/2014NPTforum.pdf

2013 NGO Workshop www.peacedepot.org/e-news/2013NPTWS.pdf

2012 NGO Workshop www.peacedepot.org/e-news/2012NPTWSReport.pdf

Further information

NPO Peace Depot

Hiyoshi Gruene 1F, 1-30-27-4 Hiyoshi Hon-cho, Kohoku-ku , Yokohama, Japan 223-0062

Tel: +81 45 563 5101

Fax: +81 45 563 9907

E-mail: office@peacedepot.org