



Title	New Vision towards A World Free of Nuclear Weapons
Author(s)	Kurosawa, Mitsuru
Citation	Osaka University Law Review. 2008, 55, p. 1-14
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/11094/9479">https://hdl.handle.net/11094/9479</a>
rights	
Note	

*The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

## **NEW VISION TOWARDS A WORLD FREE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

*Mitsuru KUROSAWA\**

### **Introduction**

An article “A World Free of Nuclear Weapons” by George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nan was published in *The Wall Street Journal* on January 4, 2007<sup>1)</sup>. They endorse setting the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and working energetically on the actions required to achieve that goal.

There were many proposals for a world free from nuclear weapons in the 1990s after the end of the Cold War, including the Report of the Canberra Commission, the Report by the Henry L. Stimson Center, the Report of the U.S. National Academy of Science, the Statement of Retired Admirals, the Statement by World Civilian Leaders and others.

The 2000 NPT Review Conference adopted the final document by consensus which included “An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States parties are committed under Article VI.”

The article in the Wall Street Journal is the first prominent proposal appeared in the 21<sup>st</sup> century after almost a decade-long silence on a demand for a world free from nuclear weapons. In that sense the article is valuable, but the article is worth serious analysis because not only it takes into account of new phenomena in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, that is, the emergence of nuclear terrorism and new nuclear powers, but also the authors are not peace activists or researchers but strong supporters for nuclear deterrence during the Cold War era.

Mr. George Shultz was Secretary of State from 1982 to 1989 under the Reagan Administration. Mr. William Perry was Secretary of Defense from 1994 to 1997 under Clinton Administration, Mr. Henry Kissinger was Secretary of State from

---

\* Professor of International Law and Relations, Osaka School of International Public Policy, Osaka University, Japan.

1) George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nun, “A World Free of Nuclear Weapons,” *The Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2007.

1973 to 1977 under Nixon and Ford Administrations, and Mr. Sam Nunn was former Chairman of the Senate Armed Service Committee. The article is written by these former high-ranking officials and senator from both Republicans and Democrats, who once presided over Cold War nuclear strategy.

In this article, firstly I will introduce the content of the new proposal, then I will examine some reactions to this proposal, thirdly I will take up the opinions of candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination on this proposal and nuclear weapons, and finally I will analyze the practical measures towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

### **The New Proposal in January 2007**

#### *Backgrounds or Reasons for the New Proposal*

According to their analysis, nuclear weapons were essential to maintaining international peace and security during the Cold War because they were a means of deterrence. But reliance on nuclear weapons for deterrence is becoming increasingly hazardous and decreasingly effective. The world is now on the precipice of a new and dangerous nuclear era. They mention following four backgrounds or reasons.

Firstly, the likelihood that non-state terrorists will get their hands on nuclear weaponry is increasing. Non-state terrorist groups with nuclear weapons are conceptually outside the bounds of a deterrent strategy.

Secondly, new nuclear states do not have the benefit of years of step-by-step safeguards put in effect during the Cold War to prevent nuclear accidents, misjudgments or unauthorized launches.

Thirdly, the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) envisioned the end of all nuclear weapons. It provides (a) that states that did not possess nuclear weapons as of 1967 agree not to obtain them, and (b) that states that do possess them agree to divest themselves of these weapons over time. However, non-nuclear-weapon states have grown increasingly skeptical of the sincerity of the nuclear powers.

Fourthly, Strong non-proliferation efforts such as the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Additional Protocol are under way. The negotiations on proliferation of nuclear weapons by North Korea and Iran are crucially important. But by themselves, none of these steps are adequate to the danger.

### *What Should Be Done?*

As the first and most important measure, they argue that a major effort should be launched by the United States to produce a positive answer through concrete stages. First and foremost is intensive work with leaders of the countries in possession of nuclear weapons to turn the goal of a world without nuclear weapons into a joint enterprise.

Achieving the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons will also require effective measures to impede or counter any nuclear-related conduct that is potentially threatening to the security of any state or peoples.

Reassertion of the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons and practical measures towards achieving that goal would be, and would be perceived as, a bold initiative consistent with America's moral heritage.

### *Eight Urgent Steps as Groundwork for a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*

In order to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons, they list the following eight measures as groundwork for it.

1. Changing the Cold War posture of deployed nuclear weapons to increase warning time.
2. Continue to reduce substantially the size of nuclear forces in all states that possess them.
3. Eliminating short-range nuclear weapons designed to be forward-deployed.
4. Initiating a bipartisan process with the Senate to achieve ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
5. Providing the highest possible level of security for all stocks of weapons, weapons-usable plutonium, and HEU everywhere in the world.
6. Getting control of the uranium enrichment process, combined with the guarantee of fuel supply at a reasonable price.
7. Halting the production of fissile material for weapons globally.
8. Redoubling our efforts to resolve regional confrontations and conflicts that give rise to new nuclear powers.

### **Reactions to the Proposal**

#### *Mikhail Gorbachev's Response*

Mr. Gorbachev, in his article “The Nuclear Threat” on January 31, 2007 in *The Wall Street Journal*<sup>2)</sup>, responded to this proposal saying, “It raises an issue of crucial importance for world affairs: the need for the abolition of nuclear weapons. I feel it is my duty to support their call for urgent action.”

He is calling for a dialogue to be launched within the framework of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, involving both nuclear-weapon states and non-nuclear-weapon states, to cover the full range of issues related to the elimination of nuclear weapons. The goal is to develop a common concept for moving towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

The key to success is reciprocity of obligations and actions. The members of the nuclear club should formally reiterate their commitment to reducing and ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons. They should without delay take two crucial steps: ratify the CTBT and make changes in their military doctrine, removing nuclear weapons from the Cold War-era high alert. At the same time, the states that have nuclear-power programs would pledge to terminate all elements of those programs that could have military use.

#### *Carnegie International Nonproliferation Conference*

Carnegie International Nonproliferation Conference held on June 25 and 26, 2007 prepared one session for “A World Free of Nuclear Weapons” and arranged luncheon keynote speech on “A World Free of Nuclear Weapons?” delivered by U.K. Foreign Minister, as a response to and for a more detail analysis of the new proposal six months ago. Ms. Jessica Mathews, a moderator of the session, emphasized the importance of the proposal saying, “The impact of something that is said or written reflects two things. One is what is said, content. But the other, sometimes even more important, is who says it.”

At the session, Mr. Max Kampelman, who worked for the four wise men’s proposal behind the scenes, emphasized the leadership of the United States, stating as follows<sup>3)</sup>.

I believe the United States can act unilaterally in the following way. I would have the president of the United States appear before the United Nations General Assembly and announce by putting in a resolution that the

---

2) Mikhail Gorbachev, “The Nuclear Threat,” *Wall Street Journal*, January 31, 2007.

3) Speech by Mr. Max Kampelman, “A World Free of Nuclear Weapons,” Carnegie International Nonproliferation Conference, June 25, 2007, Washington D. C.

world should accept the notion that the possession and development of nuclear weapons is a crime against humanity and a crime against international body. I think the United States and the people of the United States ought to say to the world, we've got more arms than all of you put together. We're prepared, with proper inspection and proper guidance and proper punishment for the criminal states – we're prepared to get rid of ours, too.

Mr. Nunn emphasized the ratification of the CTBT by the United States and the changing of military policy to stop having nuclear weapons on hair trigger alert.

Then U.K. Foreign Minister Margaret Beckett who agrees with the new proposal in the necessity to have bold vision of a world free of nuclear weapons, but is pessimistic to achieve it in a near future, stated as follows<sup>4)</sup>.

What that Wall Street Journal article has been quite right to identify is that our efforts on non-proliferation will be dangerously undermined if others believe that the terms of the grand bargain have changed, that the nuclear weapon states have abandoned any commitment to disarmament.

As that Wall Street Journal article put it: "Without the bold vision, the actions will not be perceived as fair and urgent. Without the actions, the vision will not be perceived as realistic or possible."

The truth is that I very much doubt – though I wish it otherwise – that we will see the total elimination of nuclear weapons in my lifetime. To reach that point would require much more than disarmament diplomacy. It would require a much more secure and predictable global political context.

That context does not exist today. Indeed it is why, only a few months ago, the U.K. took the decision to retain our ability to have an independent nuclear deterrent beyond the 2020s.

### **Opinions of Candidates for the Democratic Presidential Nomination**

#### *Senator Barack Obama*

In an article "Renewing American Leadership" in July/August 2007 issue of

---

4) Margaret Beckett, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, United Kingdom, Luncheon Keynote, "A World Free of Nuclear-Weapons?" Carnegie International Nonproliferation Conference, June 25, 2007.

*Foreign Affairs*<sup>5)</sup>, he recognizes as the most urgent threat to the security of America and the world the spread of nuclear weapons, material, and technology and the risk that a nuclear device will fall into the hands of terrorists. He refers to the new proposal by the four wise men, saying, "As George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nun have warned, our current measures are not sufficient to meet the nuclear threat."

If elected as a president, he promises to work for the following measures in order to secure, destroy, and stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

- 1) America has to lead a global effort to secure all nuclear weapons and material at vulnerable sites within four years.
- 2) We must work with Russia to update and scale back our dangerous outdated Cold War nuclear postures and de-emphasize the role of nuclear weapons.
- 3) We should take advantage of recent technological advances to build bipartisan consensus behind ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- 4) I will work to negotiate a verifiable global ban on the production of new nuclear weapons material.
- 5) We must also stop the spread of nuclear weapons technology and ensure that countries cannot build a weapons program under the auspices of developing peaceful nuclear power.

In this article, Mr. Obama accepted several proposals for concrete measures towards a world free of nuclear weapons submitted by Mr. Schultz and others, but he stopped short of supporting a world free of nuclear weapons.

However, in the speech in Chicago, Illinois, on October 2, 2007, he clearly expressed his support for a world free of nuclear weapons, stating as follows<sup>6)</sup>.

Here's what I'll say as President: America seeks a world in which there are no nuclear weapons. We will not pursue unilateral disarmament. As long as nuclear weapons exist, we'll retain a strong nuclear deterrent. But we'll keep our commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on the long road towards eliminating nuclear weapons. We'll work with Russia to take U.S. and Russian ballistic missiles off hair-trigger alert, and to dramatically reduce the stockpiles of our nuclear weapons and material. We'll start by seeking a

---

5) Barack Obama, "Renewing American Leadership," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.86, No.4, July/August 2007, pp.8-9.

6) "Remarks of Senator Barack Obama: A New Beginning," Speech given in Chicago, IL on October 02, 2007.

<[http://www.clw.org/elections/2008/presidential/obama\\_remarks\\_a\\_new\\_beginning/](http://www.clw.org/elections/2008/presidential/obama_remarks_a_new_beginning/)>

global ban on the production of fissile material for weapons. And we'll set a goal to expand the U.S.-Russian ban on intermediate-range missiles so that the agreement is global.

In setting a goal of eliminating nuclear weapons in the world, Mr. Obama is endorsing a call for urgent new actions to prevent a new nuclear era that was laid out in January in a commentary in *The Wall Street Journal* written by several former high-ranking government officials<sup>7)</sup>.

*Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton*

In her article, “Security and Opportunity for the Twenty-First Century,” in November/December 2007 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, Ms. Clinton argued for nuclear reduction and other measures referring to the new proposal made by Mr. Schultz and others, stating as follows<sup>8)</sup>:

Neither North Korea nor Iran will change course as a result of what we do with our own nuclear weapons, but taking dramatic steps to reduce our nuclear arsenals would build support for the coalitions we need to address the threat of nuclear proliferation and help the United States regain the moral high ground. Former Secretaries of State George Schultz and Henry Kissinger, former Defense Secretary William Perry, and former Senate Sam Nunn have called on the United States to “rekindle the vision,” shared by every president from Dwight Eisenhower to Bill Clinton, of reducing reliance on nuclear weapons.

To assert our nonproliferation leadership, I will seek to negotiate an accord that substantially and verifiably reduces the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals....I will also seek Senate approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by 2009...As president, I will support efforts to supplement the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Establishing an international fuel bank that guaranteed secure access to nuclear fuel at reasonable prices would help limit the number of countries that pose proliferation risks.

She does not explicitly support the idea of a world free of nuclear weapons,

---

7) Jeff Zeleny, “Obama to Urge Elimination of Nuclear Weapons,” *The New York Times*, October 2, 2007.

8) Hillary Rodham Clinton, “Security and Opportunity for the Twenty-First Century,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.86, No.6, November/December 2007, p.12.

though she seems sympathetic, but she argues for many concrete nuclear disarmament measures.

*Former Senator John Edwards*

In his article “Reengaging With the World” in September/October 2007 issue of *Foreign Affairs*<sup>9)</sup>, he emphasizes more systematic approach to confronting the most dangerous threat of the new century: the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. He proposes creation of a new Global Nuclear Compact to bolster the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which would support peaceful nuclear programs, improve security for existing stocks of nuclear materials, and ensure more frequent verification that materials are not being diverted and nuclear facilities are not being misused.

He does not mention the elimination of nuclear weapons in this article, but he is cited as “Former Senator John Edwards has also pledged to lead an international effort to eliminate nuclear weapons, as has Governor Bill Richardson in New Mexico.<sup>10)</sup>”

### **Practical Measures towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons**

*De-alerting of Deployed Nuclear Weapons*

The first measure recommended by the proposal is “Changing the Cold War posture of deployed nuclear weapons to increase warning time and thereby reduce the danger of an accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons.”

The total number of warheads ready for immediate firing is about 2,500, divided fairly evenly between the U.S. and Russia. Removing the hair trigger from these strategic weapons is an urgent priority that has not been dealt with by the United States and Russia<sup>11)</sup>.

Mr. Obama emphasizes that “we must work with Russia to update and scale

---

9) John Edwards, “Reengaging With the World,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.86, No.5, September/November 2007, p.27.

10) Ivo Daalder and John Holum, “It’s Time to Junk Them,” *International Herald Tribune*, October 6-7, 2007.

11) George Bunn and John B. Rhinelander, “Reykjavik Revisited: Toward a World Free of Nuclear Weapons,” *World Security Institute Policy Brief*, September 2007.  
<[http://www.cdi.org/PDFs/Reykjavik\\_Sept07.pdf](http://www.cdi.org/PDFs/Reykjavik_Sept07.pdf)>

back our dangerously outdated Cold War nuclear posture, and we'll work with Russia to take U.S. and Russian ballistic missiles off hair-trigger."

The final document of the 2000 NPT review conference also includes as one of the steps by all the nuclear-weapon states leading to nuclear disarmament, "concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems."

In the current international security environment where the U.S. and Russia are not an enemy anymore, the measure of de-alerting is a logical and useful first step for the abolition of nuclear weapons, as many experts argue for it.

#### *Reduction of Nuclear Weapons*

The second measure recommended is "Continuing to reduce substantially the size of nuclear forces in all states that possess them." Mr. Obama argues that "we'll work with Russia to dramatically reduce the stockpiles of our nuclear weapons and material," and Ms. Clinton states that "to reassert our nonproliferation leadership, I will seek to negotiate an accord that substantially and verifiably reduces the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals".

Ivo Daalder and John Holum argue that the U.S. can sharply reduce its nuclear stockpile to 1,000 weapons or less, if Russia agrees to go down to the same level, and George Bunn and John B. Rhinelander suggest that with respect to reductions, they urge an initial target, for both Russia and the United States, of no more than 500 strategic warheads associated with de-alerted forces of each country.

In the final document of the 2000 NPT review conference, states parties agreed that "the early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible," and "further efforts by the nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally."

The START I Treaty is going to expire in 2009 and the Moscow Treaty will also expire in 2012. The Moscow Treaty lacks the fundamental elements of disarmament treaty, that is, verifiability, irreversibility and predictability. Early resumption of the negotiation between the U.S. and Russia for a treaty that provides for further reduction of their nuclear weapons is urgently needed.

#### *Elimination of Short-Range Nuclear Weapons*

The third measure recommended is "Eliminating short-range nuclear weapons designed to be forward-deployed." 480 U.S. nuclear bombs are deployed with

allied forces in six NATO countries, that is, in the U.K., Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy and Turkey. In addition the U.S. is estimated to have 620 tactical nuclear weapons and Russia somewhere between 3,000 and 6,000 tactical nuclear weapons.

Daalder and Holum also argue that the U.S. can eliminate tactical nuclear weapons. In addition, Mr. Obama says that “we’ll set a goal to expand the U.S.-Russian ban on intermediate-range missiles so that the agreement is global.”

At the 2000 NPT review conference, it was agreed that “the further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process.”

The tactical nuclear weapons deployed in the six countries of the NATO has lost their military utility with the end of the Cold War but were maintained as a symbol of trans-Atlantic solidarity. As is shown in the case of Japan and South Korea, solidarity of alliance does not need the deployment of nuclear weapons. The U.S. and Russia should commence the negotiation on the withdrawal of NATO tactical nuclear weapons and the reduction of Russian tactical nuclear weapons.

#### *Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty*

The fourth recommendation is “Initiating a bipartisan process with the Senate, including understandings to increase confidence and provide for periodic review, to achieve ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, taking advantage of recent technical advances, and working to secure ratification by other key states.”

Mr. Obama argues that “we should take advantage of recent technological advances to build bipartisan consensus behind ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,” and Ms. Clinton argues that “I will also seek Senate approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by 2009, the tenth anniversary of the Senate’s initial rejection of the agreement. This would enhance the United States’ credibility when demanding that other nations refrain from testing.”

Daalder and Holum argue that the U.S. can commit never again to test a nuclear device, and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and Bunn and Rhinlander recommend that the next U.S. administration should renew the CTBT condition on nuclear assistance to India and also focus on bringing China, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea into the CTBT at the time of the U.S. ratification.”

At the 2000 NPT conference, the issue of the CTBT is included in the first and second paragraphs as the most urgent and important measure. “The importance and urgency of signatures and ratifications to achieve the early entry into force of the

CTBT," and "A moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions pending entry into force of that Treaty" are agreed.

More than ten years have passed since its adoption by the UN General Assembly in 1996. The key for the entry into force is the U.S. ratification of the treaty, though it does not necessarily ensure its early entry into force. If the U.S. ratifies, China surely follows suit, and the U.S. can impose strong pressure to India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea to ratify it.

#### *Nuclear Security*

The fifth recommendation is "Providing the highest possible standards of security for all stocks of weapons, weapons-usable plutonium, and highly enriched uranium everywhere in the world."

Mr. Obama says "America must lead a global effort to secure all nuclear weapons and material at vulnerable sites within four years—the most effective way to prevent terrorists from acquiring a bomb....We must work with Russia in areas of common interest—above all, in making sure that nuclear weapons and material is secure." In order to prevent nuclear terrorism, Ms. Clinton says that "my first goal would be to remove all nuclear material from the world's most vulnerable nuclear sites and effectively secure the remainder during my first term in office."

Daalder and Holum argue that "the first order of business must be to ensure that all the nuclear weapons and materials in Russia and elsewhere are safe and secure."

Many measures have been taken to prevent nuclear material from falling in the hand of terrorists, but they are not still enough. The international community as a whole and the U.S. and Russia in particular should work harder for nuclear security in parallel with dealing with root causes for terrorism.

#### *Control of Uranium Enrichment Process*

The sixth recommendation is "Getting control of the uranium enrichment process, combined with the guarantee that uranium for nuclear power reactors could be obtained at a reasonable price, first from the Nuclear Suppliers Group and then from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or other controlled international reserves. It will also be necessary to deal with proliferation issues presented by spent fuel from reactors producing electricity."

Mr. Obama says, "my administration will immediately provide \$50 million to jump-start the creation of an IAEA-controlled nuclear fuel bank," and Ms. Clinton

argues that “the establishing an international fuel bank that guaranteed secure access to nuclear fuel at reasonable prices would help limit the number of countries that pose proliferation risks.”

Bunn and Rheinlander support the IAEA Director-General’s proposal for multilateral facilities for uranium enrichment as the most promising, politically realistic policy to be followed.

The control on the use of enriched uranium is necessary, but the conditions should be agreed on multilaterally including suppliers and recipients.

#### *Halting the Production of Fissile Material for Weapons*

The seventh concrete measures recommended is “Halting the production of fissile material for weapons globally; phasing out the use of highly enriched uranium in civil commerce and removing weapons-usable uranium from research facilities around the world and rendering the materials safe.”

Mr. Obama says “As we look down existing nuclear stockpiles, I will work to negotiate a verifiable global ban on the production of new nuclear weapons material.”

Daalder and Holum assert that the U.S. can agree never to produce highly enriched uranium and plutonium for weapons purposes, and accept the need for intrusive verification if other states agrees to end such production as well, and Bunn and Rhinlander argue that the U.S. should recede from its blocking position of FMCT negotiations and abandon its present position against international verification measures for such a treaty.

At the 2000 NPT conference, “the necessity of negotiations in the CD on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices” is agreed.

At the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in 2007, six chairmen’s proposal for the commencement of the negotiation of a FMCT was overwhelmingly supported but consensus was not gained because China, Pakistan and Iran did not agree.

Unless all states parties agree on a FMCT without verification measure, a FMCT should include verification measure as a logical next step after the CTBT.

#### *Solving Regional Conflicts*

The last recommendation is “Redoubling our efforts to resolve regional confrontations and conflicts that give rise to new nuclear powers.”

In particular, North Korea and Iran are focal points in the recommendation. The North Korean nuclear issue has been discussed under the Six-Party Talks and some measures have been agreed and implemented. Through dialogue, progress has been developed towards a nuclear-weapon-free Korean Peninsula. On Iranian nuclear issue, there has been no progress and confrontation between Iran and Western states continues. Direct negotiation between the U.S. and Iran may lead the way for dialogue just like North Korean case.

### **Conclusion**

Since G. W. Bush became a president in 2001, U.S. security policy has stressed military power with unilateral initiative, and arms control and disarmament has been ignored although he has emphasized non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The new proposal of January 2007 seems to be a critical response to the nuclear policy by Bush administration. The proposal is different from many previous proposals in the sense that it attracted many people including candidates for the Democratic Presidential nomination, because the authors of the proposal are bipartisan former high-ranking officials and senator.

In order to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons, we have to make efforts in the following areas.

Firstly, we should ask the U.S. Government, maybe a next Administration, to take a bold vision and initiative for a world free of nuclear weapons, based on the proposal put forward in January 2007. The proposal is very useful as a starting point for us to ask the U.S. to take the bold vision and concrete measures.

Secondly, we should make efforts to reaffirm an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. In the NPT review process, the U.S. and France behave as if there is no agreement for nuclear elimination that they once agreed, although almost all other nations seriously support the final document of the 2000 NPT review conference.

Thirdly, we should make efforts at the Conference on Disarmament (CD) to start substantive discussions or negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Last March, almost all the members of the CD agreed but a few did not to the presidential draft decision which decides for negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, and

substantive discussions on nuclear disarmament, prevention of an arms race in outer space and negative security assurances.