

## **Japan and the International Efforts on Non-Proliferation**

Sukeyuki ICHIMASA

Research Fellow

Center for the Promotion of Disarmament and  
Non-Proliferation (CPDNP),  
Japan Institute of International Affairs

### **Introduction**

Under existing international condition, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation business is in the time of political and technical turmoil with emergence of newly acquiring nuclear states. Therefore, what is necessary for achieving efficient non-proliferation framework is to equip an effective verification system, expediting the universalization of Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Regime and maintaining the momentum of promoting the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation among the international community by whatever means possible.

Over the past many years, Japan has most ardently supported the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation activity of the international community. Indeed, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation is one of the most important agendas for Japan. As the only nation that was the victim of nuclear bombing, it is very important for Japan to take an initiative relating to the total elimination of nuclear weapons in such a tangible manner. Actually, there are approaches at various levels in the pursuit of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation as well as other diplomatic issues.

Based on such ideas, this article describes features of the current international efforts on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation policy and Japanese engagements to these. In this context, this article covers recent events concerning such issues as the review conference of NPT in 2005, the nuclear Safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Then, this article treats of a case of international support for denuclearization in former Soviet Union region. Also, considering its growing importance and value following the U.S. -India nuclear agreements, this article especially argue about the current situation of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG).

When it comes to non-proliferation, effectiveness and verifiability are always the two important keywords. Even if international community could reach to the consensus on specific non-proliferation regime, without an effective verification tool of compliance, it will turn out to be a pie in the sky. So, this article also treats of Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) as tasks for the future non-proliferation efforts. Then finally, it touches upon the recent case of Japan-EU ‘region-to-region’ cooperation in the area of non-proliferation by way of example.

The view and analysis expressed on this article is that of the author’s personal remark and do not necessarily represent those of CPDNP.

### **1. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference in 2005**

2005 NPT review conference was a major turning point for the most of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation work. Especially on the nuclear issue, the rights and obligations of the P5 states has been broadly acknowledged again. It is also important to remember that the inherent right to exercising the peaceful use of atomic energy has been addressed by the developing countries.

Needless to say, for many years NPT was one of the major diplomatic agenda for Japan. This conference has given the Japanese government of prime opportunities to state her such strong view on the importance of accelerating the nuclear arms control and disarmament. In this sense, failure of 2005 NPT review conference was a kind of test-stone for Japan whether to continue its effort to nuclear arms control and disarmament.

In March 2006, the U.S.-India nuclear agreement was concluded. The agreement of the cooperation of

the nuclear power of the U.S. and India means that admitting the India's virtual possession of the nuclear weapons and excluding India from the country list of export restriction stipulated by the NSG. That is to say that the result of the U.S.-India nuclear agreement may well be directly linked to the permission of sharing the sensitive technologies, which relates to the nuclear power development that has been prohibited up to now. The U.S.-India nuclear agreement does not only matter between these two countries. This sort of arrangement might consequentially lead to the collapse of the NPT regime. As the member of NPT and major promoter of abolishing the nuclear weapons and strengthening the NPT regime, Japan should not take a detached attitude to this case.

In 2006, however Iranian President Ahmadinejad stated that the uranium enrichment for peaceful utilization should continue in the face of international pressure. On 16 November 2006, President Ahmadinejad stated that the Iran's nuclear programme entered the final stages. On the other hand, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) lastly carried out a nuclear test on 9 October at the pressure increased. Moreover, encountering perceived unprecedented act such as U.S.-India nuclear agreement, the NPT regime stands at the crossroads.

## 2. The Nuclear Safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

With regard to the implementation of peaceful use of atomic energy, Nuclear Safeguards operated under the IAEA are as the matter, too, important for Japan's nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation policy. Japan has signed the IAEA Nuclear Safeguards Additional Protocol (AP, INFCIRC/540<sup>1</sup>) on December 4, 1998, and the AP has come into effect on December 16, 1999. The number of country that ratifies the AP on November 23 2006 goes up to 78<sup>2</sup>. Japan was among these the 8<sup>th</sup> country with nuclear power generation to ratify the AP the first. Outreach activity for universalization of the 'Integrated Safeguards'<sup>3</sup> has positively worked on Japan's nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation policy<sup>4</sup> through the consultation between two countries like Japan-Iran AP working-level conference, improving the opportunity of multilateral meeting such as G8, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Asian Senior-level Talks on Non-Proliferation (ASTOP)<sup>5</sup> and of course in the occasion of NPT review conferences. In short, Japan appealed an importance of the Safeguards AP, because it will contribute to the reinforcement of the verification regime.

On the other hand, it is necessary to understand that the various obligations are newly required along with a ratification of the AP. In fact, the country concluded the Safeguards AP owes an obligation to declare the nuclear power relevant activity that is not declared in the present Safeguards agreement<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> INFCIRC/540(Corrected) Model Protocol Additional to the Agreement(s) Between State(s) and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards.  
<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Infcircs/1998/infcirc540corrected.pdf> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>2</sup> Strengthened Safeguards System: Status of Additional Protocols.  
[http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/sg\\_protocol.html](http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/sg_protocol.html) (accessed 27 November 2006)

<sup>3</sup> L. Wedekind, 'Stronger Nuclear Safeguards System: Taking Shape IAEA Moving Toward More Efficient Verification Approach for Nuclear Programmes,' IAEA News Center.  
[http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/News/2002/sgarticle\\_01.shtml](http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/News/2002/sgarticle_01.shtml) (accessed 2 October 2006)

<sup>4</sup> Statement by Mr. Toshimitsu Motegi (Minister of State for Science and Technology Policy), Delegate of the Government of Japan at the 48<sup>th</sup> General Conference of the IAEA.  
<http://www.vie-mission.emb-japan.go.jp/Statements/IAEA/GC/48th%20Minister.htm> (accessed 15 October 2006)

<sup>5</sup> The 3<sup>rd</sup> Asian Senior-level Talks on Non-Proliferation (ASTOP).  
<http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/event/2006/2/0203-3.html> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>6</sup> The safeguards system of the IAEA.  
[http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/safeg\\_system.pdf](http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/safeg_system.pdf) (accessed 8 September 2006)

Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA)  
“EU and Japan: the emerging challenges for the middle of the decade 2000-2010”  
Brussels, 27-28 November 2006

Moreover, sometimes the country will be required to admit the ‘Complementary Access’ by the IAEA inspectors to the site, where access is not permitted under the ‘Full-Scope’ Safeguards based on INFCIRC/153<sup>7</sup>.

On 3 October 2005, H.E. Ambassador Yukiya Amano of Permanent Mission of Japan in Vienna was elected to the Chairman of the IAEA General Conference<sup>8</sup>. It is fair to say that this nomination is a result of that international community has appreciated the contribution of Japan to the IAEA for years.

For the promotion of a peaceful use of nuclear power and strengthening the international system of a nuclear non-proliferation, championship of the NPT regime is still one of the most important goals of Japan. In the light of the importance of verification effectiveness, universalization of the IAEA Nuclear Safeguards AP will remain the most important part of Japanese policy relevant to the IAEA. It seems therefore that Japan will make a further effort to improve its influence and *raison-d’être* of Japan in the IAEA continuously.

Needless to add, current issue relevant to IAEA is the nuclear problem in Iran and the DPRK. A nuclear problem of Iran came to be taken up in the IAEA in the wake of construction of large-scale secret nuclear power facilities in Natanz and Arak has revealed in August 2002. After the report of the IAEA Director General Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei in November 2003<sup>9</sup>, Iran’s violation of the Nuclear Safeguards has aroused serious concern to the international community. In this situation, Japan also joined the other European countries and made effort on couple of diplomatic dialogues with Iranian government in order to find a solution. In January 2004 Japan-Iran consultation on disarmament and non-proliferation issues<sup>10</sup> took place in Tokyo. In this consultation, Japan encouraged Iran to ratify the IAEA Safeguards AP and also emphasized the merit of complying with the resolution of IAEA Board of Governors.

After the strenuous consultation lead by European countries<sup>11</sup>, EU-3 (UK, France, and Germany) and Iran agreed upon ‘Paris Accord’<sup>12</sup> in November 2004 and Iran pledged a temporal suspension of uranium enrichment and reprocessing relevant activities. Within the framework of this ‘Paris Accord’, Iran also accepted the IAEA to verify of its temporal suspension. Following the ‘Paris Accord’, in August 2005 EU-3 submitted a new proposal of ‘Long-Term Agreement’<sup>13</sup>. However, Iran rejected this proposal and hereupon reactivated a part of the uranium-conversion programme that has suspended

---

<sup>7</sup> INFCIRC/153 (Corrected) The Structure and Content of Agreements Between the Agency and States Required in Connection with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.  
<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/npt/text/inf153.html> (accessed 20 November 2006)

<sup>8</sup> H.E. Ambassador Y. Amano holds the post of chairman of the IAEA Board of Governors (2005-2006).  
[http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/News/2004/bogchair\\_2005.html](http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/News/2004/bogchair_2005.html) (accessed 2 November 2006)

<sup>9</sup> Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran (GOV/2003/75).  
<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2003/gov2003-75.pdf> (accessed 4 October 2006)

<sup>10</sup> Summary of Japan-Iran Consultation on Disarmament and Non-proliferation Issues (January 27th, 2004). [http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/middle\\_e/iran/consult0401.html](http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/middle_e/iran/consult0401.html) (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>11</sup> The EU’s relations with Iran (General Affairs and External Relations Council).  
[http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external\\_relations/iran/intro/gac.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/iran/intro/gac.htm) (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>12</sup> Communication dated 26 November 2004 received from the Permanent Representatives of France, Germany, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United Kingdom concerning the agreement signed in Paris on 15 November 2004 (INFCIRC/637).  
<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Infcircs/2004/infcirc637.pdf> (accessed 1 September 2006)

<sup>13</sup> European Parliament resolution on Iran (B6-0539/2005).  
<http://www.europarl.eu.int/omk/sipade3?PUBREF=-//EP//NONSGML+MOTION+B6-2005-0539+0+DOC+WORD+V0//EN&L=EN&LEVEL=0&NAV=S&LSTDOC=Y> (accessed 5 October 2006)

Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA)  
“EU and Japan: the emerging challenges for the middle of the decade 2000-2010”  
Brussels, 27-28 November 2006

under the ‘Paris Accord’. Under such circumstances, Japanese approach toward Iran’s suspected nuclear weapon development keeps in step with the IAEA resolutions<sup>14</sup> and making an overture for the Iran to accept every item on the resolution, inter alias:

- (a) Cooperation with the IAEA including complete information disclosure concerning past 18 years nuclear activity,
- (b) Conclusion, complete implementation, and tentative execution of the IAEA Safeguards AP,
- (c) Suspension of all activities relevant to the uranium enrichment and reprocessing,
- (d) Return to negotiation process (board of governor’s resolution in September 2005).

For the sake of retrieving the situation, it might be necessary for Iran to regain trust of the international society ruined by the past violation of the IAEA Safeguards agreement and Japan thus pursuing a negotiated political settlement to Iran. On 22 April of 2006, immediately after the Iranian government has announced of its achievement of low uranium enrichment<sup>15</sup>, Director Motohide Kikkawa of Middle Eastern and African Affairs Bureau of Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs visited Iran to carry on a conversation with Vice Foreign Minister Mehdi Safari conveying Japan’s regrets and requesting to comply with the UN Security Council presidential statement underlines importance of Iran’s re-establishing full, sustained suspension of uranium enrichment activities<sup>16</sup> in the meantime. However, the Iranian government answered that the country did the maximum cooperation with the IAEA already, and sole purpose of its uranium enrichment activity is to develop the peaceful use of atomic energy.

In July 2006, UN Security Council finally demanded Iran suspend uranium enrichment by 31 August, or face possible economic or diplomatic sanctions (UNSC Resolution 1696<sup>17</sup>). However President Ahmadinejad substantially denied the suspension of Iran’s uranium enrichment.

The situation surrounding Iran’s nuclear problem raised serious concerns. On 22 November 2006, a committee of the IAEA Board of Governors discussed the Agency’s proposed Technical Cooperation programme and finally decided not to provide technical cooperation to Iran from 2007 to 2008. About that time, several medias reported that the Dr. ElBaradei’s latest report circulated to the Board of Governors described that the Iran’s nuclear programme makes progress.

As just described, the situation does not allow premature conclusions and still it is necessary to keep a close watch on the Iran’s nuclear problem, which is an extremely important case beyond the principle of the peaceful use of the nuclear power approved by NPT.

About the DPRK situation, since October 2002, the DPRK’s possession of a uranium enrichment program has caused not only a serious concern to the regional security and stability of Far East Asia, but also an aweless challenge to the international regime of nuclear non-proliferation. Thereafter, the DPRK began to take outrageous attitudes to the concerned states and engaged in brinkmanship in the years that

---

<sup>14</sup> Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran and related Board resolutions Resolution adopted on 11 August 2005 (GOV/2005/59).

<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2005/gov2005-64.pdf> (accessed 10 November 2006)  
Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran Resolution adopted on 24 September 2005 (GOV/2005/70).

<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2005/gov2005-77.pdf> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>15</sup> Presidency of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ahmadinejad: Gov’t firm to restore nation’s full nuclear rights (Mashhad, April 11, IRNA).

<http://www.president.ir/eng/ahmadinejad/cronicnews/1385/01/22/index-e.htm#b1> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>16</sup> UN Security Council (SC/8679).

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8679.doc.htm> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>17</sup> UN Security Council (SC/8792).

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8792.doc.htm> (accessed 10 November 2006)

followed. After the pronouncement of its withdraw from NPT, the DPRK reactivated its frozen nuclear reactor and started reprocessing plant for spent nuclear fuel rods in the eyes of international community. In November 2002, Resolution of the IAEA Board of Governors<sup>18</sup> addressed that the DPRK uranium enrichment plan and secret nuclear activity will become the violations of international agreement and breaches the implementation of NPT. Also this resolution requests the DPRK to disclose all of the information relevant to the secret nuclear activity and moreover, called on the DPRK to abolish all of nuclear weapons development programme in a verifiable manner with the assistance of the IAEA.

As a matter of reality, Japan and the DPRK has no diplomatic relation and there were little chances of security dialogue including a nuclear problem between Japan and the DPRK. In the past several years, Japan-DPRK inter-governmental conference has been interrupted more than once. At the first occasion of six party talk in 2003 (Beijing), Japan persisted the importance that the DPRK's nuclear program should completely be abolished in a verifiable manner. Also, Japan keeps arguing the necessity to tackle with the DPRK nuclear issue in 'dialogue and pressure' approach and in seeking comprehensive solution of nuclear, missile and Japanese citizen abduction in connection with the DPRK in accordance with the 'Pyongyang Declaration'<sup>19</sup>. Also, Japan deeply involves in six party talks as key member, and has carried out every possible diplomatic effort with other states in cooperative manner. However, Japan's comprehensive approach to the DPRK, which treats the abduction cases of Japanese citizens along with the nuclear issues finds little support by other states except for the U.S. Actually, the DPRK not only poses the serious concern for the regional security and nuclear issue including the nuclear black market that has been known to exist and occurrence of missile that puts Japan in range, possibility of refugee problem and normalization of diplomatic relation also jeopardize the security of the Japanese people as was covered so many times by Japanese domestic news media.

After the controversial DPRK's nuclear test on 9 October 2006, Japan immediately decided to lay on economic sanction. Japan and U.S. requested that the DPRK's total acceptance of complete, verifiable, irreversible dismantlement (CVID) of all nuclear materials. Japan, South Korea and U.S. has agreed never to accept the DPRK to resume the six party talk as a nuclear state, and urge the DPRK to call for specific action to denuclearization. Three nations also agreed to continue punitive measure based on the UNSC resolution 1718<sup>20</sup>.

According to the Japanese officials statements so far, the matter of utmost importance is that the five states (Japan, U.S., China, South Korea and Russia) should move closely together against this critical situation. In this context, resumed six parties talk should bring possible forth fruit.

### **3. International Support for Denuclearization: Cooperation for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons**

In the fall of Soviet Union in December 1991, it was decided that a tremendous number of nuclear weapons disposed to the former Soviet Union will be reduced. At the same time, with the aim of maintaining the international nuclear non-proliferation order, strategic nuclear weapons assigned to Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus were decided to be transported to Russia. However, the possibility of

---

<sup>18</sup> IAEA Board of Governors Adopts Resolution on Safeguards in the DPRK (IAEA Media Advisory 2002/33). [http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/MediaAdvisory/2002/med-advise\\_033.shtml](http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/MediaAdvisory/2002/med-advise_033.shtml) (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>19</sup> Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration (September 17, 2002 Pyongyang). [http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/n\\_korea/pmv0209/pyongyang.html](http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/n_korea/pmv0209/pyongyang.html) (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>20</sup> UN Security Council (SC8853). <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8853.doc.htm> (accessed 20 November 2006)

Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA)  
“EU and Japan: the emerging challenges for the middle of the decade 2000-2010”  
Brussels, 27-28 November 2006

delaying the process of abandonment and processing of the reduced nuclear weapons due to the political disorder following the collapse of the Soviet Union had become a serious concern of international community. With regard to the dismantlement of nuclear weapons, plutonium disposal was also an urgent problem for the maintenance of the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

Therefore, Japan assumed that promoting the cooperation with such nations as the U.S., UK, Germany, France and Italy for the solution of the nuclear weapons abandonment and processing of the former Soviet Union, as well as relevant environmental problems based on the agreement of the Munich Summit in 1992<sup>21</sup>. At the same time, those non-nuclear weapon states (Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus) were urged to join NPT and cooperate with the international action for safeguarding the nuclear materials to detect and prevent an illicit transfer or clandestine production of nuclear weapons. Thus international community has attached the highest importance to the establishment of such an effective safeguards of nuclear related sensitive materials, goods and technologies possessed by the former Soviet Union, and Japan demonstrated strong initiative to this case and did various substantial cooperation described as follows.

In April 1993, Japan announced that about 100 million dollars in total would be offered to support the abandonment of nuclear weapons of the former Soviet Union (Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus). Moreover, in the Koln Summit (1999), Japan stated additional capital grant of about 115 million dollars to the cooperation for elimination of nuclear weapons. Under the framework of the Committee on Cooperation for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons<sup>22</sup>, Japan assists the establishment of Liquid Radioactive Waste Treatment Plant (named ‘SUZURAN’) in the territory of Russian Federation. Also Japan provides substantial assistance for the establishment of State Systems of Accounting for and Control of nuclear materials (SSACs)<sup>23</sup> to Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus. In addition, for the sake of preventing the brain drain of sensitive knowledge especially related to the production of nuclear weapons from former Soviet Union, Japan joined the international effort to establish the International Science and Technology Center (ISTC)<sup>24</sup>.

Today, this process has consolidated with ‘G8 Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction’<sup>25</sup>. In this regard, Japan has now contributed 200 million dollars in this framework. Among these contributions, nearly 100 million dollars is used to dismantle the decommissioned nuclear submarines. Moreover, it is assumed that the remaining 100 million dollars will be donated for the plutonium disposal plan of surplus arms and it could be said that this case is a good example of Japanese effort to contribute the nuclear disarmament, which will positively produce substantive results.

---

<sup>21</sup> G7 Summit: Munich, July 6-8, 1992 ‘New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union’.  
<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1992munich/communique/russia.html> (accessed 10 November 2006)

‘Safety of Nuclear Power Plants in the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union and in Central and Eastern Europe’.

<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1992munich/communique/nuclear.html> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>22</sup> 16th Meeting of the Committee on Cooperation for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in February 2003. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/europe/russia/meet0302.html> (accessed 2 November 2006)

<sup>23</sup> ‘IAEA Further Steps in the Development of the Safeguards System’.  
<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Booklets/Safeguards/pia3812.html> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>24</sup> ISTC (Website) <http://www.istc.ru/ISTC/sc.nsf/html/index.htm?OpenDocument&lang=en>

<sup>25</sup> ‘Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction - A G8 Action Plan’.

[http://www.g8.fr/evian/english/navigation/2003\\_g8\\_summit/summit\\_documents/global\\_partnership\\_against\\_the\\_spread\\_of\\_weapons\\_and\\_materials\\_of\\_mass\\_destruction\\_-\\_a\\_g8\\_action\\_plan.html](http://www.g8.fr/evian/english/navigation/2003_g8_summit/summit_documents/global_partnership_against_the_spread_of_weapons_and_materials_of_mass_destruction_-_a_g8_action_plan.html) (accessed 10 November 2006)

#### **4. Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG)**

Japan was an original member from time when the NSG conference starts in 1975 and has been positively participated in the conference establishing the Guidelines<sup>26</sup> for Transfers of Nuclear-Related Dual-Use Equipment, Material and Technology that could become an important contribution to the nuclear fuel cycle or nuclear explosive activity, which has not yet covered by previous one.

After the Part 2 of INFCIRC/254 is agreed, Japan keep committing proactively to the NSG meetings and Permanent Mission of Japan to the International Organization in Vienna has been taking on the role of Point of Contact (POC). Within this capacity, Japan has been engaging substantive outreach activities of NSG for instance, India and Pakistan. Moreover, since 1995, Japan has also taking on the secretariat of the Guidelines for Nuclear Transfers (INFCIRC/254, Part1). Moreover, Permanent Mission of Japan in Vienna provides not only the convention hall to the NSG meetings but also provides pragmatic support as the POC for example it receives and circulates the ‘Denial Notification’ and ‘Complementary Information’ to the member states.

For the further enhancement of the NSG activity, Japan strongly supports to set a condition on the export of the nuclear related materials, machine parts and the technology with the possibilities of diversion to the nuclear weapon development, contingent upon the ratification of the IAEA Safeguards AP. Up to now, strengthening the NSG as the comprehensive export control of the nuclear material and nuclear related technologies were a point of issues.

In the last general conference at Brasilia in July 2006, basic policy against the Iran’s nuclear problem was addressed by the member states that this problem should be solved through the diplomatic dialogue and IAEA will keep carrying out its commission on this issue. Japan also supports this basic policy, however the current situation where the U.S. - India nuclear agreement passed the U.S. senate and house may affects the NSG, that will not allow Japan to go into optimism.

#### **5. Japan-EU Cooperation for Non-Proliferation**

Japan recently made a series of diplomatic effort for the disarmament and non-proliferation issues as remarked below; Japan-China (2003, 2004), Japan-Australia (2004), Japan-South Korea (2003, 2004), Japan-Libya (2004), Japan-Russia (2003), Japan-Israel (2004), Japan-EU (2004), Japan-US (2002, 2003, 2004) and Japan-Iran (2003, 2004). In some cases, these joint efforts toward the specific concerns beyond the unilateral regional approach. With respect to the foregoing, this paper particularly focuses on the Japan-EU consultation by way of example.

As a matter of fact, a lot of common features are seen in both Japan and EU. Especially on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, not only the political will but also the points of policy implementation have certain similar aspects.

In 2001 ‘An action plan for Japan-EU Cooperation’ has been released in the occasion of Japan EU Summit in Brussels. Among the item of arms Control, Disarmament and Non-proliferation<sup>27</sup>, both two parties have confirmed the necessity to launch an immediate initiative in the field of international disarmament and non-proliferation bodies. This action plan remarked the high priority on the extension of nuclear test moratorium and early entry into force of CTBT. Also, the importance of enhancing the implementation of Chemical Weapon Convention (CWC) and its universalization were mentioned. With regard to the negotiation of Biological Weapon Convention (BWC) verification related protocol,

---

<sup>26</sup> These dual-use guidelines were published as Part 2 of INFCIRC/254, and the original Guidelines published in 1978 became Part 1 of INFCIRC/254.

<http://www.nuclearsuppliersgroup.org/PDF/infirc254r6p1-030516.pdf> (accessed 28 June 2006)

<sup>27</sup> ‘An action plan for EU-Japan Cooperation, Arms Control and Disarmament initiatives to be launched immediately’. [http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/eu/kodo\\_k\\_e.html#1-2](http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/eu/kodo_k_e.html#1-2) (accessed 10 November 2006)

Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA)  
“EU and Japan: the emerging challenges for the middle of the decade 2000-2010”  
Brussels, 27-28 November 2006

importance of the joint effort has been acknowledged. At several occasions on the CD, diplomatic efforts were made for establishing the Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate FMCT. Through the efforts, necessity for enhancement of the IAEA safeguard and also for universalization of the safeguard AP has reached to the mutual agreement. Therefore, it is understood in general that Japan and EU policy of disarmament and non-proliferation pursuing more or less the same target.

On 22 June 2004, Japan-EU Joint Declaration on Disarmament and Non-proliferation was released<sup>28</sup>. Historically<sup>29</sup>, such declaration was an epoch-making outcome, for Japan-EU actually commits on the 2001 action plan and also the joint press statement in 2002 of disarmament and non-proliferation. Indeed, both two parties have reaffirmed the importance of continuing their strong commitment to the multilateral efforts for NPT, Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention (BTWC), CWC, CTBT, Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), Mine Ban Treaty (MBT), Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (HCOB) and IAEA. In this joint declaration, the most significant aspect that has been recognized by both two parties was that Japan and EU have reaffirmed to provide their assistance toward those international bodies engaged upon the verification and upholding of compliance with the treaties, protocols and any kind of agreements. With this regard, the joint declaration also inserts the ‘priority areas for specific cooperation’. Remarkable areas for mutual cooperation include nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, biological and chemical weapons, missiles, export control, conventional weapons, assistance to the country in need and issue for non-compliance with the obligations under the disarmament and non-proliferation treaties.

On 24 April, 2006 15<sup>th</sup> Japan-EU summit meeting took place in Tokyo<sup>30</sup>. At this summit, the head of Japan and EU reconfirmed the importance of the continuation of the execution of the 2004 Japan-EU Joint Declaration on Disarmament and Non-proliferation. They also confirmed the importance of maintaining the impartiality of NPT and CTBT. Moreover, making specific mention of the BWC review conference in 2006, Japan and EU confirmed the importance of mutual cooperation.

About the DPRK situation, Japan and EU requested to emphasize the importance of the resume of six party talks, and for DPRK to cooperate in a prompt implementation of the joint statement of 4<sup>th</sup> six party talks including the abandonment of all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear development plans. In the light of humanitarian aspect of the DPRK issue, EU confirmed all efforts for the solution of the abduction case<sup>31</sup>. That followed the event on 2 November 2006 where 32 states including Japan and EU submitted the draft resolution to the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) 3<sup>rd</sup> committee accusing the DPRK situation of abusing human rights.

Also, one of the maximum topics of the summit was a joint statement against the Iran’s nuclear problem. With this regard, Japan basically endorses the approach of EU-3, which is already supposed to represent

---

<sup>28</sup> ‘Japan-EU Joint Declaration on Disarmament and Non-proliferation’.

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/europe/eu/Summit/joint0406-2.pdf> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>29</sup> In advance of this declaration May 17 in 2004, Ambassador Yukiya Amano, director of the science division of the ministry of foreign affairs of Japan and Ms. Annalisa Giannella, the personal representative on weapons of mass destruction to EU high representative Javier Solana has held a council and promised to continue their close partnership in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.

<sup>30</sup> Joint press statement of 15th Japan-EU summit in Tokyo (24 April 2006).

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/europe/eu/summit/joint0604.html> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>31</sup> EU Presidency Statement – Human Rights in the DPRK.

[http://europa.eu-un.org/articles/en/article\\_5351\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu-un.org/articles/en/article_5351_en.htm) (accessed 10 November 2006)

U.S Department of State, DPRK Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2004 Released by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (February 28, 2005).

<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2004/41646.htm> (accessed 10 November 2006)

the EU position, and it seems that the joint statement has successfully demonstrated to the international community of Japan-EU close partnership.

Finally, it is also important to mention that the possibility of ‘region-to-region’ cooperation in the context of disarmament and non-proliferation. In fact, Japan attaches importance for the framework of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) and in May 2005, Japan hosted the 7th foreign ministers’ meeting in Kyoto<sup>32</sup> as the first ministerial conference after its enlargement of the ASEM. Then on 24 July 2005, ‘Political Declaration on Prevention of Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and their Means of Delivery’<sup>33</sup> was released as an outcome of the 5<sup>th</sup> ASEM foreign ministers meeting in Bali. Under this useful framework, foreign ministers exchanged views on the ‘region-to-region’ cooperation and discussed about how to further substantiate the partnership between Asian and European countries in the context of disarmament and non-proliferation.

## 6. Future Tasks

### (1) Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)

Japan extremely values CTBT of its early entry into force as a part of the NPT regime along with the IAEA Nuclear Safeguards. Japan sends foreign-minister level delegates to the ‘Conference Facilitating the Entry into Force of CTBT’ held every two years, and is carrying out a diplomatic effort to the outreach activity of CTBT through a multiple approach. For instance, Japan has granted major instruments for constructing the International Monitoring System (IMS) of CTBT to 17 countries. Every year since 1995, ten participants from various countries have been accepted to the global earthquake observation training (total 107 people have been accepted by fiscal year 2005). In addition, ‘CTBT Friends Foreign Minister Meeting’<sup>34</sup> started to maintain and to promote the momentum of CTBT entry into force by the proposal of Japan in 2003. In the ‘CTBT Friends Foreign Minister Meeting’ joined many countries including the nuclear weapon states namely UK, France and Russia. As a political opportunity to promote CTBT entry into force at such a chance, the meeting is expected to promote the deterrent on the nuclear test execution.

In CTBT, the IMS monitoring facilities will set up in 337 places around the world<sup>35</sup>. Accepting countries of the IMS monitoring facilities have to take charge of these operations. Actually, ten of those facilities are constructed within the territory of Japan. In preparation for the possibility that Japan would be elected a member of the Executive Council (EC) of CTBT from Asia, it is necessary to provide with a Japanese unique analysis (analysis and evaluation of a radionuclide and a continuous seismic wave form, etc.) that relates to the detection and verification of the nuclear explosion experiment. One of the most critical functions of the EC is On-Site Inspection (OSI)<sup>36</sup>. As for OSI that is the ‘challenge inspection’ in substance, the responsibility of the member states of the EC becomes extremely important, especially in the situation of judging the inspection result. Therefore, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as the national authority, made the Centre for Promotion of Disarmament and Non-Proliferation (CPDNP<sup>37</sup>) a

<sup>32</sup> The Seventh ASEM Foreign Ministers’ Meeting in Kyoto, Japan (May 2005).

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/asem/asem7/fm.html> (accessed 14 April 2006)

<sup>33</sup> The ASIA-EUROPE meeting, Political Declaration on Prevention of Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Their Means of Delivery.

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/asem/asem5/dec.html> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>34</sup> CTBT: Launch of Joint Ministerial Statement (Overview and Evaluation).

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/pfmv0209/ctbt-2.html> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>35</sup> CTBTO preparatory commission, An Overview of the Verification Regime, The International Monitoring System. <http://www.ctbto.org/verification/overview.html> (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>36</sup> CTBTO preparatory commission, An Overview of the Verification Regime, On-Site Inspection. <http://www.ctbto.org/verification/onsiteinspection.html> (accessed 22 May 2006)

<sup>37</sup> CPDNP makes efforts to enhance the NDCs’ capabilities and monitors their performance by

secretariat of ‘CTBT National Operation System of Japan’, consisting of National Data Centers (NDCs) under the cooperation of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology and the Japan Meteorological Agency.

Through the arguments, Japan takes particular note of promoting the early entry into force of the CTBT as subsidiary important part of the NPT regime. In this behalf, Japan also regards that building the effective method of verification is especially vital to the future CTBT. With regard to the CTBT verification system, its effective OSI mechanism as the last resort to the nuclear-test-ban will consequently be the key establishment to pursue.

## **(2) Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT)**

Japan has made a continuous effort to facilitate a substantial discussion on Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT) in Geneva. Especial contribution that stands out is the working document that has been submitted in Geneva Conference of Disarmament (CD) in 2003<sup>38</sup>. After the negotiation for CTBT had been ended, Japanese Government worried that the current state of the CD was not committed to the disarmament negotiation in shape. Since Japan evaluates FMCT as one of the top priority matters of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and the government expects the negotiation on FMCT to be promoted by submitting the working document to the CD. The working document advocates to: (i) identify the range of object of FMCT, (ii) examine the technical feasibility including the verification technique and (iii) identify the legal/political issue and technological problem. Verification mechanism of FMCT is also the matter to be discussed on the CD. This working document mentions the importance of the IAEA Nuclear Safeguards including the AP as a basis of future FMCT verification mechanism. And it also emphasize that the additional obligations will not be applied to the ratifiers of the IAEA Safeguards AP. It has also remarked the idea to introduce the verification related expert working group of CTBT and protracted experience, infrastructure and appropriate expertise of the IAEA Nuclear Safeguards to FMCT. Then it aims at the conclusion of FMCT negotiation within five years.

## **Concluding Remark**

On 27 October 2006, Japan submitted ‘Draft Resolution on Nuclear Disarmament’ to the First Committee of the UNGA was adopted by the large majority of 169 states, agreed opposite 3 (the U.S., India and the DPRK) and abstentions 8 (China, Iran, Israel, Egypt, Cuba, Pakistan, Bhutan and Myanmar). This addressed that the approach of Japan that has been continued since 1994 (Japan’s first proposition) has shown its effectiveness and been widely supported among the international community. This draft resolution includes such an important factor as the denunciation against the nuclear test conducted by the DPRK on 9 October and also stressed the significance to hold the first session of the preparatory committee in 2007 for the sake of facilitating the next NPT review conference in 2010.

In this draft resolution, Japan prepared a concise, powerful text based on the ‘Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons’, which has been also adopted by the large majority of 168 states in 2005, and emphasized the importance of compliance of NPT, early entry into force of CTBT and continuance of nuclear test moratorium, starting the negotiation of FMCT and coming to an

---

conducting simulation tests on their infrastructure. Furthermore, CPDNP supports human resource development for NDCs and addresses the other activities such as those related to on-site inspection, a component of the CTBT verification regime, that shall be required in the future CTBT National Operation System. [http://www.ijnet.or.jp/JIIA-CPDNP/English/e\\_disarm.htm](http://www.ijnet.or.jp/JIIA-CPDNP/English/e_disarm.htm) (accessed 10 November 2006)

<sup>38</sup> Working paper on a Treaty to Ban the production of Fissile Material for Nuclear Weapons and other Nuclear Explosive Devices submitted by Japan on 14 August 2003. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/political/cd/speeches03/FMCTwp.pdf> (accessed 10 November 2006)

Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA)  
“EU and Japan: the emerging challenges for the middle of the decade 2000-2010”  
Brussels, 27-28 November 2006

agreement at the early stage.

In the last few years, number of nuclear states has dramatically increased. In this context, it could be said that the NPT regime is really facing a crisis. Next several years, international community should tackle with the prevention of nuclear weapons with renewed commitments. Those willing nations of international community including Japan, who find value in sustaining the NPT regime, together have to make efforts to present new values of the regime to overcome the regime's current deficit of being double standard.