

Background for President Obama's Nuclear Policy

Mitsuru Kurosawa

オバマ大統領の核政策の背景

黒 澤 満

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to examine the background of President Obama's nuclear policy, by making clear four background points for a new trend toward nuclear disarmament. After introducing the contents of the Prague address by the President, I will critically examine President Bush's nuclear policy, and then discuss international circumstances surrounding nuclear weapons. I study the arguments for a world without nuclear weapons by the Hoover plan, and take up President Obama's personal ideas and preferences. In conclusion, I will argue that these four background points worked side by side each other, and worked synergistically to fabricate Obama's final nuclear policy.

Key words: President Obama, nuclear policy, a world free of nuclear weapons, nuclear disarmament, nuclear terrorism

(Received September 30, 2009)

抄 録

本稿の目的は新たな核軍縮への流れを生み出した4つの背景を明確にすることにより、オバマ大統領の核政策の背景を検討することである。大統領のプラハ演説の内容を紹介した後、ブッシュ大統領の核政策を批判的に検討し、核兵器を取り巻く国際環境を考察する。さらにフーバー・プランによる核のない世界の議論を研究し、オバマ大統領の個人的な考えや好みを議論する。結論として、これらの4つの背景がお互いに影響しあい、オバマの最終的な核政策を形成するのに相乗的に効果をもったと結論する。

キーワード：オバマ大統領、核政策、核のない世界、核軍縮、核テロ

(2009年9月30日受理)

Introduction

During the last several months, a trend toward nuclear disarmament and a world free of nuclear weapons has appeared and its momentum has been increasing, mainly because of the address by U.S. President Barak Obama on April 5, 2009 in Prague, Czech Republic. After a decade-long inaction on nuclear disarmament by the international community, the trend is warmly welcomed by many people around the world.

This is a very rare occasion that a U.S. President proposes a significantly ambitious nuclear disarmament proposal. Behind the trend are, what I call, many background points. This phenomenon seems to be a result of synergetic effect of these background points.

The purpose of this paper is to examine these background points of this new trend. Why does this trend come out at this time? First, I will briefly introduce the contents of the Prague address by the President. Then in order to answer the question of why the last decade kept ignoring nuclear disarmament, I will critically examine President Bush's nuclear policy. Third, I will discuss international circumstances surrounding nuclear weapons in order to make clear the danger of the current nuclear situation. Fourth, as one of the most influential proponents of a world free of nuclear weapons, I will study the arguments of the Hoover plan. Fifth, I take up President Obama's personal ideas and preferences, before I come to a conclusion.

President Obama's Address in Prague on April 5, 2009¹

President Obama, talking on the future of nuclear weapons in the 21st century, first of all emphasized that "the Cold War has disappeared...but the risk of nuclear attack has gone up." He stated "as a nuclear power – as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon – the United States has a moral responsibility to act." This is the first time for a President of the U.S. to recognize its moral responsibility while other Presidents have justified its nuclear use as necessary to save the lives of young Americans. He stated clearly and with conviction America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons.

Nuclear Disarmament

Proclaiming that the U.S. will take concrete steps toward a world without nuclear weapons, he first emphasizes the U.S. would reduce the role of nuclear weapons in its national security strategy and urges others to do the same, in order to put an end to Cold War thinking. At the same time, he cautions that "as long as these weapons exist, we will maintain a safe, secure and effective arsenal to deter adversary." The following three measures are mentioned as concrete steps:

- (1) To reduce our warheads and stockpiles, we will negotiate a new strategic arms

reduction treaty with Russia this year.

- (2) To achieve a global ban on nuclear testing, my Administration will immediately and aggressively pursue U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- (3) To cut off the building blocks needed for a bomb, the United States will seek a treaty that verifiably ends the production of fissile materials intended for use in state nuclear weapons.

Nuclear Non-Proliferation

Reaffirming that the basic bargain of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) - nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy - is sound, he suggests the following principles to strengthen the Treaty.

- (1) We need more resources and authority to strengthen international inspections.
- (2) We need real and immediate consequences for countries caught breaking the rules or trying to leave the Treaty without cause.
- (3) We should build a new framework for civil nuclear cooperation including an international fuel bank.
- (4) North Korea must know that the path to security and respect will never come through threats and illegal weapons.
- (5) My Administration will seek engagement with Iran based upon mutual interests and mutual respects.

Measures against Nuclear Terrorism

Emphasizing the importance to ensure that terrorists never acquire nuclear weapons, as this is the most immediate and extreme threat to global security, he recommends the following measures:

- (1) I am announcing a new international effort to secure all vulnerable nuclear materials around the world within four years.
- (2) We must build on our efforts to break up black markets, detect and intercept material in transit, and use financial tools to disrupt this dangerous trade.
- (3) We should come together to turn efforts such as the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism into durable international institutions.
- (4) We should start by having a Global Summit on Nuclear Security that the United States will host within the next year.

Evaluation

Generally speaking, the speech at Prague has been highly evaluated all over the world,

only with a few skeptical comments concerning its practicability. For example, AFP writes “US President Barack Obama’s call for a nuclear-free world builds on solidifying support at home and abroad amid what experts fear is the rising risk of an atomic weapons attack².”

The Guardian, referring to two speeches in Strasbourg and Prague, carried the headline “The 52 minutes of Obama magic that changed the nuclear rules: Two presidential speeches in two days signal end of cold war strategic thinking.³”

The Japanese Government also supports President Obama’s call for a world without nuclear weapons⁴. In Japan, the speech has been widely and favorably welcomed as a new restart toward a world without nuclear weapons.

The Prague address includes both a strong message toward a goal of a world without nuclear weapons as well as practical measures for the goal in the fields of nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

In parallel with the message, as a first step toward the goal, Presidents Obama and Medvedev on April 1, 2009 agreed to reduce their strategic nuclear weapons by drafting a new treaty by the end of this year.

As a result, the speech has been highly appreciated by many people around the world.

President Bush’s Nuclear Policy

General Characteristics

President George W. Bush’s foreign policy in the early stage was characterized as unilateralism as the U.S. generally behaved unilaterally with no concern over the interest of the international community as a whole, but based on its national interest strictly defined and nearsighted. This tendency clearly appeared in the following two areas.

First, demanding the free space to carry out its actions or the maintenance of the flexibility of its actions, the Bush Administration disregarded international institutions such as international law or the United Nations. It declared the breakaway from the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change and the opposition to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

In the field of arms control and disarmament, the U.S. impeded the efforts to elaborate a verification protocol for the Biological Weapons Convention, opposed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty⁵. President Bush preferred a coalition of the willing that consists of U.S. followers to a true multilateralism such as based on the decision by the United Nations.

Second, the Bush Administration emphasized more its military strength than international cooperation as a tool for a war against terrorism. It also emphasized non-proliferation and counter-proliferation because of an extremely strong U.S. military power compared with other

states such as Russia and China.

The report on National Security Strategy of the United States of America in September 2002 supported a preventive attack by stating "The greater the threat, the greater is the risk of inaction – and the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack."⁶ This so-called Bush Doctrine means that the U.S. is prepared to attack a country if there is a possibility the country will attack the U.S. even if the time and place of a future attack is uncertain.

This doctrine permits the use of force far beyond one that is permitted under the Charter of the United Nations which restricts the use of force as the right of self-defense in the case of actual or immediate threat. Later, in 2003, the U.S. attacked Iraq based on this doctrine.

Ignorance or Exclusion of Nuclear Disarmament

One of the most significant features of the Bush Administration was its ignorance or exclusion of nuclear disarmament and disarmament in general.

First, at G8 Summit meetings, in spite of the fact that since the early 1990s reference to nuclear arms reduction, CTBT, FMCT (Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty), START (Strategic Nuclear Reduction Treaty) had appeared in the political statements or Chairman's statements, after the advent of the Bush Administration, there was no mention of nuclear disarmament, CTBT, FMCT, or strategic nuclear reduction because of a strong demand by the U.S. to delete these words from statements.

Second, in the NPT review process, the conference in 1995 adopted the decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament" and the 2000 conference agreed on the final document. These documents include several recommendations for nuclear disarmament.

However, the Bush Administration ignored or denied the content of all these documents, and demanded that we should concentrate our efforts only upon nuclear non-proliferation. That is the main reason why the 2005 NPT Review Conference failed, showing only a deep gulf between the U.S. and Non-Aligned States.

Indeed, the U.S. signed the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (Moscow Treaty) with Russia in May 2002 that demands for each to reduce their aggregate number of strategic nuclear warheads to 1700-2200 by December 31, 2012. But the content of the Treaty is just the same as what President Bush stated as a unilateral action. Furthermore, the Treaty lacks essential elements of a nuclear disarmament treaty such as verifiability, transparency, irreversibility, predictability and permanency.

Nuclear Non-proliferation and Counter-proliferation

For the Bush Administration, the greatest threat to the U.S. was the possession of weapons

of mass destruction by terrorists and rogue states, among which North Korea, Iran and Iraq were nominated as an axis of evil. As a result, his nuclear policy was mainly concentrated on nuclear non-proliferation and counter-proliferation.

A few non-proliferation measures initiated by President Bush have been widely accepted and working effectively such as the Global Partnership to secure nuclear weapons and materials of former Soviet Union, UN Security Council resolution 1540 which demands all states adopt and enforce laws to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, and the Proliferation Security Initiative which tries to inspect and interdict illegal transfers of weapons of mass destruction.

However, the Bush Administration rather strongly supported and developed the measures for counter-proliferation by military means both offensively and defensively. As an offensive measure, President Bush tried to develop nuclear bunker busters to destroy a leadership or weapons deep underground. On the defensive side, he withdrew from the ABM Treaty which restricted the deployment of national missile defense systems, and developed and deployed missile defense systems in California and Alaska.

Criticism

Joseph Cirincione, in an article states “Nearly every proliferation problem President George W. Bush inherited has grown worse with his stewardship,” and lists the following 10 key failures of the administration’s policy against proliferation in addition to the massive failure in Iraq⁷.

- (1) The danger of nuclear terrorism has increased.
- (2) Iran’s nuclear program accelerated.
- (3) North Korea detonated a nuclear bomb and expanded its weapons program.
- (4) Nuclear technology useable for weapons’ programs proliferated around the world.
- (5) Thousands of Cold War nuclear weapons remain poised for attack.
- (6) The currency of nuclear weapons increased in value.
- (7) The nonproliferation regime moved closer to catastrophic collapse.
- (8) The U.S.-India deal blew a hole through the barriers to the spread of nuclear weapons.
- (9) Nuclear smuggling networks remained active.
- (10) Anti-missile programs failed to fulfill their promise.

A New York Times editorial⁸ in 2009 criticizes Bush’s policy as they tore up the 1972 antiballistic missile treaty, opposed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and never made a serious effort to win a ban on the production of fissile material. While Mr. Bush and his team were ridiculing treaties and arms control negotiations as “old think,” North Korea tested a nuclear device, Iran has been working overtime to produce nuclear fuel and many other countries are weighing whether they need to get into the nuclear game.

The editorial argues that President Obama must do better, starting by restoring the rules of the game through treaties and a rules-based system.

The Bush administration which was eager to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime was paradoxically unsuccessful because it could not get support from a vast majority of states, as it neglected the importance of nuclear disarmament as a tool to indirectly strengthen non-proliferation. That is the main reason why the 2005 NPT review conference failed to get any agreement to strengthen non-proliferation.

What was needed was the shift or change from unilateralism to true multilateralism, from the rule of power to the rule of law, and from national interest of the U.S. to international interest.

International Circumstances Surrounding Nuclear Weapons

In the current international society, many politicians, government officials and experts perceive that the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons is increasing although the nuclear exchange between the two superpowers faded with the end of the Cold War.

Nuclear Terrorism

Since the 9.11 terrorist attacks on the U.S. homeland, the fear of nuclear terrorism has been increasing among politicians, government officials and experts, in particular in the United States. For American national security, the greatest threat has been the possession of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists. The threat is increasing because terrorists are now becoming more violent and materials for nuclear weapons are now more available.

The most serious issue concerning terrorism is the fear that terrorists will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons if they get them. They have no return address to which a retaliatory nuclear attack by a victim state could be sent. In addition, they are not afraid of suicide bombings. Nuclear deterrence which is believed to have prevented the use of nuclear weapons among nuclear-weapon states will not work against terrorists.

Non-Nuclear-Weapon States

Although non-nuclear-weapon-states promise not to produce or acquire nuclear weapons, there is a new tendency among them to use nuclear energy widely for energy security including uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing in the age of protecting the environment. As these technologies are directly connected with producing nuclear weapons, the risk of proliferation of nuclear weapons is and will be increasing.

In addition, the widespread uses of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing imply that the chance for terrorists to get fissile material will increase substantially.

New Nuclear-Weapon States

There are some concerns with the situation between India and Pakistan. Does mutual deterrence work between them? Could there be any misuse of nuclear weapons by miscalculation or miscommunication? Is nuclear security in Pakistan sufficient? Is there any possibility that Pakistani nuclear weapons will be given to or stolen by terrorists?

Israeli nuclear weapons, the existence of which has not formally been recognized by Israel, causes surrounding Islam states anxiety which may eventually force them to acquire nuclear weapons, just as Iran seems to be now trying to do. North Korea is also a concern due to its possible irrational acts.

Nuclear-Weapon States

About half of the nuclear weapons deployed by the U.S. and Russia are in a hair-trigger alert status that means they can be launched in a minute. This situation is very dangerous as nuclear weapons could be launched as a result of miscalculation, misunderstanding or misjudgment. This strategy is criticized because we are not in the Cold War anymore.

There is more concern of misuse of tactical weapons by misjudgment. In addition, as their security is laxer compared with strategic weapons, they are vulnerable to be stolen or seized by terrorists. Furthermore, under the Bush Administration, the preventive use of nuclear weapons was intended, further promoting the use of nuclear weapons.

Assessment

It is generally believed that no nuclear war occurred during the Cold War era between the two superpowers because the theory of the mutual assured destruction effectively worked, although it is impossible to proof it. It is also claimed that the long peace during the Cold War era was possible because of the existence of nuclear weapons.

After the end of the Cold War, the main threat to the United States has been perceived as the possession of weapons of mass destruction by rogue states such as Iraq, North Korea, Iran and others. After the 9.11 terrorist attacks, the object of the threat shifted to terrorists.

As President Obama emphasized in Prague, "Today, the Cold War has disappeared but thousands of those weapons have not. In a strange turn of history, the threat of global nuclear war has gone down, but the risk of nuclear attack has gone up. More nations have acquired these weapons."⁹

Hoover Plan and Its Follow-ups

From 2007, numerous important proposals and meetings have been help to examine a

world free of nuclear weapons. The first one greatly influenced subsequent meetings.

“A World Free of Nuclear Weapons” in January 2007

An op-ed “A World Free of Nuclear Weapons” by George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn, the first and original Hoover plan, was published in The Wall Street Journal on January 4, 2007¹⁰. They endorsed setting the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and working energetically on the actions required to achieve that goal.

This proposal was warmly and seriously accepted because not only did it take account of the new phenomena in the 21st century, but also the authors are from both the Democratic and the Republican parties and are not peace activists or researchers but strong supporters for nuclear deterrence during the Cold War and the architects of U.S. nuclear policy.

The authors argue that a major effort should be launched by the United States to 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. In order to achieve the goal, the authors list eight measures as groundwork for it, including de-alerting, the reduction of nuclear weapons, the elimination of short-range nuclear weapons, the ratification of the CTBT, and halting the production of fissile material for weapons.

“Reykjavik Revisited” in October 2007

In October 2007, a conference “Reykjavik Revisited: Steps Toward a World Free of Nuclear Weapons” was held at Hoover Institution, Stanford University to discuss practical steps required to address the nuclear threat and to move toward the goal established by then Presidents Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev at their historic 1986 meeting in Reykjavik¹¹.

With many former high-ranking U.S. officials and experts on nuclear issues participating, they discussed further reducing nuclear forces, de-alerting strategic forces, eliminating short-range nuclear weapons, preventing the spread of enrichment and reprocessing, controlling fissile material worldwide, securing nuclear stockpiles worldwide and other concerns.

“Toward a Nuclear-Free World” in January 2008

One year later, on January 15, 2008, the four wise men again wrote an op-ed “Toward a Nuclear-Free World” to The Wall Street Journal¹², the second and additional Hoover plan, appealing for the continuity of the project and emphasizing the wide-spread support for their argument, listing the name of supporters from former high-ranking U.S. officials, which includes more than two-thirds of the living former secretaries of state and defense and national security advisors in the last nine administrations.

This paper, in particular, recommends short-term steps that the U.S. and Russia could take, beginning in 2008, to dramatically reduce nuclear dangers. It includes extending key

provisions of START of 1991, taking steps to increase the warning and decision times for the launch of nuclear missiles, and discarding any existing operational plans for massive attacks.

“Achieving the Vision of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons” in February 2008

The Norwegian government sponsored an international conference on nuclear disarmament titled “Achieving the Vision of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons” in February 2008, in Oslo, Norway. This conference aimed at deepening and widening the understanding of the original project, by inviting many experts from all over the world.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Norway, Mr. Jonas Støre submitted his summery and preliminary recommendations¹³, in which he offered five principles for progress in this global effort and ten conclusions based on the principles. The five principles include leadership at the highest level, taking concrete measures, a joint enterprise among all states, non-discrimination and transparency.

Appraisal

In the last few years a number of private groups and governments have offered proposals for moving toward nuclear disarmament including Global Zero, Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, and International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament¹⁴.

However, the Hoover Plan has been the most influential and widely accepted proposal, and importantly, it has influenced the policy of President Obama for several reasons. The authors are all Americans, famous as prominent former secretaries of defense and state and senator. Two of them are Democrats and other two are Republicans. They were strong supporters for nuclear deterrence during the Cold War and recently radically changed their attitudes toward nuclear weapons. They have opportunities to talk directly with President Obama. Timing was vital as the presidential campaign had just started. The plan is easy to understand. It includes both the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons and practical measures toward it. As the Hoover Plan embraces these important characteristics, the plan has been accepted by Obama and later in the Democrats' Platform.

Obama's Personal Ideas and Preferences

Obama's own life experiences have helped shape his views, also. These ideas have developed since his days as a student at Columbia University.

Columbia Student

In 1983 when the Cold War was at its peak and many demonstrators were crying for

nuclear freeze, Barak Obama, a senior at Columbia University, wrote an article "Breaking the War Mentality" in *Sundial*, a college magazine¹⁵. He critically wrote that "Generally, the narrow focus of the Freeze movement as well as academic discussions of first versus second strike capabilities, suit the military-industrial interests," and in conclusion, he denounced "the twisted logic of which we are a part today" and praised students' efforts to realize "the possibility of a decent world."

During the same time, Obama wrote a seminar paper about how to negotiate with the Soviets to cut nuclear arsenals, having as a central question: How would the United States and the Soviet Union effectively manage these nuclear arsenals, and were there ways to dial down the dangers that humanity faced¹⁶?

Senator

Mr. Obama became a senator in January 2005 and found a mentor in Senator Richard Lugar, then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Later that year, he asked to accompany Senator Lugar on a trip to monitor Russian efforts to scrap nuclear arms and secure atomic materials from theft or diversion¹⁷.

With Senator Lugar, he passed a law that helps the United States and our allies to detect and stop the smuggling of weapons of mass destruction throughout the world. His main concern with nuclear weapons at this time seemed to be about nuclear security.

Presidential Campaign

Mr. Obama's first comprehensive policy statement for the presidential campaign appeared in the July/August 2007 issue of the *Foreign Affairs*¹⁸. He stated that "we must confront 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."

According to the policy statement, first, he will work to secure, destroy, and stop the spread of these weapons and lead a global effort to secure all nuclear weapons and material. Second, he will work with Russia to update and scale back our dangerously outdated Cold War nuclear postures and de-emphasize the role of nuclear weapons. In addition, he talks about CTBT ratification, FMCT negotiation and some control of peaceful nuclear utilization.

What is remarkable in this paper is that there was no reference to "a world free of nuclear weapons", although he recognized the op-ed article of January 2007, stating "As George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn have warned, our current measures are not sufficient to meet the nuclear threat."

At this time, Mr. Obama's main interest was in nuclear security, emphasizing "America must lead a global effort to secure all nuclear weapons and materials at vulnerable sites within four

years.”

It was on October 2, 2007 that Mr. Obama for the first time clearly supported the concept of “a world free of nuclear weapons.”¹⁹ He said “Here’s what I’ll say as President: America seeks a world in which there are no nuclear weapons,” not as a dreamer or idealist but as a realist, stating “We will not pursue unilateral disarmament. As long as nuclear weapons exist, we’ll retain a strong nuclear deterrent.” In this speech, he recognized that we needed to do much more beyond working hard for nuclear security. On this occasion, the strong influence of the Hoover proposal is present.

In Berlin, Germany on July 24, 2008, Mr. Obama addressed an audience of 200 thousand saying “This is the moment when we must renew the goal of a world without nuclear weapons.”²⁰

Finally, the idea of a world free of nuclear weapons was accepted as the basic policy of the Democrats at the National Convention in August 2008. They adopted a platform that included “America will seek a world with no nuclear weapons and take concrete actions to move in this direction.”²¹

Analysis

It seems that Obama, since his college age, has been very interested in the issue of international peace and security, having an idealistic and future-oriented point of view. As a senator he was mainly concerned with nuclear security as he visited Russia and passed a law on nuclear security.

During his presidential campaign his first concern had been with nuclear security as well as nuclear reduction, CTBT and FMCT. However, he was profoundly and decisively affected by the Hoover Plan and strongly advocates a world free of nuclear weapons. If the Hoover Plan had not existed, Obama might not have advocated a world free of nuclear weapons. Then there would have been no goal of a world free of nuclear weapons in the Prague remarks by President Obama.

Conclusion

William Walker, analyzing this issue in 2009 from a little different perspective from my analysis, finds the following four reasons for nuclear disarmament’s comeback in the U.S.²². The first is the return of a mood of anxiety about future chaos and catastrophe, and the second is a shift of view about strategic advantage to get rid of nuclear weapons from rogue states. The third reason is the desire to reinvigorate the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and other institutions of arms control, and the fourth draws on a U.S. tradition of political idealism.

George Perkovich and James M. Acton, analyzing this issue in 2008 from another aspect,

find the following five reasons why the objective should be taken more seriously than it has been in the past.²³

- (1) By bringing the NPT into force, the nuclear-weapons states were promising eventually to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.
- (2) The expansion of nuclear energy will threaten security if it is not paired with the universal adoption of tougher verification and inspection protocols and other instruments.
- (3) Preventing nuclear terrorism is another major reason to pursue the measures necessary to securely and verifiably eliminate nuclear arsenals and enforceably bar proliferation.
- (4) The failure of the nuclear-armed states to eliminate their nuclear arsenals is likely to tempt others to seek their own such weapons in coming decades.
- (5) The ultimate reason for trying to eliminate nuclear arsenals is to reduce the danger of sudden mass annihilation that nuclear weapons are uniquely capable of producing.

These authors analyze the reasons why the U.S. has reconsidered nuclear disarmament or why nuclear disarmament should be taken more seriously. These analyses have some common aspects with my analysis. However, my focus is on why this trend for nuclear disarmament comes out at this time. In other words, my analysis focuses on “what are the background points for this new trend?”

There are four background points based on which the new trend for nuclear disarmament has come out at this time. The first is Bush's nuclear policy. This is a very important background point which we have to oppose and criticize. We have to make a new nuclear policy that overcomes the Bush policy.

Secondly, the international circumstances surrounding nuclear weapons have become extremely dangerous with the chance of the use of nuclear weapons increasing. This is a background within which we have to create a new international nuclear order in order to prevent, restrict and eliminate the use of nuclear weapons.

Thirdly, the Hoover Plan was submitted as a uniquely bold and pragmatic plan for nuclear disarmament. This is a critically important background point based on which “a world free of nuclear weapons” was widely and warmly accepted, culminating in the policy of the United States.

Fourthly, Obama's personal ideas and preferences have played a key role. This is a background point on which the whole structure for nuclear disarmament has been created.

These four background points worked side by side with each other, and worked synergistically to fabricate Obama's final nuclear policy. Lacking any one background point would have inhibited the success in formulating the final nuclear policy.

In the long history since the advent of nuclear weapons in 1945, now is the unique and

best opportunity to proceed with nuclear disarmament according to Obama's nuclear policy. As the opportune moment will not last long, we must make every effort to cooperatively take concrete measures, such as the reduction of nuclear weapons, the ratification of the CTBT, the negotiation of the FMCT and others, setting the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.

- ¹ The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Remarks by President Barak Obama," Prague, Czech Republic, April 5, 2009. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered/>
- ² AFP "Obama's Nuke-Free Call Taps Global Momentum," *Morning Express*. <<http://www.morningexpress.com/international/20030.html>>
- ³ Ian Traynor, "The 52 minutes of Obama magic that changed the nuclear rules: Two presidential speeches in two days signal end of cold war strategic thinking," *The Guardian*, 6 April 2009. <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/apr/06/obama-nuclear-weapons-speeches>>
- ⁴ VOA News, "Japan Backs Obama's Call for Nuclear Weapons-Free World," 06 April 2009. <<http://www.voanews.com/english/2009-05-06-voa30.cfm>>
- ⁵ Nicole Deller, Arjun Makhijani, and John Burroughs (eds.) *Rule of Power or Rule of Law?* Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, 2003.
- ⁶ The White House, *The National Security Policy of the United States of America*, September 2002. <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>>
- ⁷ Joseph Cirincione, "Strategic Collapse: The Failure of the Bush Nuclear Doctrine," *Arms Control Today*, Vol.38, No.9, November 2008, pp.20-26.
- ⁸ "Rules of the Game," Editorial, *New York Times*, January 29, 2009. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/30/opinion/30fri1.htm?_r=1>
- ⁹ op. cit., note 1.
- ¹⁰ George P. Schultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn, "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2007. <http://www.fcnl.org/issues/item.php?item_id=2252&issue_id=54>
- ¹¹ The Conference Paper, *Reykjavik Revisited: Steps Towards A World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, October 2007. <<http://www.hoover.org/publications/books/online/15766737.html>>
- ¹² George P. Schultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn, "Toward a Nuclear-Free World," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 15, 2008. <http://www.nti.org/c_press/TOWARD_A_NUCLEAR_FREE?WORLD_OPED_011508.pdf>
- ¹³ Jonas Gahr Støre, *Minister's Summary and Preliminary Recommendations: A Global Effort to Achieve a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*. <http://disarmament.nrpa.no/data/docs/chairs_written_summary.pdf>
- ¹⁴ See Randy Rydell, "The Future of Nuclear Arms: A World United and Divided by Zero," *Arms Control Today*, Vol.39, No.3, April 2009, pp.21-25.
- ¹⁵ Barack Obama, "Breaking the War Mentality," *Sundial*, March 10, 1983. pp.2-4. in Obama's 1983 College Magazine Article – The New York times. <<http://documents.nytimes.com/obama-s-1983-college-magazine-article?scp=4&sq=college%20article%20Obama&st=cse#p=1>>
- ¹⁶ William J. Broad and David E. Sanger, "Obama's Youth Shaped His Nuclear-Free Vision," *New York Times*,

July 4, 2009. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/05/world/05nuclear.html?_r2&bl&ex=1246939200&en=9c6e7530c1a524cf&ei=5087%0A>

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Barack Obama, "Renewing American Leadership," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.86, No.4, July/August 2007, pp.2-16.

¹⁹ "Remarks of Senator Barack Obama: A New Beginning," Speech given in Chicago, Ill., on October 02, 2007. <http://www.clw.org/elections/2008/presidential/obama_remarks_a_new_beginning/>

²⁰ Obama Press Release: Remarks of Senator Obama (Berlin, Germany), July 24, 2008. <<http://2008Central.net/2008/07/24/obama-press-release-remarks-of-senator-barack-obama-berlingermany>>

²¹ Report of the Platform Committee, Renewing America's Promise: Presented to the 2008 Democratic National Convention, August 13, 2008. <<http://www.politicalfact.com/media/files/demplatform2008.pdf>>

²² William Walker, "President-elect Obama and Nuclear Disarmament: Between Elimination and Restraint," IFRI Security Studies Center, Proliferation Paper, Winter 2009, pp.1-30. <http://www.ifri.org/securite_defense/walker_obama_nuclear_disarmament.pdf>

²³ George Perkovic and James M. Acton, *Abolishing Nuclear Weapons*, Adelphi Paper 396, 2008, pp.109-110.

