

# Three Approaches toward a Nuclear-Free World

Mitsuru Kurosawa

## 核兵器のない世界に向けての三つのアプローチ

黒 澤 満

### Abstract

Since President Obama's speech for a world without nuclear weapons in April 2009, arguments on how to get there have become popular among many experts. Recent arguments toward a nuclear-free world can be divided into three: first, a nuclear weapons convention, second, humanitarian nuclear disarmament and third, delegitimizing nuclear weapons. The purpose of this paper is to examine these three approaches toward a nuclear-free world by precisely surveying the historical background and the contents of each approach, to contend that these three approaches have their own merits and to recommend pursuing these three approaches simultaneously as they are interdependent and have synergistic effects.

**Key words:** a world without nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons convention,  
humanitarian nuclear disarmament, delegitimizing nuclear weapons

(Received September 25, 2012)

### 抄 録

2009年4月のオバマ大統領の核兵器のない世界に向けた演説以来、そこにどのように到達するが広く議論されている。核兵器のない世界に向けての最近の議論は以下の三つに分けることができる。第一は核兵器禁止条約、第二は人道的核軍縮、第三は核兵器の非正当化である。本稿の目的は、それぞれのアプローチの歴史的背景およびその内容を詳細に検討することであり、それぞれのアプローチが独自のメリットを有していると結論し、それらは相互依存関係にあるので相乗的効果をもつように同時に三つの方法を追求することを勧告する。

**キーワード:** 核兵器のない世界、核兵器禁止条約、人道的核軍縮、核兵器の非正当化

(2012年9月25日受理)

## **Introduction**

On April 5, 2009 in Prague, the Czech Republic, United States President Barak Obama clearly and with conviction stated America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons, and proclaimed that "the U.S will take concrete steps toward a world without nuclear weapons"<sup>1</sup>. Even before that, on January 4, 2007, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn advocated to set the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and work energetically on the actions required to achieve that goal<sup>2</sup>.

At the 2010 NPT review conference, the Foreign Minister of Switzerland denied the value of nuclear weapons comprehensively, saying "nuclear weapons have no use, they are immoral and illegal"<sup>3</sup>.

Recent arguments toward a nuclear-free world can be divided into three: first, a nuclear weapons convention, second, humanitarian nuclear disarmament and third, delegitimizing nuclear weapons.

## **A Nuclear Weapons Convention**

### ***Historical Background***

The advisory opinion by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons given on July 8, 1996 stated unanimously that "F. There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control"<sup>4</sup>.

The interpretation of Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) by the ICJ goes beyond that of a mere conduct, and involves an obligation to achieve a precise result – nuclear disarmament in all its aspects – by adopting a particular course of conduct, namely, the pursuit of negotiations on the matter in good faith<sup>5</sup>.

Based on this opinion, each year since 1996, the UN General Assembly has passed a resolution calling upon all states immediately to fulfill that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination<sup>6</sup>. However, there have been no negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention so far.

In April 1997, a group of lawyers, scientists, physicians, former-diplomats and disarmament specialists drafted a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention. This draft was submitted by Costa Rica to the United Nations as a discussion document<sup>7</sup>. Ten years later, in 2007, a revised version of a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention was drafted by the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons and submitted to the Preparatory

Committee meeting of the NPT review conference by Costa Rica<sup>8</sup> and to the United Nations General Assembly by Costa Rica and Malaysia<sup>9</sup>.

### ***Recent Arguments***

On October 24, 2008, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon addressed the East-West Institute at UN Headquarters in New York with a speech entitled "The United Nations and security in a nuclear-weapon-free world". In his speech the Secretary-General proposed a five point plan for nuclear disarmament and urged "all NPT parties, in particular the nuclear-weapon states, to fulfill their obligations under the treaty to undertake negotiations on effective measures leading to nuclear disarmament. They could pursue this goal by agreement on a framework of separate, mutually reinforcing instruments. Or they could consider negotiating a nuclear weapons convention, backed by a strong system of verification, as has long been proposed at the United Nations. Upon the request of Costa Rica and Malaysia, I have circulated to all UN member states a draft of such a convention, which offers a good point of departure"<sup>10</sup>.

The updated Model Nuclear Weapons Convention<sup>11</sup>, which was recommended as a good point of departure by the UN Secretary-General, prohibits development, testing, production, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons and states possessing nuclear weapons will be required to destroy their arsenals according to a series of phases. The convention also prohibits the production of weapon-usable fissile material and requires delivery vehicles to be destroyed.

The convention outlines a series of five phases for the elimination of nuclear weapons: 1) taking nuclear weapons off alert, 2) removing weapons from deployment, 3) removing nuclear warheads from their delivery vehicles, 4) disabling the warheads, removing and disfiguring the pits, and 5) placing the fissile material under international control.

Verification will include declarations and reports from states, routine inspection, challenge (surprise) inspection, on-site inspection, satellite photography, radionuclide sampling and other remote sensor monitoring, information sharing with other organizations and citizen reporting. An international monitoring system will be established under the convention.

An agency would be established to implement the convention, which will be responsible for verification, ensuring compliance and decision making and will comprise a Conference of States Parties, an Executive Council and a Technical Secretariat.

As another initiative, the Global Zero Commission, a group of political and military leaders from the U.S., Russia and other key countries submitted Global Zero Action Plan on June 29, 2009, outlining a four-phased process to achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons as follows<sup>12</sup>.

Phase 1 (2010-2013): negotiate a bilateral accord for the U.S. and Russia to reduce to 1,000

total warheads each, and prepare for multilateral negotiations.

Phase 2 (2014-2018): the U.S. and Russia reach agreement to reduce to 500 total warheads each while all other nuclear weapons countries agree to freeze their stockpiles until 2018, followed by proportional reduction until 2021.

Phase 3 (2019-2023): negotiate a global zero accord, which includes a schedule for the phased, verified, proportionate reduction of all nuclear arsenals to zero total warheads by 2030.

Phase 4 (2024-2030): complete the phased, verified, proportionate reduction of all nuclear arsenals to zero total warheads by 2030.

Furthermore, Mayors for Peace, which includes more than 5,000 cities in more than 150 countries, has been conducting the 2020 Vision Campaign since 2004. The objectives of the vision are 1) immediately de-alert all nuclear weapons, 2) immediately start substantive negotiations toward a universal nuclear weapons convention, 3) conclude a nuclear weapons convention by 2015, and 4) physically destruct all nuclear weapons by 2020<sup>13</sup>.

### ***2010 NPT Review Conference and Thereafter***

The issue of a nuclear weapons convention was one of the focal points of the discussions at the 2010 NPT review conference, as the pursuit for a world without nuclear weapons was popular and Ban Ki-moon's speech on a nuclear weapons convention was timely.

The Non-aligned Movement (NAM) states demanded "to agree on an action plan on nuclear disarmament which includes concrete steps for the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time including a nuclear weapons convention, without delay,<sup>14</sup>" and submitted "Elements for a Plan of Action for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons<sup>15</sup>" which provides for a three-phased plan to eliminate nuclear weapons by 2025.

The nuclear-weapon states, except for China, generally opposed the idea, with the U.S. stating, "The United States does not share that view. A Nuclear Weapons Convention is not achievable in the near term and therefore is not a realistic alternative to the step-to-step approach we are taking,<sup>16</sup>"

The final document states that "The Conference calls on all nuclear-weapon states to undertake concrete disarmament efforts and affirms that all states need to make special efforts to establish the necessary framework to achieve and maintain a world without nuclear weapons. The Conference notes the Five-Point Proposal for Nuclear Disarmament by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which proposes inter alia consideration of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention or agreement on a framework of separate mutually reinforcing instruments, backed by a strong system of verification." This is the first time the final document of an NPT review conference refers to a nuclear weapons convention.

In addition, in the final document's review part, undertaken by the responsibility of the conference President, "The Conference affirms that the final phase of the nuclear disarmament process and other related measures should be pursued within an agreed legal framework, which a majority of states parties believe should include specified timelines." There was no consensus but a majority supports a nuclear weapons convention with specified timelines.

According to the recent survey by the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons based on the voting on UN General Assembly resolutions and official statements, 146 states support a nuclear weapons convention, 22 states are on the fence, and 26 states do not support it. While the U.S., Russia, the U.K., France, Israel and many NATO states oppose, Canada, Croatia, Germany, Iceland and Romania among NATO states, Australia, Japan and South Korea are on the fence. China, India, Pakistan and North Korea as nuclear possessing countries and Norway as the only NATO country are supporting it<sup>17</sup>.

## **Humanitarian Nuclear Disarmament**

### ***Arguments at the 2010 NPT Review Conference***

At the 2010 NPT review conference, the Foreign Minister of Switzerland called for a debate on the humanitarian aspect, stating, "As a nuclear war would threaten the very survival of our common humankind, a debate should be launched concerning the legitimacy of the use of nuclear weapons regardless of the legitimacy of the motive of defence that can be invoked. In addition to military and legal considerations, Switzerland's aim is to bring the humanitarian aspect to the heart of the current debate on nuclear disarmament. In fact, it is necessary to ask the question at which point the right of states must yield to the interests of humanity. In the long term we must outlaw nuclear weapons, specifically by means of a new convention as the UN Secretary General has proposed"<sup>18</sup>.

The humanitarian aspect of nuclear disarmament had never been discussed at previous NPT review conferences. The U.K. and France immediately opposed to discuss the humanitarian aspect at the conference. However, many non-nuclear-weapon states from Europe and Latin America strongly supported Switzerland's proposal and discussions on this issue widely began.

The final document of the 2010 NPT review conference agreed that "The conference expresses its deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons and reaffirms the need for all states at all times to comply with applicable international law, including international humanitarian law."

Middle Power Initiative, saying it is significant that the review conference for the first time addressed the question of international humanitarian law (IHL), analyzed that "First,

NPT parties have now taken on the existing obligation of compliance with IHL with respect to nuclear weapons as an NPT commitment for which they are accountable within the NPT review process. Second, the conference's reference to the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of 'any' use of nuclear weapons, directly coupled with the call for compliance with law 'at all times,' implies that use of nuclear weapons is unlawful in all circumstances<sup>19</sup>."

The ICJ in 1996 concluded that "the threat or use of nuclear weapons would 'generally' be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law,<sup>20</sup>" because "the principles and rules of law applicable in armed conflict make the conduct of armed hostilities subject to a number of strict requirements....In view of the unique characteristics of nuclear weapons, the use of such weapons in fact seems 'scarcely reconcilable' with respect for such requirements.<sup>21</sup>" Therefore, it seems that the final document advances the 1996 advisory opinion of the ICJ from general prohibition to complete prohibition.

### ***Recent Arguments for a Humanitarian Approach to Nuclear Disarmament***

Just prior to the 2010 NPT review conference, on April 20, the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Jakob Kellenberger, made a statement that in the light of ICJ's finding, the ICRC finds it difficult to envisage how any use of nuclear weapons could be compatible with the rule of international humanitarian law....In the view of the ICRC, preventing the use of nuclear weapons requires fulfillment of existing obligations to pursue negotiations aimed at prohibiting and completely eliminating such weapons through a legally binding international treaty....We must never allow ourselves to become morally indifferent to the terrifying effects of a weapon that defies our common humanity, calls into question the most fundamental principles of international humanitarian law, and can threaten the continued existence of the human species<sup>22</sup>."

It is very rare for the ICRC to express such a clear message on the humanitarian aspect of nuclear weapons and urge to negotiate a nuclear weapons convention. In addition, the successful conclusion of the Convention on Anti-Personnel Land Mines and the Convention on Cluster Munitions mainly negotiated from a humanitarian point of view rather than arms control point of view leads arguments for nuclear disarmament from a humanitarian aspect.

The Council of Delegations of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement adopted a resolution on November 26, 2011, convinced that they have an historic and important role to play in efforts to create the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons, and it

- 1) emphasizes the incalculable human suffering that can be expected to result from any use of nuclear weapons, the lack of any adequate humanitarian response capacity and the absolute imperative to prevent such use,

2) finds it difficult to envisage how any use of nuclear weapons could be compatible with the rules of international humanitarian law, in particular the rules of distinction, precaution and proportionality,

3) appeals to all states:

-to ensure that nuclear weapons are never again used, regardless of their views on the legality of such weapons,

-to pursue in good faith and conclude with urgency and determination negotiations to prohibit the use of and completely eliminate nuclear weapons through a legally binding international agreement, based on existing commitments and international obligations<sup>23</sup>.

At the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT review conference, on May 2, 2012, Austria, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Holy See, Egypt, Indonesia, Ireland, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, South Africa and Switzerland read a Joint Statement on the humanitarian dimension of nuclear weapons.

After stating that serious concerns related to humanitarian dimensions of nuclear weapons have been voiced repeatedly, if such weapons were to be used again, be it intentionally or accidentally, immense humanitarian consequences would be unavoidable, and nuclear weapons have the destructive capacity to pose a threat to the survival of humanity and as long as they continue to exist the threat to humanity will remain, it concludes that “It is of utmost importance that these weapons never be used again, under any circumstances. The only approach to guarantee this is the total, irreversible and verifiable elimination of nuclear weapons....All states must intensify their efforts to outlaw nuclear weapons and achieve a world free of nuclear weapons.”<sup>24</sup>

Rebecca Johnson, who praised this 16 state statement, said that “Whether people liked what was said or not, they knew that the ground had shifted and that these ideas and this group of states could become an important catalyst for reframing the debate around nuclear weapons.”<sup>25</sup>

## **Delegitimizing Nuclear Weapons**

### ***The ICNND Report***

The Report by the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (ICNND), *Eliminating Nuclear Threats: A Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers*, submitted in December 2009 just prior to the 2010 NPT review conference, emphasizes “delegitimizing nuclear weapons” as one of the basic themes for meeting the challenge of nuclear disarmament, states, “If we want to minimize and ultimately eliminate nuclear weapons, the critical need is to change perception of the role and utility: in effect, to achieve their progressive delegitimation, from a position in which they occupied a central

strategic place to one in which their role is seen as quite marginal, and eventually wholly unnecessary as well as undesirable.”

The report, saying that to a significant extent this process has already begun, mentions the three following facts:

- 1) It is now broadly accepted that nuclear weapons have little or no utility as instrument of warfighting.
- 2) There is a strong taboo on the actual use, if not possession of nuclear weapons: a profound normative constraint, as well as a practical one, against using weapons of such indiscriminate and disproportionate destruction.
- 3) There is a base of delegitimation on which to build: it is a matter of restoring the momentum lost in the last decade, rather than starting from the beginning.

Then, the report critically rethinks the following deterrence-based arguments for retaining nuclear weapons:

- 1) Nuclear weapons have deterred, and will continue to deter, war between the major powers.
- 2) Nuclear weapons will deter any large scale conventional attacks.
- 3) Nuclear weapons will deter any chemical or biological weapons attack.
- 4) Nuclear weapons will deter terrorist attacks.
- 5) Extended nuclear deterrence is necessary to reassure allies.
- 6) Any major move toward disarmament is inherently destabilizing.

Next, the report critically deals with other justifications for retaining nuclear weapons:

- 1) Nuclear weapons cannot be uninvented so there is no point trying to eliminate them.
- 2) Nuclear weapons confer unequalled status and prestige.
- 3) Disarmament is not necessary to advance non-proliferation.
- 4) Nuclear weapons do not inhibit other security cooperation between nuclear-armed states.
- 5) Nuclear weapons cost less than conventional weapons.
- 6) Nuclear weapons establishments are needed to maintain expertise<sup>26</sup>.

The report contains 76 commission recommendations, and on overall disarmament strategy, recommendation 2 provides for as follows:

2. Short (to 2012) and medium (to 2025) term efforts should focus on achieving the general delegitimation of nuclear weapons, and on reaching as soon as possible, and no later than 2025, a “minimization point” characterized by:

- (a) low numbers: a world with no more than 2,000 warheads (less than 10 per cent of present arsenals);
- (b) agreed doctrine: every nuclear-armed state committed to no first use of nuclear weapons;  
and
- (c) credible force postures: verifiable deployment and alert status reflecting that doctrine<sup>27</sup>.



### ***The Report of James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies***

During the 2010 NPT review conference, the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies submitted its report, *Delegitimizing Nuclear Weapons: Examining the Validity of Nuclear Deterrence*.

Delegitimization is defined as a process of devaluation; diminishing and destroying all claims to legitimacy, prestige and authority. The report states that “The delegitimization of nuclear weapons is fundamental to preventing their use and achieving nuclear disarmament ...Delegitimization gets to the heart of the nuclear deterrence debate and the evidence for nuclear deterrence has been found wanting....the fact is that nuclear weapons are not particularly useful in today’s world, and may even have increased pre-existing dangers in the form of international terrorism and old and decaying weapons still in storage<sup>28</sup>.”

Among the study’s findings, it emphasizes that there is clear evidence that the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki did not end the Pacific War in 1945, rather it was the declaration of war by the Soviet Union on 8<sup>th</sup> August.

As to nuclear deterrence, it finds that contrary to common belief, there is no evidence that nuclear weapons ‘kept the peace’ during the Cold War, that there is positive evidence that nuclear threats do not prevent conventional, chemical or biological weapons attacks, even in circumstances where nuclear deterrence ought to work robustly, and that possessing nuclear weapons provides little leverage and nuclear weapons have failed to give their possessors decisive military advantage in war<sup>29</sup>.

The report also argues that, “nuclear weapons have no inherent legitimacy as weapons of war in that they are inhumane, indiscriminate and cause unacceptable harm. What deterrent legitimacy they possess has been conferred on them through the mind-games of the Cold War, a period that is now over. Delegitimization will be a self-reinforcing endeavor, affecting the credibility of deterrent threats and allowing the restatement of the immorality of both the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons<sup>30</sup>.”

In order to achieve nuclear disarmament, the report says that engagement of the public is the single most important factor in achieving success in delegitimizing nuclear weapons, and mobilizing international public and political support and sustaining it throughout the disarmament process, is perhaps the most fundamental precondition for progress on the path towards a world without nuclear weapons<sup>31</sup>.

At the panel discussion on delegitimizing nuclear weapons, Randy Rydell stated that the entire nuclear weapons enterprise rests on a bedrock foundation of strata: the first strata is what could be called “interests”, consisting of material and political interests and institutional constituencies representing those who have an interest in the perpetuation of these weapons, and a second strata is “ideas”, the power of ideas in shaping the thinking about nuclear weapons. The prescription for the future elimination of nuclear weapons implies the need to

eliminate the superstructure, which means all of these institutions and ideas that support it<sup>32</sup>.

## Conclusion

Traditional arguments and historical negotiations and achievements of nuclear disarmament have been a step-by-step approach, just like Strategic Arms Reduction Talks between the U.S. and Russia, whose most recent outcome is the New START Treaty signed in April 2010 and entered into force in February 2011.

What is claimed in recent arguments as are explained in this paper is a comprehensive approach, which is quite different from the step-by-step approach. A nuclear weapons convention will prohibit all nuclear-weapons-related activities and ask for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Nuclear abolition cannot take place immediately but it takes time, for example ten or twenty years in several phases. It is not the traditional step-by-step approach where there is neither abolition commitment nor an abolition time-framework.

There are some draft conventions or frameworks of the abolition process, but it is very difficult to start negotiations in the near future because the nuclear-weapon states are quite reluctant to do so. However, it is necessary and useful to think and discuss a nuclear weapons convention, which will show the final stage of the process toward a world without nuclear weapons and the process to get there. Then we have to think and discuss why it is difficult and hard to get there. What kinds of preparations are necessary? What kinds of conditions are necessary? What kinds of transformations of the international society are necessary? What kinds of confidence-building measures are necessary?

These kinds of questions have to be discussed and answers have to be found. That is a very important process for elaborating a nuclear weapons convention. Just drafting a convention is not enough. We all have to think about how to successfully negotiate and conclude a convention by getting rid of many obstacles standing in the way of a world without nuclear weapons.

The humanitarian approach to nuclear disarmament is based on inhuman characteristics of nuclear weapons, which aspect has not been very positively argued until recent time. The ICRC and Switzerland are playing a leading role. International humanitarian law deals originally and fundamentally with the legality of use of weapons or method of use of weapons. However, recent arguments based on the humanitarian aspect appealed for not only the illegality of use of nuclear weapons but also or mainly the abolition of nuclear weapons. That is why they are humanitarian approaches to nuclear disarmament.

Arms control and disarmament negotiations have been traditionally conducted mainly based on strategic considerations. Not only during the Cold War era but also after the end of it, the main consideration of the negotiation on strategic nuclear weapons has been the

strategic stability between the U.S. and the Soviet Union/Russia. Reduction of strategic nuclear weapons started after the end of the Cold War, but their main concern has been strategic stability. That is a main reason why the reductions have not been so substantive, the step-by-step approach has been pursued, and the final stage, that is nuclear abolition, has not been prospective.

On the other hand, the humanitarian approach is completely different from the arms control approach, and focuses on humanity. They emphasize that nuclear weapons cannot co-exist with human beings as the result of the use of nuclear weapons is catastrophic and implies the destruction of all people of the earth. That is why they advocate the abolition of nuclear weapons, but not reduction of nuclear weapons through the step-by-step approach.

This kind of thinking is very useful and helpful as the basis for a nuclear weapons convention and nuclear abolition.

Delegitimizing nuclear weapons is a completely new approach to nuclear disarmament, which concerns every aspect of nuclear weapons. It claims the illegality of nuclear weapons from a legal point of view, and their immorality from a moral point of view. It also makes claims for the uselessness of nuclear weapons from military or political points of view. It includes every measure which reduces or deprives the legitimacy, value, role, authority and prestige that nuclear weapons have been believed to possess.

The most important job that delegitimizing nuclear weapons can do is to correct traditional myths which support the usefulness of nuclear weapons for national peace and security. For example, the myth that the nuclear bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki ended the Pacific War and saved many young Americans must be corrected as the main reason Japan surrendered was not the nuclear bombings but the Soviet declaration of war against Japan. Also there are several cases where nuclear deterrence against conventional attacks did not work.

Furthermore, it is necessary to reduce or eliminate the political prestige associated with possessing nuclear weapons. For example, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council happen to be the same as the five nuclear-weapon states recognized by the NPT. In order to reduce the value of nuclear weapons, it will be necessary to select new permanent members from non-nuclear-weapon states such as Japan or Germany.

In order to achieve a world without nuclear weapons, it is indispensable to reduce and eliminate the value or role which it is believed possessing nuclear weapons gives militarily, politically, morally or practically.

A nuclear weapons convention makes the final legal outcome of the negotiation toward a world without nuclear weapons clear, but it does not explain the conditions or circumstances which will lead to the final outcome. Humanitarian nuclear disarmament has introduced a new dimension of discussions toward a nuclear-free world. It is a very strong

argument for nuclear elimination based on the illegality or the catastrophic effects of the use of nuclear weapons. However, it does not necessarily show the process for a world without nuclear weapons.

Delegitimizing nuclear weapons covers all facets of the problem, including legal, political, moral and practical aspects. These arguments are useful as a basis for a nuclear weapons convention and nuclear abolition from a humanitarian perspective.

The progress in one approach will promote or strengthen the progress in other approaches as they are independent but also interdependent. The three approaches should be energetically pursued simultaneously. If they are pursued simultaneously, they will have a synergetic effect which will exert a much greater influence toward a world without nuclear weapons.

#### (Endnotes)

- 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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered)>
- 2 George P. Schultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nun, "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2007. <[http://www.fenl.org/issues/item.php?item\\_id=2252&issue\\_id=54](http://www.fenl.org/issues/item.php?item_id=2252&issue_id=54)>
- 3 2010 NPT Review Conference, Statement by Switzerland, General Debate, 4 May 2010.
- 4 International Court of Justice, Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion of 8 July 1996, 1996, para. 105.
- 5 Ibid., para. 99.
- 6 Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, A/C.1/66/L.42, 17 October 2011.
- 7 UN Doc A/C.1/52/7, 17 November 1997.
- 8 2010 NPT Review Conference, NPT/CONF.2010/PC.1/WP.17, 1 May 2007.
- 9 UN Doc A/62/650, 18 January 2008.
- 10 Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, "The United Nations and Security in a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World," UN News Centre, 24 October 2008. <[http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocus/sgspeeches/statement\\_full.asp?statID=351](http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocus/sgspeeches/statement_full.asp?statID=351)>
- 11 *Securing our Survival (SOS): The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention*, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, 2007.
- 12 Global Zero Commission, *Global Zero Action Plan*, 29 June 2009. <[http://www.globalzero.org/files/pdf/gzap\\_3.0pdf](http://www.globalzero.org/files/pdf/gzap_3.0pdf)>
- 13 *Mayors for Peace*, August 2012, The City of Hiroshima. <<http://www.mayorsforpeace.org/english/index.html>>
- 14 2010 NPT Review Conference, Working Paper by the Group of Non-Aligned States Parties, NPT/CONF.2010/WP.46, 28 April 2010.

- 15 2010 NPT Review Conference, Working Paper by the Group of Non-Aligned States Parties, NPT/CONF.2010/WP.47, 28 April 2010.
- 16 2010 NPT Review Conference, Statement by the United States, Subsidiary Body I, May 10, 2010.
- 17 International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, *Towards a Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons: A Guide to Government Positions on a Nuclear Weapons Convention*, January 2012. <<http://xa.yimg.com/kq/groups/1413460/2086673147/name/TowardTreatyBanningNuclearWeapons.pdf>>
- 18 2010 NPT Review Conference, Statement by Switzerland, General Debate, 4 May 2010.
- 19 Middle Power Initiative, *The Humanitarian Imperative for Nuclear Disarmament*, September 15, 2010, p. 7. <[http://www.gsinsitute.org/mpi/pubs/Geneva\\_2010\\_Breafing\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.gsinsitute.org/mpi/pubs/Geneva_2010_Breafing_Paper.pdf)>
- 20 International Court of Justice, Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion of 8 July 1996, 1996, para. 105.
- 21 *Ibid.*, para. 95.
- 22 International Committee of the Red Cross, "Bringing the Era of Nuclear Weapons to an End," Statement by Jakob Kellenberger, President of the ICRC, to the Geneva Diplomat Corps, Geneva, 20 April 2010. <<http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/statement/nuclear-weapon-statement-200410.htm>>
- 23 ICRC International Committee of the Red Cross, Council of Delegates 2100: Resolution 1, Working towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, 26 November 2011. <<http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/resolution/council-delegates-resolution-1-2011.htm>>
- 24 The First Session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference, Joint Statement on the Humanitarian Dimension of Nuclear Disarmament by Austria, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Holy See, Egypt, Indonesia, Ireland, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, South Africa and Switzerland. General Debate, 2 May 2012. <[http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/npt/prepcom12/statements/2May\\_IHL.pdf](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/npt/prepcom12/statements/2May_IHL.pdf)>
- 25 Rebecca Johnson, "16-Nation Statement Puts Humanitarian Dimension Diplomacy into the NPT Frame," *Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy*, 3 May 2012. <<http://www.acronym.org.uk/blog/2012-npt-prepcom/16-nation-statement-put-humanitarian-dimension-directly-npt-frame>>
- 26 *Eliminating Nuclear Threats: A Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers*, Gareth Evans and Yoriko Kawaguchi, co-chairs, Report of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, Canberra/Tokyo, November 2009, pp. 59-71.
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 77.
- 28 Ken Berry, Patricia Lewis, Benoit Pelopidas, Nikolai Sokov and Ward Wilson, *Delegitimizing Nuclear Weapons: Examining the Validity of Nuclear Deterrence*, The James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies, May 2010, p. 69.
- 29 *Ibid.*, pp. vi-vii.
- 30 *Ibid.*, p. 69.
- 31 *Ibid.*, pp. vi-vii.
- 32 "Delegitimizing Nuclear Weapons", *Disarmament: Critical Disarmament Issues*, Panel Discussion held by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security on December 6, 2010, the United Nations, p. 3. <<http://www.un.org/disarmament/HomePage/ODAPublications/PDF?DELEGITIMIZING-NUCLEAR-WEAPONS.pdf>>

