WORKING PAPERS

EAST-WEST CENTER WORKING PAPERS

EAST-WEST CENTER

The U.S. Congress established the East-West Center in 1960 to foster mutual understanding and cooperation among the governments and peoples of the Asia Pacific region including the United States. Funding for the Center comes from the U.S. government with additional support provided by private agencies, individuals, corporations, and Asian and Pacific governments.

East-West Center Working Papers are circulated for comment and to inform interested colleagues about work in progress at the Center.

For more information about the Center or to order publications, contact:

Publication Sales Office
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848-1601

Telephone: 808-944-7145
Facsimile: 808-944-7376
Email: ewcbooks@EastWestCenter.org
Website: www.EastWestCenter.org

Politics and Security Series

No. 8, October 2004

Civil Society, Nuclear Disarmament, and the U.S. Alliance: The Cases of Australia, New Zealand, and Japan

Naoki Kamimura

Dr. Naoki Kamimura is Professor of American Studies in the Faculty of International Studies at Hiroshima City University. He has written extensively on the impact of civil society on nuclear disarmament efforts in the Asia Pacific and North America. Dr. Kamimura received his BA degree from the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, and his MA and PhD degrees from the University of California, Los Angeles.

This paper was presented at the workshop "In Whose Interests? The Future of the US Military in Asia," held at the East-West Center, February 20-22, 2003. As an initial review of how civil society groups have sought to affect their governments' policy of alliance with the United States, this working paper will form the basis of discussion for a cross-national study of how citizens in Asia view the presence of US forces within their society and the resources they have mobilized to affect policy change.

East-West Center Working Papers: Politics and Security Series is an unreviewed and unedited prepublication series reporting on research in progress. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Center. Please direct orders and requests to the East-West Center's Publication Sales Office. The price for Working Papers is $3.00 each plus shipping and handling.

Civil Society, Nuclear Disarmament, and the U.S. Alliance: The Cases of Australia, New Zealand, and Japan

Introduction

Australia, New Zealand, and Japan have been among the closest allies of the United States during most of the post-World War II period.[1] The three Pacific allies were also among the leading advocates of nuclear disarmament. Nuclear issues, in fact, became increasingly a defining factor in their alliance relationship and often a source of strain between the United States and its three partners. Civil society actors were always critical in this respect and repeatedly challenged the nuclear alliance with the United Sates, urging their respective government to adopt stricter non-nuclear policies. The U.S.-New Zealand alliance was "disrupted" by this civil society activism and virtually terminated in the wake of the so-called ANZUS crisis in the mid 1980s. The governments of the other two countries repeatedly faced similar challenges from their civil society actors but have managed to preserve the alliance. Australia and Japan, in fact, "redefined" their U.S. alliances and reconfirmed their post-Cold War existence in the mid 1990s.

In this paper, I will address the issue of "U.S. military presence" in a broader sense, not just as the presence of U.S. troops or bases in a given country but rather as the existence of a binding alliance with all the merits and consequences for the country resulting from ties with a powerful nuclear ally. The focus of my research is on nuclear issues and policy consequences for the three U.S. alliance partners in terms of constraints on their pursuit of non-nuclear and nuclear disarmament policies. In the following, I will first give a brief overview of the U.S. alliance issue in each of the three countries, particularly focusing on how the nuclear issue affected the alliance relationship. I will then discuss how the U.S. alliance relationship set the bounds within which the three allied governments pursued both their nuclear disarmament policy and overall security policy and how civil society actors in the three countries challenged their governments' nuclear disarmament policy, policymaking process, and, subsequently, the alliance relationship itself. In the concluding section, I will make some tentative observations on the meanings of the three national experiences as a preface to my further research.

Overview of the Alliances

Australia, New Zealand, and Japan came into a formal alliance relationship with the United States one after the other in 1951. The U.S. willingness to enter into these alliances was largely due to emergent Cold War concerns. The U.S.-Japanese Security Treaty was concluded on September 8, 1951 along with the Japanese Peace Treaty. Both of these treaties responded to heightening Cold War tensions in Northeast Asia in the aftermath of the 1949 Chinese Revolution and the 1950 breakout of the Korean War

[1] Since the ANZUS crisis of the mid 1980s, New Zealand virtually ceased to be an ally of the United States even though the ANZUS treaty was not formally relinquished between the two countries. For the matter of convenience, I will use "ally" or "alliance" when referring to New Zealand even in the present or present perfect tense in this paper.

which had accelerated the conclusion of the peace treaty granting Japan independence as a member of the Western bloc. The ANZUS Treaty was signed on September 1, 1951 by Australia, New Zealand, and the United States in anticipation of the Japanese peace and security treaties. Responding to emergent realities in Northeast Asia, particularly the new U.S.-Japanese ties, the South Pacific parties sought security guarantees from the United States against perceived threats from a possible resurgence of Japanese militarism and Communist China.[2] Even though the ANZUS alliance may not have had as much imminence as the U.S.-Japan and other frontline alliances, as the Cold War progressed, the former became as much a building block of the global alliance system the United States had built to contain Soviet and other Communist threats.

Australia was a case in point in this respect. As the Cold War increasingly became a global nuclear confrontation between the two superpowers after the late 1950s, the country "participated in the transformation of ANZUS into a nuclear alliance with the establishment of US nuclear weapons-related installations in the 1960s and 1970s" while renouncing its own nuclear ambitions.[3] These installations, called "joint facilities" or "U.S. bases," increased their importance for U.S. nuclear strategy during the course of the Cold War. Australia's goal, according to Desmond Ball, was "to secure an American presence by hosting US defence, communications and intelligence installations which were critical to US global strategic programmes and operations."[4] New Zealand's contribution was limited in this respect since it did not have U.S. military bases. Its most visible contribution to the alliance was to receive in its ports U.S. navy vessels mostly for recreational purposes. Its successive conservative governments, however, sought to align the country ever closer to the U.S.-led Western bloc, as the British started the process of dissolving its empire, turning increasingly to Europe and announcing withdrawal of their forces east of the Suez by the late 1960s. There existed a fairly solid domestic consensus on the necessity and desirability of U.S. alliance ties in the two South Pacific countries. The two countries did not question the nuclear policy of their powerful allies, the United States and the United Kingdom, for they shared the global threat perception of these nuclear allies. Then the two countries' participation in a disastrous war in Vietnam prompted the first serious challenge to that consensus.

---

[2] Australia and New Zealand obviously had depended on their former mother country, Britain, for their security before World War II. In the post-World War II period, while becoming ever more dependent on the United States for security, the two South Pacific countries have maintained substantial security ties with Britain. The most significant relationship has been the 1971 Five Power Defence Arrangements, which includes Malaysia and Singapore in addition to the three. Australia and New Zealand had been ANZAC allies since World War I, which was formalized in 1944 and, since 1991, the two countries sought closer defense relationship through the so-called CDR. Jim Rolfe, *Australia and New Zealand: Towards a More Effective Defence Relationship* (Canberra: SDSC, ANU, Working Paper No.286, 1995), pp.6-9; Stephen Hoadley, "Trans-Tasman Relations: CER and CDR," in Bruce Brown, ed., *New Zealand in World Affairs*, Vol.3: *1972-1990* (Wellington: Victoria UP, 1999), p.199. For the ANZUS Treaty, see Richard W. Baker, ed., *The ANZUS States and Their Region* (New York: Praeger, 1994); W. David McIntyre, *Background to the ANZUS Pact: Policy-Making, Strategy, and Diplomacy, 1945-55* (Christchurch: University of Canterbury Press, 1995); The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, The Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, *ANZXUS: After 45 Years, Seminar Proceedings, 11-12 August 1997* (Canberra: House of Representatives, 1997).

[3] Desmond Ball, *The US-Australian Alliance: History and Prospects* (Canberra: SDSC, ANU, Working Paper No.330, 1999), p.4.

[4] *Ibid.* For the joint facilities, see Andrew Mack, *US "Bases" in Australia* (Canberra: Peace Research Centre, ANU, Working Paper No.34).

The Vietnam War was instrumental in bringing the alliance issue into sharp political focus in the two countries. Desiring to reconfirm U.S. alliance ties and obsessed with the Cold War outlook of "domino theory," the conservative governments in Australia and New Zealand sent troops to Vietnam in the mid 1960s to fight alongside U.S. troops, somewhat more reluctantly and on a more limited scale in the latter's case. The futile war set off a large-scale protest movement by citizens and university students in both countries and helped bring about the first serious dissent from the solid pro-alliance position in the two countries. Responding to this widespread citizens' protest movement, their respective conservative governments started the process of withdrawing their troops, which was completed by the succeeding Labor governments by the early 1970s. Even though the Vietnam experience and the subsequent détente prompted a brief reconsideration of U.S. security ties in the two South Pacific allies, they had yet to challenge U.S. and British nuclear prerogatives during the 1970s.[5] It was not until the 1980s when nuclear issues became salient in the national debate over the U.S. alliance and a significant division in public opinion began to emerge over its nuclear nature.

As for Japan, the U.S. alliance was a source of serious political division from the beginning. As was the case with the two South Pacific countries, however, the issue of the U.S. alliance and that of nuclear weapons were not necessarily joined in the Japanese case, either, at least for the first two decades. The "Progressive Camp" in post-World War II Japan, including the Socialists, Communists, labor leaders, liberal intellectuals, and peace activists, strongly opposed the conservative government's policy of concluding a security treaty with the United States and aligning the country with the Western bloc. They instead advocated an unarmed and nonaligned Japan in the midst of the deepening East-West conflict. They also mounted a large-scale protest again when the treaty was revised and strengthened in 1960. After the 1960 revision of the security treaty, Japanese politics became relatively stabilized under Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) rule and the country entered a period of rapid economic growth which depended, to a significant extent, on easy access to the vast U.S. market.[6] The Vietnam War, however, caused a great strain in the alliance after the mid 1960s, for the Progressive Camp and a widespread citizens' and students' movement opposed both the war itself and the U.S. forces' extensive use of their bases in Japan for conducting the war. Then came the 1972 Okinawa reversion, which was notable not only for its significance for the overall U.S.-Japan security relationship but also for its implications on nuclear issues.

During the course of the Okinawa reversion debate in the Diet, nuclear issues emerged for the first time as a major question in the alliance relationship. The successive conservative LDP governments, while strengthening the alliance since the 1960 treaty revision, sought to de-link nuclear issues from the alliance debate in the face of

[5] Richard W. Baker, ed., *Australia, New Zealand, and the United States: Internal Challenge and Alliance Relations in the ANZUS States* (New York: Praeger, 1991), p.69, 96, 123; Rich Kuhn, "Laborism and Foreign Policy: The Case of the Vietnam War," in David Lee and Christopher Waters, eds., *Evatt to Evans: The Labor Tradition in Australian Foreign Policy* (St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1997), pp.78-80; Richard Kennaway and John Henderson, eds., *Beyond New Zealand II: Foreign Policy into the 1990s* (Auckland: Longman Paul, 1991), p.46.

[6] Naoki Kamimura, "Post-Cold War U.S. Foreign Policy Decision Making and Security Policy toward Japan: A Preliminary Survey," *Hiroshima Journal of International Studies* 3 (1997), pp.22-3.

widespread popular protest. Given the prevalent popular anti-nuclear sentiments, they took utmost care not to create a highly combustible mix of military buildup and a nuclear alliance and made a series of statements denying the country nuclear weapons. This culminated in the famous declaration by Prime Minister Eisaku Sato of the "Three Non-nuclear Principles" in 1967, which disavowed the production, possession, and introduction of nuclear weapons as a national policy. At the time of Okinawa reversion negotiations, Sato made it a point to realize a return of the islands without the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons. In the ensuing debate in the Diet, opposition parties repeatedly raised nuclear issues in connection with the U.S.-Japan security treaty, which forced Sato to make the above declaration to settle the issue. It appears that, despite some lingering doubts, most Japanese had come to assume that the nuclear character of the U.S. alliance did not apply to their country because of the Three Non-Nuclear Principles. Afterwards, the successive LDP governments were increasingly successful in consolidating the support of the majority of the Japanese population for this U.S.-centered security policy. It was not until the early 1980s when a series of events suggested that the policy of not introducing nuclear weapons into the country appeared seriously compromised.[7]

Nuclear Issues and the Alliance: Australia and New Zealand

In this section, I will first explain how anti-nuclearism became a prevalent national sentiment in Australia and New Zealand. Then, I will examine how nuclear issues came to critically influence their alliance relationship with the U.S. after the mid 1980s. I will discuss the Australian and New Zealand cases more or less together since the two South Pacific neighbors were not only in the same ANZUS alliance with the United States but they also strongly influenced each other's security and nuclear policy and often went through similar patterns in changes in domestic politics and foreign and security policy related to alliance and nuclear issues until recently.

Origins of Anti-nuclearism in Australia and New Zealand

Australia and New Zealand became actively involved in nuclear issues at the official level in the late 1960s and both countries began to initiate various anti-nuclear policies in the early 1970s. Preceding this official involvement, however, was a rising protest among civil society actors in both countries against nuclear testing in the Pacific. The motives of this protest were environmental and the catalyst was the 1954 Bikini hydrogen test, whose devastating environmental effect was covered extensively in both countries. By 1956 nuclear testing became a major public issue, particularly in New Zealand, despite efforts by both governments to emphasize the critical importance of U.S. and British nuclear deterrent for the security of the their countries. Modeling after British CND (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament), there emerged a nationwide nuclear disarmament movement in both countries in the early 1960s, New Zealand CND in 1960 and Australian CND in 1963. Drawing predominantly on professionals, students, and,

[7] Kazumi Mizumoto, "Nihon no Hikaku-seisaku to sono Kadai [Japanese Non-nuclear Policy and Its Task]," in Hiroshi Yamada and Gen Kikkawa, eds., *Naze Kaku wa Nakunaranaino ka: Kaku-heiki to Kokusai Kankei [Why Do We Still Have Nuclear Weapons: Nuclear Weapons and International Relations]*. (Kyoto: Horitu-bunka-sha, 2000), pp.232-6.

particularly, young housewives, both movements advocated an end to nuclear testing and a nuclear-free zone in the southern hemisphere among other goals. Despite widespread popular resentment against nuclear tests, the Australian anti-nuclear movement had more limited popular appeal than its counterpart in New Zealand where CND became "the nation's largest, most vital peace organization."[8] But for both countries' anti-nuclear movement to move their own government, they needed another catalyst, which turned out to be French nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

When France decided to move its nuclear test site from Algeria to French Polynesia in 1966, both Australia and New Zealand mounted vigorous protest against French tests even under conservative, pro-Western governments. After the 1972 election of Labor governments, led by Gough Whitlam in Australia and by Norman Kirk in New Zealand, the two countries began to pursue activist international policy on nuclear issues. Responding to constituent pressure from labor unions and liberal citizens in general, the Australian and New Zealand Labor governments went beyond simple collaboration in protest against French nuclear tests and started to cosponsor a resolution in 1972 at the UN General Assembly (UNGA) calling for the negotiation of a comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT) and propose a South Pacific Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. When the two Labor governments left power in both countries in the mid 1970s, many of the essential elements of their current non-nuclear and nuclear disarmament policies had already been present. [9]

After the interlude of conservative governments in the two countries, under which many of the anti-nuclear initiatives except the annual CTBT cosponsorship were suspended, their anti-nuclear activism was revived during the early 1980s under the circumstances of growing tension between the superpowers. The heightened fear of nuclear war unleashed a global surge in anti-nuclear activism in various countries and regions of the world, including Japan, Europe, and the United States, in addition to the two Pacific countries. This widespread popular anti-nuclear activism helped elect Labor governments in the two countries, the Bob Hawke government in Australia in 1983 and the David Lange government in New Zealand in 1984. Under strong domestic pressure, the two Labor leaders began to pursue vigorous non-nuclear policies. Although the two Labor governments began to pursue similar policies under relatively similar domestic and international circumstances, the Hawke and Lange governments began to follow diverging paths on nuclear issues, most critically due to different impacts of the U.S. alliance. The two Labor governments, in fact, took highly contrasting positions in terms of domestic non-nuclear policies and global nuclear disarmament diplomacy. While the

---

[8] Kevin P. Clements, *Back from the Brink: The Creation of Nuclear Free New Zealand* (Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1988), pp.98-101; Lawrence S. Wittner, *The Struggle Against the Bomb*, Vol.II: *Resisting the Bomb: A History of the World Nuclear Disarmament Movement, 1954-1970* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997), pp.25-6, 203-9.

[9] Roger Ball, "Disarmament," in Malcolm Templeton, ed., *New Zealand as an International Citizen: Fifty Years of UN Membership* (Wellington: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1995), pp.87-8; Gary Smith, Dave Cox, and Scott Burchill, *Australia in the World: An Introduction to Australian Foreign Policy* (Melbourne: Oxford UP, 1996), p.84. The most notable other initiative was a proposal for a South Pacific Nuclear Weapons Free Zone (SPNWFZ), which will be established in the mid 1980s. Trevor Findlay, *Disarming Cooperation: The Role of Australia and New Zealand in Disarmament and Arms Control* (Canberra: Peace Research Centre, ANU, Working Paper No.114, 1992), p.6, 8.; Malcolm Templeton, "New Zealand and the Development of International Law," in Bruce Brown, eds., *New Zealand in World Affairs*, Vol.3: *1972-1990* (Wellington: Victoria UP, 1999), p.69-71, 99.

Hawke government focused on the latter so as not to challenge U.S. nuclear prerogatives directly on its soil or in its ports, the Lange government, focusing on the former, took domestic measures to implement its non-nuclear policies and consumed much of its energy on the subsequent dispute with the United States.

New Zealand, the ANZUS Crisis, and Its Aftermath

For New Zealand, the port visit issue became a central political question in the early 1980s. Citizens' groups greeted every visiting allied navy vessel suspected of carrying nuclear weapons with a flotilla of small protest boats, which resulted in a series of highly publicized arrests and trials. Women's groups were also active in establishing nuclear-free zones (NFZ) in their local communities, which spread rapidly throughout the country during the 1980s. The Lange government, elected on the platform of implementing rigorous non-nuclear policies, responded to this increasing popular pressure and took drastic steps on the domestic front. Lange declared the country nuclear-free and declined a U.S. request for a port visit by a frigate, which was capable of carrying nuclear weapons. This led to the "ANZUS crisis" in 1985 and alienated New Zealand's two nuclear allies, the United States and Britain.[10] The United States announced it would withhold its "security responsibilities" toward New Zealand and took various measures against the country concerning diplomatic contacts and military cooperation. U.S. pressure and high-handed manners aroused New Zealand nationalism and helped solidify popular support for vigorous nuclear-free policy, virtually making anti-nuclearism a part of national identity.[11] The Lange government cemented its non-nuclear policy by enacting the New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone, Disarmament and Arms Control Act in 1987.

Despite this legislation's avowed goal of pursuing active nuclear disarmament policy, New Zealand became a somewhat reluctant "revolutionary," refraining from "exporting" its nuclear-free policy or challenging the U.S. and other nuclear powers directly in global disarmament forums. For Lange's New Zealand, the focus was at least initially dissociation from a nuclear alliance but not a complete breakup of the U.S. alliance. Lange first sought to "de-nuclearize" the ANZUS, but the U.S. response left him with no other alternative than choosing nuclear-free policy over alliance. Over the larger issue of nuclear deterrence, however, Lange did not directly challenge its validity for other members of the Western alliance even though he declared that New Zealand did "not subscribe to the concept of nuclear deterrent." There were strong concerns among government officials about further alienating the country's Western friends and allies through such policies.[12] Despite growing activism, New Zealand pursued a generally

---

[10] For details about the ANZUS crisis and subsequent developments, see Clements, *Back from the Brink* ; Michael C. Pugh, *The Anzus Crisis, Nuclear Visiting and Deterrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989); Wade Huntley, "The Kiwi That Roared: Nuclear-Free New Zealand in a Nuclear-Armed World," *The Nonproliferation Review*, 4-1 (Fall 1996), pp.1-16.

[11] The 1985 sinking of a Greenpeace protest vessel, the *Rainbow Warrior*, in Auckland harbor by French secret agents angered the New Zealanders and also helped this process by arousing national sentiment against the arrogance of nuclear powers. Pugh, p.15.

[12] Stuart McMillan, *Neither Confirm or Deny: The Nuclear Ships Dispute between New Zealand and the United States* (New York: Praeger, 1987), pp.74-7; Steve Hoadley, "New Zealand's Regional Security Policies," in Richard W. Baker, ed., *The ANZUS States and Their Region* (New York: Praeger, 1994), p.36.

cautious policy in global nuclear disarmament diplomacy until the early 1990s and voted on U.N. disarmament resolutions generally along with the Western rather than the non-aligned bloc.[13]

In fact, there were attempts in the early 1990s to modify the nuclear-free policy in order to accommodate U.S. security needs and thereby revive an alliance with the United States. With the Cold War rapidly coming to a close, the United States, followed by the Soviet Union and Britain, announced withdrawal of all tactical and theater nuclear weapons from surface ships in 1991. This new U.S. policy removed an important element in the U.S.-New Zealand dispute over nuclear ship visits. Now the problem was virtually only visits by nuclear-powered ships rather than nuclear-armed ones. The incoming Jim Bolger National government sought to respond to this new reality by appointing an independent commission to look into the safety of nuclear-powered ships, which concluded affirmatively on the safety issue. But the popular outcry against changing an important portion of the nuclear-free policy prevented the government from implementing the new policy which could have renewed the U.S. alliance. This episode served to confirm the sanctity of nuclear-free policy.[14] Yet the controversy also exposed a tension between the new national identity as a nuclear-free nation, on the one hand, and a lingering fear of isolation within the Western world and concerns about its own security, on the other. Until it could become relatively confident of its new security posture, New Zealand was hesitant to break away from the mainstream Western position on nuclear issues, including nuclear disarmament, which supported the U.S. position.

Australia's Labor Government and the Nuclear and Alliance Issues in the 1980s

While New Zealand had only the port visit issue through which nuclear issues directly affected the country, Australia had more extensive and complex involvement in nuclear issues. Australia was a major exporter of uranium and hosted important U.S. communications and monitoring facilities ("joint facilities") serving U.S. nuclear strategy. The Hawke government faced strong domestic pressure regarding these nuclear connections from the burgeoning peace and anti-nuclear movement as well as from the left-wing of the Labor party. Initially, the new Labor government took a firm stance on the nuclear ship visit issue, trying to be true to its non-nuclear principles. In late 1983, the Hawke government declined a request for a port visit by a British aircraft carrier, which was "almost certainly carrying nuclear weapons."[15] This invited a strong reaction from the British and U.S. governments. Under their pressure, the Hawke government backed down and quietly adopted a new policy to allow port visits by "any allied or friendly ship" in early 1984.[16] Obviously the U.S. alliance had to be preserved for the Australian Labor government, yet domestic anti-nuclear sentiments also had to be assuaged at the same time.

---

[13] Kate Dewes, *The World Court Project: The Evolution and Impact of an Effective Citizens' Movement* (Ph.D. thesis, University of New England, Australia, October, 1998), pp.243-4, 247-9.

[14] Dewes, pp.249-52.

[15] Stuart Firth, *Nuclear Playground* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1987), p.124.

[16] *Ibid.*; Bob Hawke, *Memoir*, p. 225.

The Labor government devised an innovative logic and policy to satisfy these conflicting demands. In order to defend joint facilities and the U.S. alliance itself, the government emphasized the importance of these facilities for the maintenance of a stable global strategic balance, which allowed Australia to pursue robust nuclear disarmament policy in the first place. According to Foreign Minister Bill Hayden, Australia "would be delivering a major blow to the cause of arms control," if the country "were to abolish the joint facilities from Australian territory."[17] The Hawke government also advanced the argument that Australia had more leverage on the United States in terms of nuclear arms control and disarmament from within rather than outside the alliance. Regarding uranium exports, the Hawke government focused on non-proliferation by strengthening national and multinational export control regulations.[18]

In order to respond to criticism by the peace and anti-nuclear movement, the Hawke government appointed its first disarmament ambassador in 1983, founded a peace research institute at the Australian National University, pressed for a South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone (SPNFZ) in 1985, and embarked on activist disarmament diplomacy, nuclear and otherwise.[19] Indeed, according to Stuart Firth, the impetus to arms control activism had its origins in domestic politics, specifically in "Hawke's concern in the 1980s to save the American alliance from the peace movement."[20] As Gary Smith contends, Australian Labor governments of Hawke and, later, Paul Keating "were not prepared to take domestic antinuclear measures that might jeopardize the alliance with the USA." They instead "focused on a range of multilateral initiatives that were not seen to be in conflict with the US alliance" to placate the domestic peace movement.[21]

The 1985 SPNFZ Treaty presented a good illustration of this Australian focus on the preservation of the U.S. alliance and appeasing the domestic peace movement by way of multilateral disarmament diplomacy. By promoting "a moderate nuclear free zone," according to Stewart Firth, the Hawke government was "trying to channel antinuclear sentiment in the South Pacific away from radical measures of the kind taken by New Zealand."[22] In fact, determined efforts by the Australian Labor Party to take up the SPNFZ issue when it returned to power in March 1983 surprised Helen Clark, a long-time advocate of such a treaty who would become the prime minister of the current New

---

[17] Bill Hayden quoted in Ball, *The US-Australian Alliance*, p.5.

[18] For Australia's uranium policy and nuclear nonproliferation during this period, see Richard Leaver, *Australian Uranium Policy and Non-Proliferation"* (Canberra: Peace Research Centre, ANU, Working Paper No.45, 1988).

[19] The Labor government also established an Australian Group in 1985, "a collection of countries concerned with controlling trade in the substances used for making chemical and biological weapons," and helped secure a Chemical Weapons Convention in 1992, which was, according to Foreign Minister Evans, "the first multilateral disarmament convention to provide for a complete, verifiable ban on a whole class of weapons of mass destruction." Stewart Firth, *Australia in International Politics: An Introduction to Australian Foreign Policy* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1999), pp.131-32.

[20] *Ibid.*, p.130.

[21] Gary Smith, Dave Cox, and Scott Burchill, *Australia in the World: An Introduction to Australian Foreign Policy* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1996), p.125.

[22] Firth, pp.131-2.

Zealand Labor government. From a New Zealand perspective, the Australian-proposed SPNFZ fell "far short of excluding all matters nuclear from the region," but New Zealand had no other choice but to go along with the Australian initiative because few South Pacific countries were "likely to follow New Zealand in imposing bans on port access for nuclear-powered and/or nuclear-armed vessels and aircraft."[23] From the perspectives of Lange and other New Zealand government leaders at the time, they had no wish to have another controversy with the United States in addition to the ANZUS dispute. The Hawke government, on the other hand, was "angered by the US refusal to endorse the Treaty" since it "went to considerable lengths during the drafting and negotiation of the Treaty to ensure that any possible US objections were taken into account."[24]

What lay behind these contrasting policies by the two South Pacific Labor governments on nuclear weapons and the U.S. alliance was a complex mix of geopolitical conditions, domestic politics, and personalities of government leaders. Yet threat perceptions were also critical in making substantial differences in popular attitudes in the two countries towards the U.S. alliance and nuclear disarmament. While more than two thirds of New Zealanders thought a direct attack on their soil unlikely by the mid 1980s, a majority of Australians thought it likely at the time.[25] In contrast to an island nation isolated in the midst of a vast ocean, Australia, a continent which lies between two oceans and has to be defended with a scarce population, had more unsettling security perceptions, especially given densely populated Asian countries closer to the north.[26]

In any event, a majority of Australians ostensibly became satisfied with the government policy of "independent foreign policy" within the larger framework of the U.S. alliance, which consisted of continuing uranium exports, hosting joint facilities as well as accepting nuclear ship visits in return for an activist global and regional nuclear disarmament posture.[27] According to Gary Smith, successive Australian Labor Party leaders "sought ways of legitimating and rationalising their chosen foreign-policy directions" and came to depend heavily on multilateralism and a "middle-power terminology."[28]

---

[23] Helen Clark, "New Zealand's Non-Nuclear Initiative," in Ranginui Walker and William Sutherland, eds., *The Pacific: Peace, Security & the Nuclear Issue* (London: Zed Books, 1988), pp.123-5.

[24] Andrew Mack, *"Nuclear Allergy": New Zealand's Anti-Nuclear Stance and the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone* (Canberra: Peace Research Centre, ANU, Working Paper No. 26, Feb. 1988), p.23.

[25] David Campbell, *The Social Basis of Australian and New Zealand Security Policy* (Canberra: Peace Research Centre, ANU, 1989), pp.17-18.

[26] A direct Japanese attack on the Australian territory and the continuing threat of Japanese invasion during World War II also separated the two countries' security perception and contributed to Australian insecurity. Australia was convinced of the utmost necessity to defend the country in a strong alliance framework. David Horner, "The Security Dimension of Australian Foreign Policy," in F.A. Mediansky, ed., *Australia in a Changing World: New Foreign Policy Directions* (Botany: Maxwell Macmillan Publishing Australia, 1992), pp.87.

[27] Firth, *Australia in International Politics*, pp.120-25, 130-31.

[28] Smith, et al., *Australia in the World*, p.108.

Cold War's End and the Nuclear Disarmament Policy of Australia and New Zealand

By the early 1990s, Australia and New Zealand had developed a fairly firm commitment to their own versions of non-nuclear policies and began to embark on a more extensive diplomacy in multilateral nuclear disarmament and arms control. With the Cold War's end, the world experienced an unprecedented movement toward nuclear disarmament, first between the two superpowers and, then, in the multilateral arena toward the mid 1990s. Small and medium-sized countries like New Zealand and Australia found themselves with an unparalleled opportunity to advance their nuclear disarmament initiatives in multilateral forums. In fact, the two countries, along with Japan and others, played a leading role in the CTBT and NPT negotiations of the first half of the 1990s. Particularly significant for New Zealand and Australia was the signing of the CTBT in 1996, which, indeed, was a culmination of years of collaborative efforts in nuclear disarmament by the two South Pacific partners. Australia, for its part, took a significant step toward realizing a nuclear-free world during the Paul Keating Labor government, which succeeded the Hawke government in 1991, particularly under the leadership of Foreign Minister Gareth Evans. Released from the Cold War straitjacket, Keating-Evans foreign policy promoted multilateral nuclear arms control and disarmament negotiations as "a good international citizen" within a loosened framework of alliance politics.[29] New Zealand also became increasingly active in multilateral nuclear disarmament diplomacy during the 1990s with the restraints of the U.S. alliance removed, which was consummated by its participation in the New Agenda Coalition in 1998.

1996 ICJ Advisory Opinion on Nuclear Weapons

With the U.S. security umbrella taken away, New Zealand first strengthened security ties with Australia in the early 1990s but it also started searching for a more independent post-ANZUS security policy. In this process, New Zealand has gradually come to assume an ever more independent posture, not only from the United States but also from the solid Western position in issues. New Zealand's clear break from the Western position became apparent in the 1994 U.N. vote on the International Court of Justice (ICJ) advisory case. The World Court Project (WCP), a civil society initiative through which the ICJ was asked to make judgment on the legality of nuclear weapons' use, came to a critical stage toward the mid 1990s. The WCP posed a difficult problem for New Zealand in terms of its relations with the United States and other Western countries and allies. For New Zealand, according to Kate Dewes, the country's "Western allegiance was severely tested by the WCP."[30] Although the WCP could trace its immediate roots to citizens' antinuclear activism in New Zealand in the early 1980s, the country's National government was slow to embrace it during the early 1990s because it was reluctant to break away from a solid Western position against requesting an ICJ ruling on nuclear weapons. At the urging of prominent transnational civil society organizations such as

---

[29] Marianne Hanson, *Australia and Nuclear Arms Control as "Good International Citizenship*" (Canberra: Department of International Relations, ANU, Working Paper No.1992/2, 1999), pp.1-2; Smith, et al., *Australia in the World*, pp.24-5. See also Gareth Evans and Bruce Grant, *Australia's Foreign Relations: In the World of the 1990s*, 2nd ed. (Melbourne University Press, 1995), pp.77-90.

[30] Dewes, p.263; Smith, et al..

International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA) and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), non-aligned countries had taken up the cause and had been pressing by the early 1990s the WHO and the UNGA to adopt a resolution calling for an ICJ judgment. The WHO and the UNGA adopted such resolutions in 1993 and 1994 respectively and the ICJ accepted their appeals.

On the question of supporting these resolutions, New Zealand's National government was divided and "vacillated" between domestic pressure and pressures from Western countries and allies. According to Kate Dewes, it is "highly unlikely" that the New Zealand government "would have put in a submission or eventually voted for the UNGA resolution" without strong public and parliamentarian advocacy.[31] Ultimately, New Zealand "withstood international peer pressure" and joined 78 other, mostly non-aligned, countries in voting for a UNGA resolution seeking an ICJ opinion, "despite large reservations about the wisdom of such a move." New Zealand was the only Western-allied state and there were 43 states voting against the resolution and 38 abstaining.[32] After deciding to side with national and transnational civil society and non-aligned countries on the ICJ issue, New Zealand came to embrace the Court's advisory opinion as providing "nuclear disarmament with a significant push in the right direction."[33] In fact, the Court's advisory opinion included the famous admonition against nuclear powers that 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."[34]

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Australia played a particularly critical role in the final phase of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) negotiation. Since first presenting a CTBT resolution at the UNGA in 1972, Australia and New Zealand, while closely working with each other, sought to expand support among other states. The platform from which they launched their CTBT diplomacy was the so-called "core group," which included Canada, Sweden, Japan, the Netherlands and Norway at various times in addition to themselves. There were close consultations within the core group in the drafting process, with the other states in the group not only offering their input but also cosponsoring the resolution.[35] National positions remained rather rigid during the Cold War and a CTBT remained an elusive goal. A breakthrough came with the end of the Cold War and a CTBT suddenly appeared

---

[31] Dewes, p.259, 265-6.

[32] *Ibid.*; Ball, p.91. The only other Western country voting affirmatively was San Marino. Christine Bogel, "Address by Christine Bogel, New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, June 7, 1997," in Centre for Peace Studies, University of Auckland, *A Celebration: 10 years of Nuclear Free Legislation: Proceedings of a Joint Centre for Peace Studies/Peace Foundation Seminar Held at the University of Auckland, 7 June 1997* (Auckland: Centre for Peace Studies, University of Auckland, Occasional Paper No.6, 1997), p.5.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] Guy Wilson-Roberts, *Nuclear Arms Control Negotiation with Special Reference to New Zealand and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Auckland, 1999), p.140.

attainable by the early 1990s, with one nuclear-weapon state after another declaring a moratorium on their tests (all four except China). There was not only a dramatic improvement in East-West relations but a gap also narrowed between the West and the NAM on the nuclear test issue. The two rival camps for the first time agreed on a joint resolution on the CTBT in 1991. The UNGA ultimately adopted a joint CTBT resolution by consensus in 1993 and negotiations started in the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament (CD). Negotiations started in earnest at the CD in January 1994. Australia, in collaboration with New Zealand, launched vigorous efforts at concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty with "zero yield" and an effective verification regime. The target date was 1996 before the U.S. presidential election of the same year, which, according to the Australian government, presented the "best window of opportunity."[36] A focus of Australian efforts had been to persuade the U.S. government into a full support of a "zero yield" treaty. Not only working in Geneva, Australian diplomats worked closely with the U.S. arms control community to exchange information and reflect on strategy to persuade the Clinton administration.[37] With all nuclear-weapon states ultimately in full support, a CTBT finally seemed within reach, but India's veto of the treaty text prevented the CD from coming to a conclusion by a consensus, which was required by CD rules, in August 1996. Australia took the initiative at that moment in bringing the CTBT text to the UNGA. Surprisingly, the Coalition government's Foreign Minster Alexander Downer became actively involved at this juncture. Working closely with New Zealand and other CTBT supporters, Australia pressed for a prompt adoption of the treaty text by UNGA, which resulted in a successful adoption of the CTBT in September 1996.[38]

Canberra Commission Initiative

While CTBT negotiations were under way in Geneva, the Australian government took a distinct initiative on nuclear disarmament. Prime Minister Paul Keating announced the establishment of the Canberra Commission for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in October 1995.[39] Post-Cold War international circumstances appeared increasingly propitious for significant progress in nuclear disarmament both on the bilateral U.S.-Russian level and multilateral levels. The Keating government sought to build on Australia's tradition of middle-power diplomacy and came up with a fresh approach to furthering its nuclear disarmament cause. Domestically, according to Marianne Hanson and Carl Ungerer, the Keating government had been "seeking for some time to channel the mounting political pressures from within the Left of the Labor Party and from antinuclear groups" into a "practical proposal" on nuclear disarmament. There was, indeed, strong domestic pressure on the government to play a more activist and visible

---

[36] Australia, DFAT, *DFATNEWS* 3-4 (Oct. 14, 1996), p.4.

[37] Interview with Daryl Kimball, executive director, Arms Control Association, December 27, 2001, Washington, DC.

[38] Australia, DFAT, *DFATNEWS* 3-4 (Oct. 14, 1996), p.8.

[39] Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, *Report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons* (Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 1996). For detailed discussion of the origins and contents of the Commission report, see Marianne Hanson and Carl Ungerer, "Promoting an Agenda for Nuclear Weapons Elimination: The Canberra Commission and Dilemmas of Disarmament," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 44-4 (1998), pp.533-51.

international role against nuclear weapons. The domestic uproar over 1995-96 French nuclear tests and the subsequent criticism of a mild government response may also have played a role in launching the initiative in anticipation of general elections in early 1996.[40]

The Commission was composed of prominent international experts and high-level former government officials and military leaders from overseas, including such distinguished U.S. figures as former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and General Lee Butler, a former Commander in Chief of the U.S. Strategic Air Command. This choice was deliberate so that the Commission's work would "be incorporated positively into the arms control and disarmament debates in Washington."[41] The Commission presented its report in August 1996. The report, with its cautious step-by-step approach to eventual nuclear disarmament, was received as "the most comprehensive and credible set of proposals currently available" and was "incorporated into the non-proliferation and elimination debates" as "a core reference point" and "has sparked a number of related initiatives."[42] The Canberra Commission initiative was unique in the sense that for the first time "a Western ally of the US, and one that was aligned with the US nuclear infrastructure, has attempted to develop a serious agenda for nuclear weapons elimination."[43] Consummating highly activist arms control diplomacy of the Labor years, the Canberra Commission Report proved to be among the most visible contributions Australia made in nuclear disarmament during the 1990s.

With a change of government in the 1996 general election, the final report was submitted to John Howard's new Coalition government which replaced Keating's Labor government and took a more pronouncedly pro-U.S. alliance position. Apart from transmitting the report to other governments and to the UNGA and the CD in Geneva, the Howard government "initially did little" to promote it, perhaps because it was "so identified with Keating."[44] Concerns were expressed both within and outside Australia about the fate of Labor's activist and multilateral disarmament diplomacy. Despite its "arms-length" approach to arms control and disarmament, however, the new Coalition government could not but jump into on-going multilateral negotiations over significant nuclear arms control and disarmament issues, with CTBT negotiations at a critical juncture. On other issues, the new Australian government continued to face nuclear export controls and non-proliferation issues as a particularly important aspect of Australia's nuclear efforts given the country's uranium exporter status. The conservative

---

[40] *Ibid.*, p.539; Firth, *Australia in International Policies*, p.128.

[41] Hanson and Ungerer, pp. 533-51.

[42] Marianne Hanson and Carl Ungerer, "The Canberra Commission: Paths Followed, Paths Ahead," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 53-1 (1999), pp.6-8. For a critical view of the Canberra Commission report, see, for instance, John Forge and Sverre Myhra, "The Canberra Commission: A 'Realistic' Appraisal?" *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 44-4 (1998), pp.513-32; Rod Lyon, "A Pillar of Salt: The Future of Nuclear Arms Control," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 54-3 (2000), pp.297-308.

[43] Hanson and Ungerer, "The Canberra Commission," p.8; Firth, *Australia in International Policies*, p.135; Hanson and Ungerer, "Promoting an Agenda," p.534.

[44] Firth, *Australia in International Policies*, p.135.

Coalition government, in fact, could not but adopt some of the Commission's recommendations toward the end of the 1990s, with Foreign Minister Alexander Downer, who dismissed the Canberra Commission as a "political stunt" before the 1996 election, was pressing the CD by 1998 to "adopt one of the Canberra Commission's key proposals, a cut-off treaty."[45]

New Agenda Coalition and 2000 NPT Review Conference

During the 1990s, New Zealand's main goal in disarmament diplomacy continued to be the elimination of all nuclear weapons, but the approach to realizing such a goal gradually shifted from cautious pro-Western diplomacy to a more independent position.[46] New Zealand was going through this difficult and gradual transition under the cautious leadership of the Bolger National government during the mid 1990s. In those years, there were not only a series of significant multilateral nuclear negotiations and consultations over such issues as the enactment of a CTBT and the extension of the NPT but also such dramatic events as French and Chinese nuclear tests and the ICJ Advisory Opinion on nuclear weapons.[47] For New Zealand, more than for Australia, these developments appeared to work as a catalyst for the change in nuclear disarmament diplomacy. New Zealand's tactics clearly changed from securing consent from nuclear-weapon states for nuclear disarmament to pressuring those states to abandon nuclear weapons through international pressure and persuasion in the changed strategic conditions of the post-Cold War world.

Toward the late 1990s, the New Zealand government, even under the National government, appears to have taken definitive steps toward a more independent stance regarding nuclear disarmament. A culmination of this process was New Zealand's participation in the creation of a New Agenda Coalition (NAC) in 1998 with other like-minded small to mid-sized nations with highly independent foreign policy aspirations, such as Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, South Africa and Sweden.[48] This was a result of the gradual evolution of a new security posture after the interruption of U.S. security connections under the ANZUS alliance. Matt Robson, the current Disarmament Minister, describes it, with a little oversimplification, as follows: "in the mid-1980s, when New Zealand decided that we did not want nuclear ships to visit our ports, the government of the day faint-heartedly pleaded that this policy was 'not for export.' Well, our disarmament and arms control policy is for export now. We have acquired more confidence as a nation since then."[49] According to Prime Minister Clark, the NAC is "a

---

[45] Hanson and Ungerer, "The Canberra Commission," p. 8.

[46] For a good overview of New Zealand's nuclear disarmament policy during this period, see Rob Ayson, "Towards a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: New Zealand and the Quest for Global Nuclear Disarmament," *International Journal* (Autumn 2000), pp. .531-44.

[47] The WCP, a civil society initiative through which the ICJ (International Court of Justice) was asked to make judgment on the legality of nuclear weapons, came to a critical stage toward the mid 1990s, was started by New Zealand citizens groups in the 1980s and promoted by such transnational disarmament NGOs as IPPNW, IALANA, and IPB. For detail, see Dewes 1998.

[48] Initially, Slovenia was also a NAC member.

[49] Matt Robson, "A Wider View of Disarmament and Arms Control," a speech on Feb 2, 2001.

group of countries crossing the traditional North/South divide and escaping the straitjacket of the Cold War groupings of East, West, and Non-aligned."[50] In fact, this diverseness of its members both geographically and politically as well as their high credentials on the issue gave it a unique position in nuclear disarmament diplomacy and helped thrust the NAC into the forefront of negotiations at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

An immediate impetus for the NAC initiative in New Zealand was a 1997 Parliamentary inquiry, according to Robson. The Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee of the Parliament conducted an inquiry into New Zealand's place in the world. Public submissions made it abundantly clear, contends Robson, that it was time for a change, and the committee recommended a new approach in which the country would embark on "a large-scale exercise mobilising world opinion, without any of our traditional friends being in the group of activists." New Zealand's "traditional" concept of "friends" was, according to Robson, Australia, Britain, Canada and the United States, which was based on the "old Cold War mindset." The National government and the country's foreign policy establishment "recognized, too, that a new approach to international diplomacy on the part of New Zealand might be useful" and supported the initiative.[51]

One of NAC's intellectual origins was Australia's Canberra Commission Report, according to Hanson and Ungerer, in addition to the 1996 ICJ advisory opinion. Major arguments advanced in NAC's inaugural June 6, 1998 letter was, for the most part, "a restatement of the Canberra Commission's main recommendations." What separated the NAC initiative from the Canberra Commission Report and the overall Australian stance on nuclear disarmament was "the question of a legally binding instrument for nuclear elimination—the proposed Nuclear Weapons Treaty," which resulted in Australia not being "invited to be included among the signatories" to the above letter. Hanson and Ungerer argues that this demonstrated Australia's "declining status in arms control matters," presumably under the current Coalition government, but given the increasingly diverging paths Australia and New Zealand had been following after the mid 1980s, it was less a matter of "declining status" than a consequence of conscious policy decisions.[52]

During the 2000 NPT Review Conference in New York, New Zealand, led by Disarmament Minister Robson and supported by Ambassador Clive Pearson, played a highly active and consequential role as part of the NAC.[53] Pearson, chairing an important subsidiary body under the Conference's first committee on nuclear disarmament, contributed to adopting a set of principles, which ultimately became a basis for the famous 13-steps for promoting nuclear disarmament. Moreover, New Zealand, acting

---

[50] Helen Clark, "Address to the Auckland Branch of the IPPNW," University of Auckland, Aug. 4, 2000.

[51] Robson, "A Wider View," Feb. 2, 2001.

[52] Hanson and Ungerer, "Canberra Commission," pp.13-4.

[53] Pearson was New Zealand's first Disarmament Ambassador appointed in 1996 to the CD, when the country became a formal member of the disarmament body. Ayson, "Towards a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World," p. 535.

with other NAC members, helped secure from the five nuclear-weapon states in the so-called "seven plus five" negotiations commitments to an "unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals" based on the 13-steps.[54] Australia, on the other hand, working more closely with other disarmament-minded allies of the United States, namely Japan, Canada, and the so-called NATO-5, was left on the sidelines at this final moment of critical negotiations and decisions. [55] As Robson emphasizes, New Zealand's involvement with the New Agenda Coalition does not mean "the abandonment of old friends" but does indicate "an appreciation that New Zealand's comprehensive security involves more than military alliances."[56] In this sense, New Zealand's commitment to NAC orientation is fairly solid and the country is expected to conduct substantial parts of its nuclear disarmament diplomacy through this grouping of nations.

Despite the long history of active and often collaborative roles in global nuclear disarmament diplomacy, Australia's and New Zealand's paths began to diverge largely due to conscious decisions made by their respective governments regarding the maintenance of a robust U.S. alliance and the pursuit of vigorous non-nuclear policies. A significant source of this difference lay in the differences in the overall impact of civil society actors on official nuclear and alliance policies in addition to different geostrategic conditions. Australia, placing an utmost emphasis on the U.S. alliance, has continued a delicate balancing act and pursued non-nuclear and nuclear disarmament policies compatible with that alliance relationship, including the Canberra Commission's nuclear disarmament initiative in the mid 1990s. New Zealand, on the other hand, has begun to pursue a vigorous nuclear disarmament policy often in opposition to U.S. and other nuclear powers, which has become only possible by virtually dissolving an alliance with the foremost nuclear power.

Nuclear Issues and the Alliance: Japan

Origins of Anti-nuclearism

Postwar Japan has been characterized as having strong nuclear "allergy" and a wide-spread popular sympathy toward the anti-nuclear movement existed. This anti-nuclearism could trace its roots to the country's unique and tragic experience of suffering atomic bombings. The experience, however, did not automatically result in a broad and sustained political support for the movement. This broadness and the shallowness of popular support was, in fact, among the main characteristics and weaknesses of the Japanese anti-nuclear movement. Another has been serious political and ideological divisions in the

---

[54] Hiroshima Peace Institute, in collaboration with the Acronym Institute, *A Compilation of Reports on the NPT Review Conference* (Hiroshima: Hiroshima Peace Institute, 2000), pp.3-4.

[55] NATO-5 consists of Germany, Italy, Belgium, Norway, and the Netherlands, which "appeared as the European Union's pro-disarmament faction." Mitsuru Kurosawa, "A Step in the Right Direction: An Analysis of the 6th NPT Review Conference," *Hiroshima Research News* 3-1 (July 2000), p.1.

[56] *Ibid.*

movement.[57] The latter has much to do with the character of major actors in the Japanese movement. The hardcore of the movement has been made up of the *hibakusha* (atomic bomb victims) and their families and immediate supporters. The cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have been strong advocates of the cause of nuclear abolition because of the large presence of the *hibakusha* in their jurisdictions. There were also a large number of "citizens" involved in this movement, such as journalists, professors, students, and house wives in addition to religious leaders of various denominations. The most prominent and enduring feature, however, was arguably the dominance of leftist political parties and party-affiliated labor unions in the movement at least until the early 1990s. Their political and ideological divisions were directly brought into the Japanese anti-nuclear movement and independent voices were hard to raise. The two features, particularly the latter, haunted the Japanese movement and tended to keep it from realizing its full potential as an effective global player in the nuclear disarmament field. Yet the movement's beginning was a nonpartisan and fairly independent citizens' initiative.

Suppressed during the occupation period, the anti-nuclear movement developed rapidly in Japan after the 1954 Bikini hydrogen bomb test and the subsequent Lucky Dragon incident. In the aftermath of world-wide stirrings over the Bikini test, a group of house wives in Tokyo started a petition drive against hydrogen bombs, which spread as a nation-wide petition drive against both hydrogen and atomic bombs and collected 22 million signatures by early 1955.[58] This non-partisan citizens' movement culminated in a first World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs in Hiroshima on August 6, 1955. The conference was organized by a broadly based coalition of politicians, intellectuals, religious leaders, and representatives of such civil society organizations as consumer leagues and community groups in addition to labor unions and leftist parties. The conference proposed a movement unencumbered by differences in religions, parties, and political systems and advocated abolition of nuclear weapons among other things. Thereafter an immediate abolition of all nuclear weapons and victim support became the central goals of the Japanese anti-nuclear movement.

The movement, however, soon fell victim to the Cold War conflict and was beset by its domestic political repercussions, especially the rivalry between the Communists and Socialists. The Communist-controlled Gensuikyo (Japan Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs) and Socialist-led Gensuikin (Japan Congress Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs) were locked in a bitter political and ideological struggle and competed with each other for the leadership of domestic and world-wide grassroots anti-nuclear activism, holding separate World Conferences for nuclear abolition on the Hiroshima and Nagasaki Days. Even though most Japanese remained sympathetic to the cause of complete nuclear disarmament, they were rebuffed by this politicization and the Japanese

---

[57] Still another characteristic of the Japanese antinuclear movement was that it has been largely focused on nuclear weapons but not on nuclear power until recent years. This distinguishes Japan from most other countries with strong anti-nuclearism, which usually have a strong environmental component in their movement, including Australia and New Zealand.

[58] Kazumi Mizumoto, "Nihon no Hikaku-seisaku to sono Kadai [Japanese Non-nuclear Policy and Its Task]," in Hiroshi Yamada and Gen Kikkawa, eds., *Naze Kaku wa Nakunaranaino ka: Kaku-heiki to Kokusai Kankei [Why Do We Still Have Nuclear Weapons: Nuclear Weapons and International Relations]*. (Kyoto: Horitu-bunka-sha, 2000), pp.236-7.

anti-nuclear movement failed to attract "a broad cross section of the Japanese population" until the 1980s.[59] Partly due to this failure to develop a broad popular base and a united national front, the Japanese anti-nuclear movement failed to play a leadership role in the global nuclear disarmament movement, despite the strong moral appeal of the Japanese *hibakusha* and their supporters, as well as failing to have much impact on the policy of successive conservative national governments.

Impact on the Alliance

During the Cold War, as discussed earlier, the conservative governments gave utmost importance to the security relationship with the United States and refrained from advocating any policy initiative which might jeopardize U.S. strategic interests and the U.S.-Japan alliance. Mindful of the continuing nuclear "allergy" of the population, however, the LDP governments gave mostly lip service to the anti-nuclear cause through such measures as the Three Non-Nuclear Principles. In fact, the Sato administration established the basic policy on nuclear issues by the late 1960s, which was made up of four basic elements that were often mutually conflicting: the Three Non-Nuclear Principles, reliance on U.S. nuclear deterrence, active nuclear disarmament diplomacy, and promotion of peaceful use of nuclear energy.[60] The Three Non-Nuclear Principles have been in constant strain with the basic Japanese security policy based on the U.S. "nuclear umbrella" while nuclear disarmament was not actively pursued diplomatically during the Cold War due to sensitivities to U.S. alliance ties.

Directly testing the sincerity of the government's non-nuclear policy, the city government of Kobe adopted a nuclear-free policy for its ports in 1975 and launched one of the most innovative and provocative measures in the Japanese anti-nuclear movement. The policy became known as the Kobe Formula, which required visiting foreign military ships to certify its non-nuclear status.[61] The policy was started under the leadership of a newly elected *kakushin* (progressive or leftist) mayor with a strong backing from local citizens and labor unions. The U.S. Navy ceased sending ships because of its policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear weapons on a particular ship (NCND policy).[62] Since Kobe asserted that it was implementing the three non-nuclear principles and other municipalities did not follow its example, the national government did not challenge Kobe's authority over accepting or denying foreign military ships until the late 1990s.[63]

---

[59] Wittner, *The Struggle Against the Bomb*, Vol.II, pp.9-10, 42, 92-94, 321-324.

[60] Mizumoto, "Nihon no Hikaku-seisaku," p.232.

[61] For details about the Kobe Formula, see Yoshiatsu Okawa, *Hikaku "Kobe Hoshiki" [Nuclear-Free "Kobe Formula"]* (Kobe: Hyogo Buraku-mondai Kenkyujo, 1992), pp.16-24. Under the Kobe Formula, the city requires visiting foreign military ships to present a certificate to prove its nuclear-free status. While most nuclear-free declarations or resolutions by local bodies do not specify measures for implementation, the Kobe Formula has an established procedure for implementation.

[62] For NCND policy, see Jan Prawitz, *The Neither Confirming Nor Denying Controversy* (Working Paper No.196; Canberra: SDSC, ANU, Dec. 1989).

[63] Okawa, *Hikaku "Kobe Hoshiki"*; Naoki Kamimura, "Japanese Civil Society, Local Government, and U.S.-Japan Security Relations in the 1990s: A Preliminary Survey," in Chieko Kitagawa Otsuru and Edward Rhodes, eds., *Nationalism and Citizenship III*

Surge of Antinuclear Movement in the 1980s

In the 1980s, the Japanese anti-nuclear movement was reinvigorated in response to the deepening East-West tension as well as under the influence of rising anti-nuclear movements overseas. One of the main characteristics of the Japanese movement during this period was broad popular interest and participation despite its shallowness. First, there were phenomenal national petition drives at the time of U.N. Special Disarmament Conferences, with 29 million signatures collected for abolition of nuclear weapons for the 1982 conference.

Secondly, there also emerged a nation-wide movement for nuclear-free local governments.[64] Taking clues from the emergent European Nuclear-Free Zone (NFZ) movement, which took off in response to the 1979 NATO decision on an INF deployment, there spread throughout Japan after the early 1980s towns and cities declaring their communities nuclear-free, often at the urging of local citizens' groups or labor unions. Indeed, Japanese local governments became active players in the nuclear disarmament movement.[65] Previously, only the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were significant in this respect, with another exception arguably being Kobe with its Kobe Formula. The Japanese movement soon overtook its predecessors in Europe and the number of those Japanese nuclear-free communities amounted to more than eleven hundred by 1987, with 55% of the total Japanese population living in a nuclear-free community. These nuclear free local governments organized themselves into a consortium in 1984 for consultative purposes.[66] The cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, on the other hand, became active in soliciting international support for their nuclear abolition cause and organized a *Sekai Heiwa Rentai Toshi Shichou Kaigi* (World Conference of Mayors for Peace through Inter-city Solidarity) in 1983 and holding an annual conference on the Hiroshima and Nagasaki days.[67]

The national LDP, the government party, on the other hand, became concerned about these developments and issued in 1982 a stringent warning to prefectural LDP chapters against municipal NFZ declarations. It argued that NFZ declarations by individual municipalities were not only "meaningless" because the country had the three non-

---

(JCAS Occasional Paper no.11, Feb. 2001), pp.10-11.

[64] The Japanese nuclear-free local government movement and the U.S. and European NFZ movements basically have the same origins, but since the Japanese movement used the phrase, nuclear-free local government movement (Hikaku Jichitai Undo), and the focus and method of the movement were appreciatively different, as will be discussed later, from the U.S. and European counterparts, I will use this particular naming for the Japanese movement.

[65] Yoshimichi Aoyama, "Jichitai ni okeru Heiwa-seisaku [Peace Policy at the Local Government]," in Hiroshi Iwatare, ed., *Nihon Genbakuron Taikei [Japanese Anthology on Nuclear Bombs]* Vol.6: *Kakuheiki Kinshi e no Michi [Path toward Abolition of Nuclear Weapons]*. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Senta, 1999), pp.76-77.

[66] Masaru Nishida, "Nihon ni okeru Hikaku-jichitai-undo no Genjo to Kongo no Kadai [The Situation of the Japanese Nuclear-Free Local Government Movement and Its Task]," in Hiroshi Iwatare, ed., *Nihon Genbakuron Taikei [Japanese Anthology on Nuclear Bombs]* Vol.6: *Kakuheiki Kinshi e no Michi [Path toward Abolition of Nuclear Weapons]* (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Senta, 1999), p.87.

[67] Ironically, the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki had been reluctant to issue formal declarations as nuclear-free cities until the mid 1980s under conservative mayors. Imabori 1985, 103.

nuclear principles at the national level and was already nuclear-free, but they might also entail security risks because some of the NFZ declarations included wordings against the U.S.-Japan security treaty and the U.S. "nuclear umbrella."[68]

These anti-nuclear movements of Japanese municipalities, however, remained more or less symbolic. As for the nuclear-free local government movement, not only was its designation different from the U.S. or European counterparts but its activities were also often different. It was often designated, rather aptly, as "Hikaku Sengen Jichitai Undo" (nuclear-free declaration local government movement).[69] The movement for the most part remained true to its designation and was limited to municipal declarations of nuclear-free status without teeth in terms of municipal codes or by-laws to back it up. There were certain cases that citizens, after successfully lobbying the local government to announce the nuclear-free declaration, followed up by urging the municipality to take actions for publicizing the declaration or themselves holding peace concerts or meetings to continue education on the issue. But these are still symbolic and a far cry from actions often taken by the more limited number of nuclear-free communities in the United States.[70]

Most of more than two thousand of Japanese "nuclear-free declaration" local governments have not taken advantage of their declarations. None of the other many nuclear-free port cities adopted the Kobe style enforcement policy. For example, Osaka City, declaring itself nuclear-free, did make it a rule to send inquiries to the Foreign Ministry and the local U.S. Consulate General regarding nuclear status when U.S. navy ships were visiting. The Foreign Ministry, on its part, always responded that there were no nuclear weapons on board because there was no request for previous consultation by the U.S. government while the U.S. Consulate responded that it could not certify because of NCND policy. The city did not press further nor enact a strict code prohibiting nuclear-weapon ships.[71] After all, the Japanese nuclear-free local governments, while having symbolic appeals, failed to seriously challenge the national government's policy on nuclear disarmament, which continued to avoid initiatives that might jeopardize U.S. nuclear deterrence and capabilities.[72]

---

[68] Liberal Democratic Party, "Hikaku Toshi Sengen ni tsuite [Regarding Nuclear-Free Municipal Declarations]," in Hiroshi Iwatare, ed., *Nihon Genbakuron Taikei [Japanese Anthology on Nuclear Bombs]* Vol.6: *Kakuheiki Kinshi e no Michi [Path toward Abolition of Nuclear Weapons]* (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Senta, 1999), p.100.

[69] Its consortium was designated as "Nihon Hikaku Sengen Jichitai Kyougikai" (consortium of nuclear-free declaration local governments) and remained largely a ceremonious organization without much active political role in pushing nuclear disarmament agenda domestically and internationally.

[70] Masaru Nishida, ed., *Hikaku Jichitai-undo no Riron to Jissai [The Theory and Practice of Nuclear-Free Zone Movement]* (Tokyo: Orijin Shuppan, 1985), pp.20-30. For U.S. cases, see Gordon C. Bennett, *The New Abolitionists: The Story of Nuclear Free Zones* (Elgin, Ill.: Brethren Press 1987); Rinjiro Sodei, "Amerika no Hikaku-chiiki Undo [Nuclear-Free Zone Movement in America]," in Nishida, *op. cit.*, p.135.

[71] Kamimura, "Japanese Civil Society," pp.10-11.

[72] Peace Depot, *Kaku gunshuku to hikaku jichitai 1997 [Nuclear Disarmament and Nuclear-Free Local Governments 1997]* (Yokohama: Peace Depot, 1997), pp.71-2; interview with Hiromichi Umebayashi, director, Peace Depot, Yokohama, 8/10/00, 11/19/01.

The port visit issue became salient in Japan during the 1980s as in other U.S. allies with strong antinuclear sentiments. Because of the U.S. Navy's NCND policy and because of the existence of the three non-nuclear principles, which banned "introduction" of nuclear weapons into Japan, port visits by U.S. navy vessels always remained controversial. It became especially so after the "Reischauer Statement" in 1981, in which the former U.S. ambassador to Japan, Edwin Reischauer, admitted in public his awareness of "introduction" of U.S. nuclear weapons into Japan during his tenure. Major Japanese port cities often became a scene of demonstrations against visits by U.S. Navy vessels suspected of carrying nuclear weapons. This issue became particularly controversial because of the Reagan administration's policy of introduction into the Western Pacific of the Tomahawk missile, which was a Navy equivalent of INF (Intermediate Nuclear Forces) missiles in the European theater. Some of the groups opposed to this introduction became involved in a larger Pacific-wide campaign against the further nuclearization of the Pacific (Pacific Campaign for Disarmament and Security) which was headquartered at Hawaii. Out of these groups would emerge in the 1990s a new Japanese disarmament NGO called Peace Depot, which will be discussed in the next section. Another early transnational development during the 1980s was the establishment of a Japanese affiliate of the IPPNW, the Japanese Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War (JPPNW), in 1982.[73]

U.S. Alliance and Nuclear Disarmament in the 1990s

The 1990s witnessed seemingly paradoxical trends towards new activism on nuclear disarmament by both the Japanese government and civil society. In the first place, Japan was not immune from a global pattern of declining public attention to the nuclear weapons issue in the wake of the Cold War. Despite this absence of popular pressure, the Cold War's end released Japan, just like Australia and New Zealand, from the straightjacket of the bipolar system and the Japanese government did become more articulate in nuclear arms control and disarmament diplomacy during the 1990s even though the U.S. alliance continued to set a strict perimeter for Japanese policy initiatives. In the Japanese anti-nuclear movement, on the other hand, there emerged new types of civil society organizations focused on the issue. Transnational influences were instrumental bringing these new actors into existence. The new actors and these transnational influences, in fact, greatly contributed to reinvigorating the Japanese movement and helped make it a truly nuclear disarmament movement rather than just an anti-nuclear movement. With their technical expertise on nuclear weapons and disarmament issues, the new actors tend to focus more on influencing official nuclear disarmament policy through lobbying the government, requesting information disclosure, and presenting policy alternatives. They also collaborate with transnational actors in multilateral disarmament forums and put pressure on the Japanese government through their activities in these forums.

[73] Interview with Kenjiro Yokoro, secretary general, JPPNW (Japanese Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear Weapons), Hiroshima, 3/6/02.

Regarding official Japanese policy, the Cold War's demise more or less energized Japanese nuclear disarmament diplomacy. During the Cold War, the Japanese government was not necessarily an active player in multilateral nuclear arms control and disarmament fora, except for CTBT negotiations at the CD. The Foreign Ministry's annual report, for example, began to emphasize Japan's efforts on nuclear disarmament since the 1991 edition, declaring that it had been the policy of Japan to pursue ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. The government also started to present a resolution on the "ultimate abolition of nuclear weapons" to the UNGA every year from 1994 to 1999, after which the title of the resolution was changed to: "A Path to the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons."[74]

Even during the 1990s, however, the Japanese government emphasized "a progressive and practical approach towards the realization of the total elimination of nuclear weapons," a clear indication of the importance attached to securing consent from nuclear powers, especially from the United States, the provider of its "nuclear umbrella," for realizing an effective nuclear disarmament.[75] In fact, the Japanese government sought to strengthen the U.S.-Japan alliance in spite of the Cold War's end and the demise of the Soviet Union, which brought the alliance into existence in the first place. In the still unsettling international environment of post-Cold War East Asia, the Japanese government reconfirmed its reliance on U.S. nuclear deterrence in the new National Defense Program Outline (Bouei Taiko) in 1995. The Japanese government also continued to emphasize "ensuring an appropriate balance between nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation." It closely followed the U.S. policy of strengthening the non-proliferation regime during the 1990s as a precondition for nuclear disarmament and actively supported indefinite extension of the NPT at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference as well as helping start CTBT negotiations in 1994. [76]

Regarding the declining public interest in the nuclear weapons issues during the 1990s, there were two significant exceptions. The first was the eruption of nation-wide popular protest against French and Chinese nuclear tests in 1995. It was a spontaneous grass-roots movement with participants largely made up of youngsters and housewives, which spread throughout Japan without much sense of an immediate threat or fear from these tests.[77] This anti-nuclear protest appears to be in line with other upsurges of popular protest during the 1990s, including the nation-wide protest against the 1995 Okinawa rape incident or a series of protests against various large-scale public construction projects. In fact, the number of successfully carried out local initiatives and referenda increased

---

[74] Kazumi Mizumoto, "Nihon no Hikaku-Kakugunnshuku-seisaku [Japanese Non-Nuclear and Nuclear Disarmament Policy]," in Hiroshima Peace Institute, *21 Seiki no Kakugunnshuku: Hiroshima kara no Hasshin [Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century: A Message from Hiroshima]* (Kyoto: Houritsu Bunka-sha, 2002), pp.374-7.

[75] Directorate General, Arms Control and Scientific Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Japan), Japan's Disarmament Policy (Tokyo: Japan Institute of International Affairs, 2002), pp.27-8.

[76] *Ibid.*; Shuichiro Iwata, Kaku-sennryaku to Kaku-gunbikannri: Nihon no Hikaku-seisaku no Kadai[Nuclear Strategy and Nuclear Arms Control: Agenda for Japanese Non-nuclear Policy] (Tokyo: Nihon Kokusai Mondai Kenkyujo, 1995), pp.151-4; Masayuki Nagasaki, *Kaku-mondai Nyumon [Introduction to Nuclear Issues]* (Tokyo: Keiso Shobo, 1998), pp.187-92.

[77] Motofumi Asai, *Hikaku no Nihon, Mukaku no Sekai [Nuclear-Free Japan, the Non-Nuclear World]* (Tokyo: Rodo Jumpo-sha, 1996), pp.52-56.

significantly after the mid-1990s which directly challenged local, regional, or even national policy agenda on a broad range of issues. The issues ranged from construction of industrial waste dump sites, nuclear power plants or dams to relocation of U.S. military bases, but many of the challenges were revolving around the basic issues of environment, local autonomy, and human and women's rights. Along with the surge of volunteerism in the wake of the 1995 Kobe Earthquake, this rise of protest politics or "referenda politics" is a clear indication of Japanese civil society's rapid development.[78] This rise of referenda politics has yet to influence the Japanese nuclear disarmament movement, but if it is applied, for example, to the port visits issue, it may further reinvigorate the movement, especially coupled with the rising green politics regarding nuclear power plants.

The second exception to declining public interest concerns the Kobe Formula. The Kobe Formula had remained in force without much challenge from the Japanese national government or visiting foreign ships until Kochi Prefecture under the leadership of Governor Daijiro Hashimoto in 1998 began earnestly to emulate Kobe's example. Other cities also started deliberations on similar measures under the initiative of citizens' groups. The sudden enthusiasm with the Kobe Formula might have something to do with the above-mentioned growth in citizen activism over a spectrum of issues. The national government, on the other hand, mounted a vigorous campaign against Kochi, in collaboration with the national and local LDP, to stop Governor Hashimoto from enacting a nuclear-free code. The Foreign Ministry insisted that Kochi's nuclear-free code infringed upon the state's prerogative on foreign policy making while Hashimoto refuted that his government was not trespassing on the state's jurisdiction but was only trying to implement Japan's Three Non-Nuclear Principles.[79]

This stringent government response to Kochi had much to do with increased U.S.-Japan security cooperation. After the 1996 U.S.-Japan security "redefinition" and the 1997 New Defense Guideline, the U.S. and Japanese governments had been working closely to draw up a workable contingency plan for Japan proper and the surrounding area, which required close cooperation by Japanese local governments. If the Kobe Formula should spread through Japan, U.S. navy vessels could be excluded from Japanese ports. Ultimately, strong opposition from LDP representatives in Kochi's Prefectural Assembly, which constituted its largest faction and the lack of strong support from public opinion and other local governments made Governor Hashimoto retract his nuclear-free proposal in early 1999. The lack of vigorous support from local as well as national civil society actors made powerless this significant local government initiative on nuclear issues.[80]

---

[78] Kamimura, "Japanese Civil Society," pp.3-5. For a more detailed discussion on referendum in Japan, see Hiroshi Shiratori, "Kokusai Isshu wo Meguru Refarendamu: Okinawa no Jirei [Referendum on International Issues: Okinawa's Case," *Kokusai Seiji* [*International Politics*] 120 (1999), pp.135-54.

[79] Peace Depot, *Kaku gunshuku to hikaku jichitai 1998 [Nuclear Disarmament and Nuclear-Free Local Governments 1998]* (Tokyo: Peace Depot, 1998), pp.123-5.

[80] Kamimura, "Japanese Civil Society," pp.10-11.

Japanese Civil Society and Nuclear Disarmament in the 1990s

In the area of advocacy and research on disarmament, the mid 1990s witnessed a significant new development, the emergence of a few highly focused and internationally well-connected NGOs and think tanks. As for think tanks, several peace research institutions were established during the decade, which are either affiliated with universities or based on grass-roots contributions. What distinguishes the new institutions from most of older ones was the fact that the former were largely free from the control of the national government, political parties, business or the labor movement, the traditional sponsors of the limited number of those more established Japanese think tanks and research organizations in the field. An example of these new institutions was the Hiroshima Peace Institute, which was established in 1998 by the City of Hiroshima as an affiliate of Hiroshima City University and successfully organized the Tokyo Forum on nuclear disarmament in collaboration with the government-supported Japan Institute of International Affairs. It was remarkable that a research organ of Hiroshima City jointly organized such a major global nuclear disarmament initiative with a research arm of the Foreign Ministry, with which the city had had awkward and sometimes antagonistic relations in the past. The 1999 Tokyo Forum report was widely acclaimed as a legitimate successor to the prestigious 1996 Canberra Commission report.[81] The policy impact of the Hiroshima Peace Institute, however, was somewhat mixed because its role in co-organizing the Tokyo Forum was essentially one of facilitator rather than putting in original and independent ideas of its own into the discussion and thereby influencing official policy. The Institute has yet to be tested before its full potential as a locally based independent think tank is fully realized.[82]

Among grass-roots Japanese NGOs with a focus on peace and disarmament advocacy, the 1990s were characterized by increasing networking among themselves and those outside the country as well as the emergence of new NGOs with much expertise and organizing skills. A series of significant international conferences during this period worked as a catalyst for both new and traditional civil society organizations focused on nuclear issues to expand transnational connections and networks as well as reinvigorating themselves, as for older organizations. Notably among those conferences were the 1995 and 2000 NPT conferences and CTBT negotiations as well as an exclusively civil society conference for the Hague Appeal for Peace in 1999.[83] For instance, JALANA (Japan Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms) was established as an affiliate of IALANA in 1994 and started active domestic and transnational activities on nuclear disarmament.[84]

---

[81] The role of the first director of the institute, Yasushi Akashi, former undersecretary general of the United Nations, appears to be instrumental in realizing such a collaboration.

[82] For detail, see Kazumi Mizumoto, "Idealism and Realism in Nuclear Disarmament Proposals: Unsolved Issues of the Tokyo Forum Report," *Hiroshima Peace Science* 22: 115-135 2000; Rod Lyon, "A Pillar of Salt: The Future of Nuclear Arms Control," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 54-3 (2000), pp.297-308.

[83] Umebayashi interview.

[84] Interview with Kenichi Okubo, executive director, JALANA (Japan Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Weapons), Tokorozawa, Japan, 3/7/02.

The most notable among those new NGOs was Peace Depot in Yokohama, established in 1997 by disarmament advocates and scholars. Its creation and activities may, indeed, indicate the coming of age of Japanese civil society in the area of national security. Peace Deport is a unique organization in the context of Japanese NGOs, in the sense that its focus is not just advocacy but also on collection, analysis and dissemination of national security information for citizens' use. The organization's focus on research and information dissemination was strongly influenced by U.S. peace and disarmament groups, especially those based in Hawaii and engaged in anti-Tomahawk campaign at the time. Peace Depot worked as a hub for networks of citizens' peace organizations in various regions in Japan. Peace Depot disseminates information on national security and nuclear issues through various publications as well as lobbying the government for nuclear disarmament. This systematic focus on research and extensive connections and networking with overseas disarmament NGOs are what distinguished Peace Depot and new disarmament NGOs from older organizations in the field. Among the older organizations there were certainly those with extensive international connections. But given the intensity of past partisan animosities in the Japanese anti-nuclear movement, even JALANA, for instance, was initially seen as having strong party identification, particularly with the Japan Communist Party, and some of those independent Japanese intellectuals and scholars who were active on nuclear disarmament often dealt directly with international parent organizations but avoided their Japanese affiliates. Peace Depot was largely free from such past political baggage.

Indeed, one of the reasons behind the rapid rise of a new comer in Japan's anti-nuclear movement was perhaps widespread frustrations among nuclear-free advocates with the long-standing political and ideological conflict and division among older organizations, especially between Gensuikin and Gensuikyo. It is true that in the post-Cold War period, there have been some conscious efforts in recent years on amending the historical enmity of the Cold War era and forming a stronger single voice. Older organizations also became more interested in real dialogue with the government as well as in developing a more genuinely transnational interaction with overseas NGOs.[85] The two rival organizations, however, are still far from overcoming historical divisions in ideology and politics.[86]

Yet there have been various initiatives by individual citizens and grassroots groups to establish a more citizen-centered nuclear disarmament movement in Japan particularly under the influence of the global Abolition 2000 movement. The citizen-centered Hiroshima Alliance for Nuclear Weapons Abolition is one such group established in 2000 and Nagasaki's 2000 Global NGO conference on peace and nuclear disarmament is an

[85] Interview with Hiroshi Takakusaki, secretary general, Gensuikyo (Japan Council against Atomic & Hydrogen Bombs), Tokyo, 3/8/02 interview; interview with Toshihiro Inoue, staff, Gensuikin (Japan Congress Against A- and H-Bombs), Tokyo, 3/8/02 interview.

[86] There were some efforts during the 1980s at overcoming the divisions in the Japanese antinuclear movement, partly owing to long-standing frustrations at the grass-roots level. Inspired by overseas examples of wide-spread citizen-based antinuclear movements, this effort at creating a united antinuclear national front resulted in holding a joint World Conference for several years in the mid 1980s. Given the depth of enmity between the rival organizations, however, the collaboration turned out to be short-lived and the rivalry was carried over to the post-Cold War period.

example of broad-based citizens' initiatives. Tokyo-based Kaku Haizetsu Shimin Renraku-kai (Citizens' Liaison Committee for Abolition of Nuclear Weapons) is still another new network of groups and individuals, which was started in 1998 and composed of JALANA, Peace Depot, YWCA, and others. This last group's basic function is to exchange information among participating organizations, but its most notable feature is a series of "dialogues or negotiations" it has conducted with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding specific policy matters in nuclear issues.

These dialogues began at the time of Tokyo Forum and had the first substantive meeting with the Ministry to present citizens' case to be included in its report on nuclear disarmament. Since then, Citizens' Liaison Committee or Peace Depot or JALANA or even Gensuikyo and Gensuikin collectively or individually continued a series of meetings with the Ministry over such issues as Japanese U.N. resolutions on nuclear disarmament.[87] These are, indeed, unprecedented steps taken by both the Japanese government and disarmament NGOs. The Foreign Ministry used to be very jealous of its prerogative in nuclear disarmament diplomacy, but only in the past few years the Ministry has become more receptive to government-civil society dialogue. At the time of the 2000 NPT review conference in New York in particular, the Ministry invited NGO representatives for a series of pre-conference consultations. In the end, the Ministry did not adopt NGOs' advice for the 2000 NPT conference, which centered on the idea of Japan taking the same position as that of the New Agenda Coalition for securing more concrete pledges from nuclear states for abolition of nuclear weapons.[88] The Foreign Ministry's basic stance has been that a responsible and realistic policy for nuclear disarmament should take into careful account of nuclear powers' position.[89]

The willingness of the Ministry for a dialogue seems partly motivated by its realization of the necessity for listening to the voice of influential NGOs, in other words, civil society. This in turn is a reflection of recent changes in the overall Japanese political context with emphasis ever more on government information disclosure and accountability. This may also be due to the fact that disarmament Japanese NGOs have acquired much expertise along with their transnational colleagues and that the Foreign Ministry was ill afford to ignore them. There may be also another factor. Now that most other developed countries have come to form close links with civil society organizations, the Japanese Foreign Ministry could not but actively pursue a similar course even in the realm of security and nuclear disarmament, especially in international forums.[90] Even though the Foreign

---

[87] Inoue interview; Takakusaki interview.

[88] Interview with Masayoshi Naito, coordinator, Kakuheiki Haizetsu Shimin Renraku-kai (Citizens' Liaison Committee for Abolition of Nuclear Weapons), Tokyo, 3/8/02 interview; interview with Umebayashi, 11/19/01. For details, see Hiromichi Umebayasi, "Turning Point for Japan's Nuclear Disarmament Diplomacy" paper presented at the International Symposium on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century, Hiroshima, July 29, 2000.

[89] Speech by Seiichiro Noboru, Japanese Ambassador to the Conference on Disarmament, "Japanese Policy regarding 2000 NPT Review Conference," delivered at the International Symposium on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century, Hiroshima, July 29, 2000.

[90] This is exactly the same effect international norms and pressure had on the Japanese government's attitudes toward international development NGOs. Kim Reimann, "Civil Society and Official Development Assistance: International Politics, Domestic Structures and the Emergence of International Development NGOs in Japan." Paper presented at the International Political Science Association World Congress, Quebec City, August 2000.

Ministry and the disarmament NGOs continued to have great disagreements over nuclear disarmament and the gap between them is fundamentally based on their larger differences in their security outlooks and evaluation of the U.S.-Japan security treaty, the very fact they have continued such substantive dialogue is phenomenal in the Japanese context. This may have a potential to bring about substantial changes in the security policy-making process especially regarding nuclear disarmament if Japanese disarmament NGOs continue to increase their expertise and negotiating power through even greater networking with transnational and domestic political actors.

Some Concluding Observations and Questions

Based on the preliminary examinations above of the nuclear and alliance policies of Australia, New Zealand, and Japan, I propose a more in-depth research on a comparative analysis of the experiences of the three U.S. allies in terms of how their respective civil society and government approached the issue of nuclear disarmament, how the U.S. alliance affected their national debate and policy on nuclear issues, and how the alliance itself was affected by this debate and policy. In other words, my research will look into, first, how the U.S. alliance relationship set the bounds within which the three allied governments pursued both their nuclear disarmament policy and overall security policy and, secondly, how civil society actors in the three countries challenged their government's nuclear disarmament policy, policymaking process, and, subsequently, the alliance relationship itself. The national experiences of Australia, New Zealand, and Japan in terms of civil society-national government relationships regarding the U.S. alliance-nuclear disarmament issue will also be compared with other cases in the project regarding U.S. military presence and elements of divergence and convergence with the others will be analyzed.

My preliminary interpretation in the three cases is that they present a spectrum of experiences. The New Zealand experience represents a case in which civil society actors most successfully challenged the conventional narrative on security and nuclear disarmament and helped introduce a more open policymaking process as well as a security policy based less on the U.S. alliance than on a global common security concept. The Australian experience represents an intermediate case while the Japanese one represents the least successful case in terms of civil society's challenge and a subsequent transformation of official disarmament and security policy. Even in the Japanese case, however, there have been significant stirrings and efforts for change on the part of civil society actors during the 1990s, as spearheaded by the Okinawans since 1995 and taken up by citizen-based new security actors with extensive transnational networks and with a central focus on nuclear disarmament. There has also been certain receptivity and openness on the part of the government regarding nuclear and security issues.

To illustrate the differences in goals and approaches in the equation of alliance and nuclear disarmament among the three U.S. allies, their position and logic regarding the so-called Nuclear Disarmament Convention may be illustrative. There is a great divide between Australia and New Zealand on this and the official Japanese position is fairly close to Australia's. According to the Australian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade:

> Some countries and non-government organisations have called for the negotiation of a global nuclear disarmament convention or treaty. Australia believes that, for the time being, the main steps towards nuclear disarmament are best pursued bilaterally, between the United States and Russia, under the START process. The premature multilateralisation of the disarmament process would serve only to complicate and slow down the existing process of bilateral nuclear disarmament between the U.S. and Russia. Once the two largest Nuclear Weapon States have reduced their nuclear stockpiles to levels roughly comparable with the other NWS, the process will become a plurilateral one – among all the recognised NWS. A nuclear weapons convention might become appropriate when all NWS have reduced their nuclear weapon holdings to quite low levels.[91]

Australia, New Zealand, and Japan pursue nuclear disarmament, but their essential approaches are different, the difference being closely related to the question of nuclear disarmament within or without the U.S. alliance framework. While New Zealand completely dissociated itself from the concept of nuclear deterrence, Australia, coming very close to relinquishing it through the Canberra Commission Report, still subscribes to the "extended deterrence provided by the US nuclear forces to deter the remote possibility of any nuclear attack on Australia." The Japanese government, for its part, has recently "rediscovered" extended deterrence and begun to articulate it more clearly to justify the U.S. alliance.[92]

According to Australian official arguments, there are opportunities as well as constraints involved in the alliance with a foremost nuclear power. Hawke and others have argued that a close alliance relationship confers a non-nuclear power a greater leverage on its nuclear ally. Yet, a harmony of interest between nuclear and non-nuclear allies tends to be only up to certain points, especially in the post-Cold War international circumstances of no overwhelming enemy. For instance, Australia's energetic work at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference very well served both Australian and U.S. interests in addition to "global interests," for nonproliferation tends to complement a nuclear alliance. Yet once the issue entered where nuclear prerogatives of their ally were directly affected, there were only constraints. The United States regards an alliance as a holistic package rather than an ala carte, in which a country can choose portions of it and decline others, as shown by a bitter experience by David Lange's government when it sought a "de-nuclearized" ANZUS. Australia's and New Zealand's frustrating series of experiences have exactly demonstrated the burden of this constraint side for countries with strong antinuclear sentiments. Japanese civil society actors can surely attest to similar constraints and frustrations.

---

[91] http://www.dfat.gov.au/security/nuclear_disarmament.html

[92] Australia, *Defence 2000: Our Future Defence Force* (Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 2000), p.36; Naito interview; Directorate General, Arms Control and Scientific Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Japan's Disarmament Policy* (Tokyo: The Center for the Promotion of Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, Japan Institute of International Affairs, 2003).

The official Australian logic used in the above quotation may be also breaking down because of deteriorations in international strategic circumstances and the stalling of the bilateral U.S.-Russian nuclear disarmament process, the latter owing significantly to increasing unilateralism in U.S. security postures.[93] The CTBT is a case in point and is severely testing Australia's as well as Japan's nuclear arms control and disarmament policy within an alliance framework. Once the nuclear ally starts to have its own ways at the expense of existing international regimes and norms regarding nuclear arms control and disarmament and its non-nuclear ally under its nuclear umbrella could not effectively use its in-alliance "leverage," the latter faces a serious dilemma. The situation has been exactly that way since 1999 when the U.S. Senate rejected ratifying the CTBT, which crucially depends on a U.S. ratification for its survival as a meaningful step toward nuclear disarmament. Australia and Japan as well as other U.S. allies and non-allies like New Zealand, will be tested critically on this as well as on the larger issue of nuclear disarmament.

With this current conundrum in mind for the three countries regarding nuclear disarmament, my proposed research will examine not only the factors behind the differences in the national experiences of U.S. military "presence" in the three Asia Pacific countries but also seek to have some general understanding of the relationship among civil society activism, nuclear disarmament, and the U.S. alliance.

[93] The 2002 U.S.-Russian Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, which stipulates to reduce U.S. and Russian nuclear strategic arsenals down to 1,700-2,200 warheads by 2012, may be "less significant than they appear since most of the weapons taken out of the operationally deployed stockpile will be kept in an inactive reserve and could be redeployed at any time," according to the International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War. http://www.ippnw.org/NukeStart.html.