

## SESSION 3: NORTHEAST ASIA NUCLEAR WEAPON FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### A Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone With a Three Plus Three Arrangement

*Hirohichi Umebayashi*

East Asia Nuclear Security Workshop, Tokyo, Japan

November 11, 2011

#### § Introduction

After the end of the Cold War, a Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (NEA-NWFZ) became more than a political slogan and several concrete proposals with different arrangements have been proposed since. Among others, the present author proposed a scenario called “three plus three” in 1996, in which a trilateral NEA-NWFZ treaty among Japan, the Republic of Korea (ROK) and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) was envisioned. As well, it included a special protocol for negative security assurances by the three neighboring nuclear weapon states -- China, Russia and the United States of America<sup>1</sup>. Later, in 2004, a model treaty was developed by the same author in cooperation with NGOs in Japan and the ROK<sup>2</sup>. In that model treaty, while it continuing to be based upon the three plus three scenario, a six-party treaty, rather than a three-party treaty, was proposed. The parties to the treaty would be placed in two categories: “Intrazonal states” (Japan, ROK and DPRK) and “neighboring nuclear weapon states” (China, Russia and the U.S.). Geographically, the NEA-NWFZ is composed of the territory of the intrazonal states. Security assurances by neighboring nuclear weapon states were incorporated into the main text of the treaty because they are deemed essential to the treaty negotiation process from its outset.

#### § Evolvement of Security Environment

These initial studies were driven by mid or long term goals in mind.

- To prevent a foreseeable competitive escalation of nuclear development among Japan, the ROK and the DPRK, or between Japan and a reunified Korea.
- To establish mechanisms to implement the provisions of the NEA-NWFZ including verification and energy cooperation, as the first step toward further confidence building and broader cooperative security mechanisms in the region.
- To demonstrate the possibility of a security framework free from extended nuclear deterrence in a region closely surrounded by nuclear weapon states. Thus, it will contribute to global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation efforts.

While these objectives still remain relevant today, substantial political changes have occurred in the past ten years, requiring a renewed assessment of the steps to be taken to forward the agenda of a NEA-NWFZ.

One positive development is the birth of the Six-Party Talks in August 2003. At the time of the introduction of a NEA-NWFZ with the three plus three arrangement in 1996, there were no Six-Party Talks. The Talks eventually involved the same six countries as proposed for the NWFZ and became a potential forum to discuss such a zone. When we developed a six-party model treaty, there was no September 2005 joint statement, the fundamental agreement among the six countries. The 2005 joint statement acknowledges the relevance of security cooperation in Northeast Asia to “the verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula,” by saying: “The Six Parties agreed to explore ways and means for promoting security cooperation in Northeast Asia.” A NEA-NWFZ is typical of such ways and means for security cooperation. Moreover, the agreement of February 2007 on “Initial Actions for the Implementation of the Joint Statement” established five working groups including one specific to a “Northeast Asia Peace and Security Mechanism.”

Another innovative element was included in the 2005 joint statement. In addition to the DPRK’s commitment to “abandoning all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs,” the United States affirmed that it has “no intention to attack or invade the DPRK with nuclear or conventional weapons.” This means that future security assurances by nuclear weapon states could be extended to include response to an attack by conventional weapons and that an unprecedented regional security cooperation mechanism could possibly be envisioned in this regard.

On the other hand, the past five years have seen serious negative development regarding the DPRK nuclear program. The DPRK conducted two underground nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009. Although the weaponization of those devices has not yet been proven, it will not be surprising if this happens in the near future. Also, the DPRK demonstrated its ongoing indigenous plan of so-called “Juche-based nuclear power industry<sup>3</sup>,” involving the construction of at least one small light water reactor (LWR) and a modern centrifuge uranium enrichment facility as was witnessed by a team of U.S. experts that visited Pyongyang in November 2010<sup>4</sup>.

The latter development relating to the LWR is considered to be more or less consistent with the DPRK’s arguments maintained before and after the start of the Six-Party Talks and could be used as a renewed path for the international community to engage the DPRK with multi-facet deliberations<sup>5</sup>. Regarding the former development of escalated nuclear deterrence, it is important to note that the DPRK has never hinted that it would possess a nuclear deterrent for the purpose of dominance, but it continues to say to the effect that the deterrence is needed to assure national security and regime preservation. In this context, this year’s Joint New Year Editorial in leading DPRK newspapers reads, “The DPRK is consistent in its stand and will to achieve peace in Northeast Asia and denuclearization of

the whole of the Korean peninsula.<sup>6</sup>”

Under these circumstances, the international community has urged the DPRK to fulfill the commitments of the Six-Party Talks in accordance with the September 2005 joint statement at the 2010 NPT Review Conference<sup>7</sup>. Furthermore, the Conference Final Document reads that, “(t)he Conference also calls on the DPRK and all States parties to fully implement all relevant nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament obligations” and “reaffirmed its firm support for the Six-Party Talks and remains determined to achieve the satisfactory and comprehensive resolution to the issues involved through diplomatic means.<sup>8</sup>” These statements imply the recognition that the DPRK’s nuclear issue is part of broader global nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament issues.

#### § Difficulties, not Unusual but Diverse in Establishing NWFZs

Some think that as long as the DPRK is not ready to discard its nuclear weapons program, a NEA-NWFZ will remain a remote aspiration or even a mere unrealistic dream. However, the difficulty involved in establishing a NEA-NWFZ is nothing exceptional when we look at the histories of efforts to establish the existing NWFZs. Those histories tell us that forerunners’ efforts for NWFZs began with legitimate people’s aspiration and political will that went well beyond the inevitable challenges of such endeavors.

In the case of the African NWFZ, African nations successfully gained a United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) resolution for a NWFZ on the African Continent in 1961, in response to French nuclear testing in the Sahara Desert in Algeria, a French colony at that time. In spite of the adoption of the UNGS resolution, French nuclear tests continued there for four years even after the independence of Algeria in 1962. Meanwhile a suspected nuclear weapon program in the Republic of South Africa emerged in 1977 and became the major obstacle to establishing an African NWFZ. Denuclearization of South Africa was realized in 1990 only after the end of the Cold War<sup>9</sup>. It took thirty-five years since the first UNGA resolution in 1961 for the African NWFZ Treaty, the Pelindaba Treaty, to be adopted in 1996.

Looking at the NWFZ in Latin America and the Caribbean, the proposal for the zone was first made by Costa Rica when it introduced a draft resolution to a Council of the Organization of the American States (OAS) in 1958<sup>10</sup>. The NWFZ Treaty for the region, the Tlatelolco Treaty, was concluded in 1967 after four years’ negotiation on the treaty’s text. The 1962 Cuban crisis contributed to the general unification of regional efforts for a NWFZ treaty. As the Tlatelolco Treaty adopted an ingenious provision for the entry into force, the organization to ensure compliance with the obligations of the Treaty, OPNAL, began operation in 1967. However, two major countries in the region with the most advanced nuclear technology, Brazil and Argentina, remained outside control of the treaty.

It was suspected that competitive nuclear weapon programs of the two countries, including even preparation for nuclear tests that was later admitted by a Brazilian official, continued for decades. Under the prevailing regional norm of the freedom from nuclear weapons brought about by the Tlatelolco Treaty, the two countries advanced incremental measures for mutual confidence building and eventually established a bilateral agency, the Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials (ABACC) and then concluded a four party agreement for full-scope safeguards among the two countries, ABACC and IAEA in 1991. It was thirty-three years after the initial Costa Rican proposal.

It may be worthwhile to quote from a speech<sup>1 1</sup> by a Canadian diplomat, William Epstein, who was deeply involved in the negotiation of the Tlatelolco Treaty. He said, "I cannot resist telling the story of how, when I first became involved in the work of the Treaty, I was told by senior diplomats of four nuclear powers...that I would be wasting my time and that there would never be an agreement on such a Treaty...It seems to be a truism that in politics and diplomacy, 'never' never means never."

In the case of Southeast Asia nuclear-weapon-free-zone, it was in 1971 during the Cold War that five ASEAN countries declared the "Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN)," which explicitly included the concept of a NWFZ. However, the presence of nuclear weapons deployed by the United States at its military bases in the Republic of the Philippines (RP) was a matter of common knowledge and an obvious obstacle to the advancement of a Southeast Asia NWFZ concept. Thus, the rejection by the Philippine Senate of the extension of the U.S.-RP Military Bases Agreement in 1991 became a turning point and viable conditions for treaty negotiations came into existence. Negotiations were concluded in 1995 and the Bangkok Treaty on the Southeast Asia NWFZ became the first NWFZ treaty after the end of the Cold War. This process took twenty-four years from the time of the ZOPFAN declaration.

Even with respect to the NWFZ treaties that involved fewer difficulties in their negotiations, such as Rarotonga Treaty for the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone, it took thirteen years to conclude that treaty after New Zealand introduced the idea to the South Pacific Forum in 1972. The Central Asia NWFZ treaty took thirteen years to be agreed upon since first proposed in a UNGA speech by the President of Uzbekistan in 1993.

These histories of the births of existing NWFZs indicate that the windows of treaty negotiations were opened by the political vision and will by one of the countries concerned, and ten to thirty years were needed for conclusion of the treaties by overcoming obstacles which differed from region to region. In the context of the Northeast Asia NWFZ, a lesson from these histories is that an inflexible way of thinking that any proposal for a NEA-NWFZ should come only after the DPRK's definite abandonment of its nuclear programs is not

appropriate. Instead, a manifestation of the political will must come first for any progress to be achieved.

#### § Significance of the Global Context

Transformation from the current security arrangement characterized by extended nuclear deterrence to a new arrangement featuring a NEA-NWFZ has special relevance to global efforts toward a world without nuclear weapons.

One of the obvious steps to be taken toward that goal after the new START, the strategic offensive arms reduction treaty between the United States and Russia, is further nuclear weapon reductions by the two countries whose nuclear stockpiles are estimated to exceed 95 % of the global total. According to expert opinion, however, there is concern about whether the United States can take a bold step for further reductions unless its targeting policy is fundamentally changed by a new Presidential Policy Directive and its strict implementation<sup>1 2</sup>. This has direct relevance to the responsibility of U.S. allies.

Those allies who request extended nuclear deterrence from the United States contribute to increasing specific numbers of targets to be attacked by U.S. nuclear weapons. As a consequence, this necessitates the United States maintain specific numbers of nuclear warheads for those attacks. The frequent assertion by Japanese foreign ministry officials that Japan's nuclear umbrella policy does not contradict its nuclear disarmament policy is becoming more and more untrue as further deep cuts in the U.S. nuclear arsenal are imperative if a world without nuclear weapons is to be realized. Thus, transformation of security policy toward a NEA-NWFZ is very much wanted for all countries in this region, and especially for U.S allies in the region.

Lastly are appended two statements to support the establishment of a NEA-NWFZ: one by 93 Japanese and Korean parliamentarians and the other by the 105 Japanese mayors.

-- End

---

<sup>1</sup> Hiromichi Umebayashi, "A Northeast Asia NWFZ: A Realistic and Attainable Goal," at INESAP Conference, Gothenburg, Sweden, May 30 – June 2, 1996, and published in INESAP Bulletin, No. 10, August 1996.

[http://www.inesap.org/sites/default/files/inesap\\_old/bulletin10/bul10art03.htm](http://www.inesap.org/sites/default/files/inesap_old/bulletin10/bul10art03.htm)

<sup>2</sup> The model treaty has been revised several times. Draft 4 is available in the Peace Depot Working Paper No.1 E, "A Model Treaty on the Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone," November 2005.

<http://www.peacedepot.org/e-news/nwfz/workingpaper1.pdf>

The most recent version, draft 7, is available in the appendix of the book in Japanese. Hiromichi Umebayashi, "Hi-kakuheikichitai – Kakunaki Sekai eno Michisuji" ("Nuclear Weapon Free Zone – A Pathway to the World without Nuclear Weapons"), Iwanami-Shoten, September 28, 2011.

---

<sup>3</sup> Foreign Ministry Statement of the DPRK, “DPRK Foreign Ministry Vehemently Refutes UNSC’s Presidential Statement,” Korea Central News Agency, April 14, 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Siegfried S. Hecker, “Redefining denuclearization in North Korea,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 20 December 2010.

<sup>5</sup> David von Hippel and Peter Hayes, “Engaging the DPRK Enrichment and Small LWR Program,” Nautilus Institute Special Report, December 23, 2010.

<sup>6</sup> “Joint New Year Editorial,” Korea Central News Agency, January 1, 2011.

<sup>7</sup> “Conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions,” 2010 NPT Review Conference Final Document, Part I, (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (vol.1), New York, 2010).

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> A detailed account of the African NWFZ is given by Oluyemi Adeniji, “The Treaty of Pelindaba on the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone,” (UNIDIR/2002/16), United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), Geneva, 2002.

<sup>10</sup> Thomas M. Leonard & John R. Redick, “Latin America,” Encyclopedia of Arms Control and Disarmament II, (editor in chief: Richard Dean Burns, Charles Scribners’ Sons), 1993.

<sup>11</sup> William Epstein, “Tlatelolco and a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World,” Nuclear Weapon-Free Zones in the 21st Century (UNIDIR 97/37), edited by Pericles Gasparini Alves & Daiana Belinda Cipollone, 1997.

<sup>12</sup> Robert S. Norris and Hans M. Kristensen, “A Presidential Policy Directive for a new nuclear path,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 10 August 2011.

**Joint Statement by Parliamentarians of Japan and the Republic of Korea on  
Denuclearization of Northeast Asia**

The world now faces a critical juncture on the issue of nuclear weapons. On one hand, efforts are being made to resume the Six-Party Talks in order to achieve the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and the establishment of a regional peace regime in Northeast Asia. On the other hand, efforts towards “a world free of nuclear weapons” are gaining support worldwide, under the leadership manifested in the address by U.S. President Barack Obama in Prague in April 2009 and the five point proposal, including a call for negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, pronounced by U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon at the U.N. Headquarters in October 2008.

The denuclearization of Northeast Asia, where conflicts among states with and without nuclear weapons have long continued, is a test case for global efforts to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons. The history of Northeast Asia is paradoxical in that it is the sole region of the world to have suffered from the atrocity of nuclear warfare, while on the other hand, states in the region have continued to choose to rely on nuclear deterrence for their security.

Security based on nuclear deterrence will not bring real peace to the region. Rather, it will perpetuate insecurity rooted in arms races of distrust and never-ending confrontation. In order to liquidate the legacy of the Cold War and build peace in the region based on mutual trust, we, parliamentarians of Japan and the ROK, have agreed as follows:

1. We recognize the importance of solidarity and cooperation between Japan and the ROK in achieving the denuclearization of Northeast Asia, in which Japan, the ROK and the DPRK commit themselves not to possessing nuclear weapons, and the neighbor countries possessing nuclear weapons commit not to using or threatening to use such weapons against Japan the ROK and the DPRK, while striving for their own nuclear disarmament. Efforts by the Governments of Japan and the ROK, along with parliamentarians, local authorities, peace-loving citizens and NGOs in both countries, are critical to achieving this end.
2. We urge the Governments of Japan and the ROK to accelerate the normalization of relations with the DPRK through active dialogue and to seek solutions to the nuclear issues involving the DPRK through its return to the Six-Party Talks, as well as through credible measures taken by all the relevant countries to support its return.

---

3. We urge the Governments of Japan and the ROK to pledge and give support for medical care and compensation to the atomic bomb survivors including those from the DPRK and ROK and to second generation survivors, and to establish concrete systems for this as needed. The two governments should also raise public awareness regarding the importance of abolishing nuclear weapons by making the tragedy caused by the atomic bombing widely known, and should provide education based on the lessons learned from these experiences.

4. We recognize that a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapons-free Zone initiative will be effective for achieving the denuclearization of the region. We urge governments in the region, in particular those of Japan and the ROK, to fully discuss this proposal. We would also like to see various actors make continued efforts to gain international support. Especially, we call on the Governments of Japan and the ROK to advocate the establishment of a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-free Zone in the international fora, including the NPT Review Conference and the U.N. General Assembly.

5. We declare our unconditional support for efforts toward “a world free of nuclear weapons” laid out in the above-mentioned speeches by President Barack Obama and U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon, believing that such efforts have opened a window of opportunity for achieving the denuclearization of Northeast Asia. We pledge to continue our cooperative efforts toward the denuclearization of Northeast Asia by grasping all available opportunities. We also appreciate international support and advice for our efforts while valuing lessons of existing NWFZs.

May 2010

Signed by (as of July 2011):

ROK Parliamentarians

CHO Seung Soo                      CHOI Younghee                      KANG Gijung                      KWON Young-Ghil  
LEE Mikyung                      PARK Eun Soo                      SHIN Nakyun

Japanese Parliamentarians

ABE Tomoko                      AIHARA Kumiko                      AMIYA Shinsuke                      ARAKI Kiyohiro  
CHUGO Atsushi                      DOI Ryuichi                      DOKYU Seiichiro                      FUJISUE Kenzo  
FUJITA Kazue                      FUJITA Yukihisa                      FUJITANI Koushin                      FUKUDA  
Eriko  
FUKUSHIMA Nobuyuki                      HACHIRO Yoshio                      HATA Tsutomu                      HATSUSHIKA Akihiro  
HATTORI Ryoichi                      HIRAOKA Hideo                      HIRAYAMA Tairo                      ICHIKAWA Yasuo

---

|                   |                    |                    |                   |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| IGARASHI Fumihiko | INAMI Tetsuo       | INATOMI Shuji      | INOUE Satoshi     |
| ISHIDA Mitsuji    | ISHIDA Yoshihiro   | ISHIGE Eiko        | ISHII Toshiro     |
| ITOKAZU Keiko     | IZUMI Kenta        | KAGAYA Ken         | KAKIZAWA Mito     |
| KAMIMOTO Mieko    | KATO Gaku          | KAWADA Ryuhei      | KAWAGOE Takahiro  |
| KAWAGUCHI Yoriko  | KAWASHIMA Tomotaro | KIUCHI Minoru      | KOMURO Hisaaki    |
| KONDO Shoichi     | KONNO Azuma        | KONO Taro          | KOORI Kazuko      |
| KOYAMA Nobuhiro   | KUSHIBUCHI Mari    | MAKIYAMA Hiroe     | MATSUMOTO Daisuke |
| MATSUMOTO Ryu     | MATSUNO Nobuo      | MIMURA Kazuya      | MIYAJIMA Daisuke  |
| MIZUNO Tomohiko   | MORIYAMA Hiroyuki  | MUROI Kunihiko     | NAKAGAWA          |
| Masaharu          |                    |                    |                   |
| NAKANO Kansei     | OGAWA Toshio       | OHKAWARA Masako    | OKUBO Tsutomu     |
| OKUMURA Tenzo     | OKUNO Soichiro     | ONISHI Kensuke     | ONISHI Takanori   |
| SAITO Tsuyoshi    | SAKAGUCHI Naoto    | SHIBAHASHI Masanao | SHIGENO Yasumasa  |
| SHINOHARA Takashi | SORAMOTO Seiki     | SUGIMOTO Kazumi    | SUTO Nobuhiko     |
| TAKAKI Yoshiaki   | TAKAMURA Tsutomu   | TAKANO Mamoru      | TAKEUCHI Norio    |
| TAKI Makoto       | TAMAKI Kimiyoshi   | TEZUKA Yoshio      | UBUKATA Yukio     |
| WADA Takashi      | YAMAGUCHI Kazuyuki | YAMAZAKI Maya      | YATAGAWA Hajime   |
| YOSHIDA Tsunehiko | ZUKERAN Chobin     |                    |                   |

Contact: PNND Japan, Tetsuo Inami Office, RM 524, Shugiin-Daini-Giinkaikan

2-1-2 Nagata-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 100-8982 Japan

tel: +81-3-3508-7623, fax: +81-3-3508-3253

PNND Korea, Lee Mikyung Office, #630 National Assembly Bldg

1 Yeouido-dong, Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul, ROK

tel: +82-2-788-2619, fax: +82-2-788-3630

Appendix 2

## Statement of Support for a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone

We, the undersigned, express our support for the efforts to establish a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone in Northeast Asia (NEA-NWFZ). We believe it is an urgent and timely initiative both for strengthening the global tide toward a Nuclear Weapon Free World and for achieving regional stability and peace in Northeast Asia.

Setting the goal of achieving a NEA-NWFZ will create a new positive dimension in the on-going Six Party Talks among the Republic of Korea (ROK), Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (DPRK), Japan, China, Russia and the United States, by

---

incorporating its goal of “verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula” (Six-nation Statement, 19 September 2005) within the broader regional vision.

Achieving a world free of nuclear weapons is an obligation not only of nuclear armed nations but of all nations, especially those whose security policy relies on a so-called nuclear umbrella. In this regards, all nations have the responsibility to find a path toward a security polity without nuclear weapons. A NEA-NWFZ will provide such a path for relevant nations in the region, including Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK).

A realistic scheme for a NEA-NWFZ would be a 3+3 arrangement, in which the ROK, the DPRK and Japan would form the central parties of the zone and the neighboring nuclear weapon states (China, Russia and the US) would support it through the provision of security assurances, as this would build upon the 1992 Inter-Korean Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of Korean Peninsula and Japan’s Three Non-Nuclear Principles.

We call upon political leaders, both national and local, citizen groups, and individuals throughout the world, to express their support for a NEA NWFZ and to work together to realize it.

**Endorser Mayors :**

Etsuo Fushimi, Mayor of Taiki, Hokkaido Pref  
Hiroataka Sato, Mayor of Kushiro, Hokkaido Pref  
Katsuhiko Akutsu, Mayor of Ashoro, Hokkaido Pref  
Masahito Nishikawa, Mayor of Asahikawa, Hokkaido Pref  
Norihisa Yonezawa, Mayor of Obihiro, Hokkaido Pref  
Toshiki Kudo, Mayor of Hakodate, Hokkaido Pref  
Tsunehiko Kotani, Mayor of Kitami, Hokkaido Pref  
Yoshiji Sato, Mayor of Kamikawa, Hokkaido Pref  
Koetsu Sasaki, Mayor of Misato, Miyagi Pref  
Kunio Saito, Mayor of Watari, Miyagi Pref  
Kiyoshi Sato, Mayor of Murayama, Yamagata Pref  
Nobuhiro Takahashi, Mayor of Kori, Fukushima Pref  
Kenji Tomioka, Mayor of Takasaki, Gunma Pref  
Kazuo Hotate, Mayor of Kamisu, Ibaraki Pref  
Sakae Nakajima, Mayor of Miura, Ibaraki Pref  
Tatsuya Murakami, Mayor of Tokai, Ibaraki Pref  
Yasushi Takahashi, Mayor of Mito, Ibaraki Pref  
Kazunari Koizumi, Mayor of Narita, Chiba Pref  
Kazuo Warabi, Mayor of Sakura, Chiba Pref  
Masanori Kanesaka, Mayor of Oamishirasato, Chiba Pref  
Takashi Saito, Mayor of Yokoshibahikari, Chiba Pref  
Toshio Ishii, Mayor of Chosei, Chiba Pref

---

Yoshiharu Izaki, Mayor of Nagareyama, Chiba Pref  
Morimasa Murakami, Mayor of Musashino, Tokyo Pref  
Hisao Nakasaki, Mayor of Oiso, Kanagawa Pref  
Katsuhiro Ochiai, Mayor of Hiratsuka, Kanagawa Pref  
Ryuichi Hirai, Mayor of Zushi, Kanagawa Pref  
Takao Abe, Mayor of Kawasaki, Kanagawa Pref  
Yasunori Ebine, Mayor of Fujisawa, Kanagawa Pref  
Yoshiyuki Furuya, Mayor of Hadano, Kanagawa Pref  
Yasuo Yatsui, Mayor of Ojiya, Niigata Pref  
Shigeo Waki, Mayor of Asahi, Toyama Pref  
Yoshinori Sawasaki, Mayor of Uozu, Toyama Pref  
Takaaki Awa, Mayor of Nonoichi, Ishikawa Pref  
Hitoshi Mochizuki, Mayor of Minobu, Yamanashi Pref  
Mikio Sumino, Mayor of Showa, Yamanashi Pref  
Akira Sugeno, Mayor of Matsumoto, Nagano Pref  
Motohiro Kumagai, Mayor of Takamori, Nagano Pref  
Takashi Shirotori, Mayor of Ina, Nagano Pref  
Hirosi Shimizu, Mayor of Yaizu, Shizuoka Pref  
Takeshi Toyooka, Mayor of Mishima, Shizuoka Pref  
Mitsuru Edo, Mayor of Fuso, Aichi Pref  
Sumio Sakakibara, Mayor of Handa, Aichi Pref  
Toshiaki Ono, Mayor of Inazawa, Aichi Pref  
Yukinori Tanaka, Mayor of Inuyama, Aichi Pref  
Masaji Matsuyama, Mayor of Fukuchiyama, Kyoto Pref  
Gen Nakagawa, Mayor of Nara, Nara Pref  
Masakatsu Yoshida, Mayor of Yamatotakada, Nara Pref  
Osamu Takeuchi, Mayor of Hirakata, Osaka Pref  
Seita Tanaka, Mayor of Yao, Osaka Pref  
Yoshihiro Baba, Mayor of Neyagawa, Osaka Pref  
Masayoshi Shimada, Mayor of Fukusaki, Hyogo Pref  
Tomoko Nakagawa, Mayor of Takarazuka, Hyogo Pref  
Isao Takeuchi, Mayor of Tottori, Tottori Pref  
Toshiro Takeuchi, Mayor of Kofu, Tottori Pref  
Takashi Nishida, Mayor of Shoo, Okayama Pref  
Akira Hada, Mayor of Fukuyama, Hiroshima Pref  
Hiroaki Yamaguchi, Mayor of Sera, Hiroshima Pref  
Hirosi Mimura, Mayor of Kumano, Hiroshima Pref  
Kanji Yamaoka, Mayor of Kaita, Hiroshima Pref  
Katsuhiro Shinno, Mayor of Hatsukaichi, Hiroshima Pref  
Kazumi Matsui, Mayor of Hiroshima, Hiroshima Pref  
Masashi Kosaka, Mayor of Takehara, Hiroshima Pref  
Yoshio Kurata, Mayor of Higashihiroshima, Hiroshima Pref  
Yoshiyuki Watari, Mayor of Fuchu, Hiroshima Pref  
Yuko Hiratani, Mayor of Onomichi, Hiroshima Pref  
Hideto Onishi, Mayor of Takamatsu, Kagawa Pref  
Takumi Ihara, Mayor of Shikokuchuo, Ehime Pref  
Akio Sugimura, Mayor of Tosashimizu, Kochi Pref  
Makio Kadowaki, Mayor of Kami, Kochi Pref  
Masayuki Tokaji, Mayor of Hidaka, Kochi Pref  
Seiya Okazaki, Mayor of Kochi, Kochi Pref

---

Yoshihiko Imanishi, Mayor of Motoyama, Kochi Pref  
Hisayoshi Shinozaki, Mayor of Kasuya, Fukuoka Pref  
Morichika Saito, Mayor of Iizuka, Fukuoka Pref  
Tsuneyuki Mitamura, Mayor of Yame, Fukuoka Pref  
Taichiro Taniguchi, Mayor of Ureshino, Saga Pref  
Akio Miyamoto, Mayor of Isahaya, Nagasaki Pref  
Ikuhiro Tomohiro, Mayor of Matuura, Nagasaki Pref  
Ikuko Nakao, Mayor of Goto, Nagasaki Pref  
Ken Hirase, Mayor of Togitsu, Nagasaki Pref  
Naruhiko Kuroda, Mayor of Hirado, Nagasaki Pref  
Shintaro Okumura, Mayor of Unzen, Nagasaki Pref  
Tomihisa Taue, Mayor of Nagasaki, Nagasaki Pref  
Takashi Matsumoto, Mayor of Omura, Nagasaki Pref  
Takaichi Tanaka, Mayor of Saikai, Nagasaki Pref  
Toshiaki Inoue, Mayor of Shinkamigoto, Nagasaki Pref  
Yoneyuki Fujiwara, Mayor of Minamishimabara, Nagasaki Pref  
Koji Yoshimoto, Mayor of Tsukumi, Oita Pref  
Syuji Korenaga, Mayor of Usa, Oita Pref  
Yoichi Sato, Mayor of Hita, Oita Pref  
Tadashi Tojiki, Mayor of Miyazaki, Miyazaki Pref  
Hiroyuki Mori, Mayor of Kagoshima, Kagoshima Pref  
Akira Uema, Mayor of Nishihara, Okinawa Pref  
Denjitsu Ishimine, Mayor of Yomitan, Okinawa Pref  
Eicho Kawamitsu, Mayor of Taketomi, Okinawa Pref  
Kunio Arakaki, Mayor of Kitanakagusuku, Okinawa Pref  
Keisuke Hamada, Mayor of Nakagusuku, Okinawa Pref  
Masaharu Noguni, Mayor of Chatan, Okinawa Pref  
Mitsuko Toumon, Mayor of Okinawa, Okinawa Pref  
Takeshi Asato, Mayor of Ginowan, Okinawa Pref  
Takeshi Onaga, Mayor of Naha, Okinawa Pref  
Toshiyasu Shiroma, Mayor of Haebaru, Okinawa Pref  
Yoshihisa Shimabukuro, Mayor of Ogimi, Okinawa Pref  
Yoshitaka Nakayama, Mayor of Ishigaki, Okinawa Pref

#### **Endorser Mayors Organizations :**

Mayors for Peace

National Council of Japan Nuclear Free Local Authorities

(105 Mayors and 2 Organizations as of August 11, 2011)

#### **Contact: Peace Depot**

E-mail: [office@peacedepot.org](mailto:office@peacedepot.org)

TEL: +81-45-563-5101 FAX: +81-45-563-9907