

A Path to Peace Explored in Hiroshima *By Masamichi Kamiya*

I will soon be leaving the Hiroshima Peace Institute (HPI) after spending almost three and a half years there as a visiting research fellow. I have learned a great deal in that time. I would like to take this opportunity to share some personal experiences of my time here in the hope that they may contribute to HPI's further development.

I have worked in the field of peace and disarmament for the last 15 years. During that time, I have witnessed multilateral disarmament negotiations at the United Nations (U.N.) from the perspective of a Non Governmental Organization (NGO) member. During the seven years I lived in Geneva and New York, I was particularly active as a member of the U.N./NGO committees for/on disarmament in both cities. As a citizen of Japan, the only nation to have experienced atomic bombings, I have found the movement to abolish nuclear weapons in Hiroshima to be the spiritual pillar of my life dedicated to disarmament.

At the beginning of the 1990s, international relations underwent fundamental changes. First and foremost, that period marked the end of the Cold War. On the one hand, negotiations between the United States and Russia, symbolized by the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) process, gathered pace, but on the other, the international community in general became less interested in disarmament. Second, our understanding of the concept of security changed. Although it was once understood in strict political and military terms, security as we now understand it has taken on social, economic and cultural dimensions, too. From that new line of thought the idea of human security emerged. Third, the international community began attaching greater importance to "individual sovereignty" as opposed to state sovereignty, which had been regarded as inviolable. That change is closely linked to the greater prominence humanitarian intervention has attained since the Gulf War.

In the mid-1990s, the international community rediscovered the need for a multilateral approach to nuclear disarmament centered on the United Nations. That shift in emphasis culminated in part in the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) at the U.N. General Assembly in 1996. Nuclear tests conducted by India and Pakistan in May 1998 further accelerated the positive change.

It was against that backdrop that HPI was inaugurated in April 1998. At the time, I was dispatched from the Rishso kosei-kai and served as an associate secretary general of the World Conference on Religion and Peace (WCRP), whose international secretariat was located across the street from the U.N. Headquarters in New York.

In June of that year, I received a visit from Yasushi Akashi, then president of HPI, who had already urged me to join the institute as a research

fellow. I accepted his offer, hoping that my work at HPI would in some way contribute to the eventual abolition of nuclear weapons, an objective shared by people all over the world. My journey along the path to peace began at that moment in Hiroshima, a city the global nuclear disarmament movement has always looked to for inspiration, for obvious reasons.

I was given two main tasks after arriving at HPI in November 1998. First, I was engaged in administrative work for the Tokyo Forum for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, and second, I contributed to an HPI project on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century, which was launched in April 2000. Co-sponsored by the Japan Institute of International Affairs and HPI and supported by the Japanese Foreign Ministry, the Tokyo Forum published its report in July 1999 after a year of intensive discussions. The report, which became an official U.N. document, gave impetus to nuclear disarmament initiatives and strengthened the non-proliferation regime. The HPI research project, due to complete its work in March 2002, will publish a final report containing practical recommendations that, it is hoped, will help bring about nuclear disarmament in the new century.

Outside HPI, I contributed to initiatives in preventive diplomacy and the reduction of small arms, hoping to build the foundations for a wide range of peace activities for HPI in the future. To that end, I promoted closer ties between HPI and the Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy, which was founded in July 1999, hoping they would help Japan make a stronger contribution to preventive diplomacy. I did so because I believe that the prevention of conflicts is an area in which Hiroshima must be involved if it is to achieve its ultimate objective of world peace.

I was an adviser to the Japanese delegation at the U.N. Conference on Small Arms and Light Weapons in July 2001. Reducing the stockpile of small arms, which have killed so many innocent people, is another vital issue Hiroshima must work into its longstanding commitment to peace and disarmament.

I have learned several lessons during my time in Hiroshima. First, the city must adopt a comprehensive approach to disarmament that encompasses not only nuclear weapons but also small arms, including anti-personnel landmines. A Hiroshima that is engaged in initiatives on small arms – which are, in their own way, weapons of mass destruction – while making nuclear disarmament its priority, would be worthy of the world's praise.

Second, Hiroshima must reaffirm its ultimate objective of eternal world peace, which will be achieved after the abolition of nuclear weapons. It must pay attention to peace activities other than nuclear disarmament as well. It can, for instance, contribute to conflict resolution through preventive diplomacy and peace-building activities, which are sine qua nons for national reconstruction after a conflict.

The vision for Hiroshima articulated above coincides with that stipulated in the Fourth Basic Plan of Hiroshima City, issued by the city of Hiroshima in 1999. It also encompasses the importance of "reconciliation" and "humanity" which Hiroshima Mayor Tadatoshi Akiba spoke of in his peace declarations of 2000 and 2001.

Hiroshima's partner in the quest for peace must be humanity, not nuclear weapons. In a work titled "Perpetual Peace," Kant attempts to prove that humans have a moral disposition to conquer the evil principle through paying homage to the rule of law, while arguing that war is society's *status naturalis*. But as I serve out my term of office as a visiting research fellow, I wish to embrace what I believe to be humanity's intrinsic love of peace as Hiroshima leads us farther on the road to peace.

Kamiya is a visiting research fellow at HPI

CONTENTS

A Path to Peace Explored in Hiroshima by Masamichi Kamiya	1
The U.S. and the Islamic World after the War in Afghanistan by Akifumi Ikeda	2
Supremacy Leads to Vulnerability in U.S. Foreign Policy by Jun Tsubouchi	2 ~ 3
HPI Research Forum	
History and Social Structure of Islamic Fundamentalism	3
Bringing China into a Regional Security Framework	3
U.S.-Middle East Relations after the War in Afghanistan	4
Research Project on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century	
Discussions Preceding the Preparation of the Final Report	4 ~ 5
Research Project on the Legitimacy and Rationality of New-interventionism	
Peace Activities and Patterns of International Intervention: A Discussion	6
Recent Publications by HPI Researchers	6 ~ 7
DIARY	8
Hello from HPI	8

The U.S. and the Islamic World after the War in Afghanistan

By Akifumi Ikeda

The September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States presaged an international war against terrorism. The U.S. launched air strikes against Afghanistan at the beginning of October, resulting in the collapse of the Taliban regime. The alleged mastermind of the terrorist attacks, Osama bin Laden, led a network of terrorists known as al-Qaeda, which, by early 2002, had been almost wiped out. With the formation of an interim government in Afghanistan led by Hamid Karzai, it appeared that some semblance of peace had come to the war-torn country.

Many people were concerned that the retaliation against the Taliban and al-Qaeda would be perceived as an attack against the Islamic world as a whole and would result in a backlash against the West. Some feared the worst-case scenario – a violent confrontation between the Christian and Muslim worlds – would become reality.

Though the war in Afghanistan continued throughout the fasting month of Ramadan, an important time in the Muslim calendar, the Islamic world remained calm. It appeared that talk of a clash of civilizations had been unfounded, at least for the time being. The relative calm proves that the vast majority of Muslims did not support al-Qaeda's actions. Despite their claims, the Taliban and al-Qaeda were not representatives of disillusioned and angry Muslims, but heretical anomalies. Their collapse is nothing less than the outcome of their self-centeredness and misplaced optimism about the political environment.

Recent events have also proved, however, that deep distrust of the West remains in the Islamic world. Certainly, most Arab nations and other Islamic countries firmly refused to be categorized alongside the Taliban and al-Qaeda, and were not surprised to see those groups disbanded and defeated. Still, when the West positioned large-scale strike forces in the region and continued to rain blows on the already hard-hit Afghanistan, several Islamic countries did not bother to conceal their contempt for the way the United States and its allies were waging the war. Some of those nations found it painful to see a strong nation punish a weak one so severely, whatever the reason may have been. Some Islamic nations also wondered whether the United States would have resorted to force had it been attacked by a largely Christian nation, such as Russia, or a European country.

The United States is likely to step up pressure on nations it suspects of supporting terrorism in its quest to wipe out the last vestiges of terrorism. It will need to exercise extreme caution, however, if it is to accomplish this goal without creating further mistrust in the Islamic world. The United States will face a very different reaction if it takes the war against terrorism to

failing nations or so-called rogue states such as Somalia, Sudan and Iraq. While the Islamic world may accept the defeat of the Taliban and al-Qaeda as necessary to maintain order, it is unlikely to stand by silently while Washington arbitrarily and unilaterally widens the scope of its police action.

At the core of the anger felt in the Islamic world is the perception that the values applied by the United States to the international order change depending on the time and circumstances, while what the ideal international society should look like remains unexplained. The United States should, above all else, offer a specific vision of the kind of order it wants to establish and maintain. It should also demonstrate that it is willing to consistently apply the same values throughout the world.

The United States is also expected to mediate in the highly volatile situations in Kashmir and the Occupied Territories in the Middle East. In view of the potential for both these flashpoints to disturb the entire world order, Washington's help will be indispensable, particularly in Kashmir where three nuclear powers – India, Pakistan and China – all have conflicting interests. The equal distance the United States maintains between itself and the neighboring nations representing the traditions of Hinduism, Islam, and Confucianism favors U.S. mediation.

The Palestinian issue will be a tougher nut to crack. It is almost impossible to expect absolute neutrality from the United States considering the power of the Jewish lobby in U.S. domestic politics and the American patronage of Israel during the Cold War. In addition, the Islamic world is suspicious of Israel's links with the West, which they see as a Judeo-Christian cultural alliance. Many in the Islamic world agree that it is futile to appeal for the consistent application of values, such as justice and fairness, when two peoples on one side of a conflict, such as Americans and Israelis, are psychologically and culturally so close. It is only natural, then, that U.S. efforts to mediate the Palestinian issue should be criticized in the Islamic world where frustration goes hand in hand with resignation. In turn, the United States can prove its credentials as the guardian of the ideal international order by continuing to try to mediate despite the criticism. Doing so would enable the United States to dispel at least some of the mistrust felt in the Islamic world. It should offer a vision of peace between the Palestinians and Israelis and lay down rules, acceptable to both sides, that will turn that vision into a reality.

Ikeda is a professor of area studies at Toyo Eiwa University

Supremacy Leads to Vulnerability in U.S. Foreign Policy

By Jun Tsubouchi

The September 11 attacks on the United States and the events that unfolded in the aftermath raised a multitude of questions in both practical and theoretical realms of international politics, economics and foreign policy. As events progress, not only the United States but the world at large is amidst an explosion of debate, much of which carries often intriguing implications. By venturing too deeply into philosophical or cultural speculation, however, we are in danger of losing sight of the issues at hand. What deserves closer observation is a simple yet paramount problem – it is, ironically, the marked supremacy itself of the United States that serves as the country's greatest vulnerability, and, in turn, a cause of instability in the international community. This argument differs fundamentally from the more familiar notion that the United States provokes antipathy because it is the world's only real winner. It is, perhaps, a better starting point to ask why the United States was ever allowed to attain such an unfavorably dominant status in the first place.

Roughly a decade since the Cold War ended, the United States has become the world's sole superpower – politically, economically and militarily. The power of American slogans of "democracy" and "market economy" served to eliminate the vital tension that had traditionally existed between universal and endemic value systems. American influence permeated throughout the world, often to the point of boorish brutality. Yet to lay blame for this state of affairs on stereotypical American arrogance is simplistic at

best. Such arguments are one-sided and unconstructive. In a world where states function according to the pursuit of individual national interests, to call on the United States alone to exercise self-restraint and accept an obligation to moral standards would be a fallacy. Such is the irony in the outspoken demands of the vehemently anti-American for a morally upright U.S. foreign policy.

By and large, and throughout history, states have functioned according to the drive to pursue maximum self-interest. As divergent interests collide, however, states are forced into adjustment and restraint. Though not morally inclined, such a system has resulted in a certain degree of order and harmony within the international community. Particularly in an era where multipolarization and interdependence co-exist (as opposed to, say, that of the Roman empire), such a system of balance is of particular importance to a modern hegemonic state. The weakness of today's America lies in its inability to undergo any such adjustment due to its own incomparable supremacy – allowing, indeed, *forcing* the United States to pursue a single-minded race for national interest in which there are no other competitors. A hegemonic power's eminent supremacy and its consequent solitude deprive it of flexibility between thought and action, and erode its capacity to utilize a logical decision making process it could otherwise rely on. Gradually, as if to push itself into a self-erected dead-end, the supremacy and solitude of the hegemonic power destabilize the entire international community.

By similar logic, it becomes clear that the dominance of the United States has harmed the study of international politics itself as a method of explaining and predicting international relations. It is no exaggeration to say that the study of today's international politics is more precisely described as "American international politics." International politics was cultivated in post-World War II America with the help of researchers who had fled the war in Europe. During the Cold War, with the U.S. taking the lead of the western world, it was the overlapping of American foreign policy and nuclear strategies that contributed to the development of current theories. With few exceptions, the study of international relations in Europe as well as in Japan has consisted of the reading of American works, and it is clear that this U.S.-centered perspective has remained unchanged to the present. Though the studies of regional issues have become commonplace, when theorizing the framework that clarifies international politics, studies by American experts continue to maintain an overwhelmingly dominant presence.

The point is that American studies in international politics simply cannot elude the pervading influence of American perspective. Despite the fact that the world has been blessed with a diversity of thoughts, each a unique source of wisdom, and despite the ultimate challenge offered in mobilizing such diversity, the "dominance" of America serves, though unintentionally, as the ultimate obstacle. Within the distinct setting of the

Cold War, America as the leader of the western world did not find this to be a particular malady. Yet in the present, and looking toward the future, based solely on a framework bolstered by American thought, it is unlikely that the anatomy of international relations can be adequately portrayed. In contemplating how to deal with, for example, the changing existence of China, or the Islamic world, it would not only be inadequate but increasingly dangerous to depend solely on tenets of American thought.

Will the impact of September 11 change the course of the United States and American foreign policy sufficiently for Washington to overcome the vulnerability supremacy has caused? It is likely to take a few more years before we are able to answer that question. Perhaps more important is the realization that it is far too simplistic to expect the United States to overcome that vulnerability independently. Realistically, Europe and Japan must utilize available resources to form a constructive counterbalance to the United States. More than just an empty expectation, the creation of such a structure is a difficult yet necessary duty of international society within an increasing anti-American world.

Jun Tsubouchi is an associate professor of international relations at Yamanashi University. He is currently a Fulbright fellow at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

HPI Research Forum

October 2, 2001

History and Social Structure of Islamic Fundamentalism

Title: "Background of Terror in the U.S.: the World of 'Islamic Fundamentalism' and its Infiltration into Eurasia"

Speaker: Akira Matsunaga, research fellow, East-West Institute; research associate, Sasakawa Peace Foundation

To promote a better understanding of the September 11 terrorist attacks in the United States, Matsunaga highlighted the following points: The geographical and historical characteristics of Afghanistan and the growth of Islamic fundamentalism, anti-Western sentiment in the Islamic world and the failure of U.S. foreign policy, and the direction of Japan's policy on Afghanistan.

For centuries, Afghanistan has been a meeting point between East and West, a place where people from diverse backgrounds have gathered to socialize and exchange information. However, as a junction, both literally for transport and figuratively for cultures, Afghanistan has had its share of problems. Since the time of the Silk Road, it has been renowned for its tradition of looking after guests and people in trouble. In the 1930s, a minister of pilgrimage in Saudi Arabia who decided to devote himself to Islamic fundamentalism took refuge in Afghanistan. It seems that Afghanistan harbored Osama bin Laden not only because of his Islamic fundamentalism but also because of this tradition of hospitality. The country has its share of structural problems, namely, poverty and regional opposition to strong central government behind the growth of Islamic fundamentalism in Afghanistan and throughout central Asia.

It can be said that U.S. policy in Afghanistan has failed. After Soviet troops invaded Afghanistan, the United States provided arms and funds to anti-Soviet forces. But when the Soviets withdrew in 1980, Washington, too, ended its involvement in the country. Clearly, the United States did not have a long-term strategy for Afghanistan. If Washington should attempt to force its values on Afghanistan or become preoccupied with short-term problems such as drug trafficking and extremism, while ignoring structural problems such as poverty, anti-American sentiment inside Afghanistan would escalate. If that should happen, it would be far more difficult for the United States to establish the kind of international order it favors.

Looking back on relations between Japan and the Islamic world, it is possible to identify a tendency for Japan to take advantage of those relations even before World War II. After the war, however, this approach disappeared. Japanese experts on Islam, who were seen as having been meddlesome, were deliberately no longer involved in Japan's policy toward the Middle East. After the Gulf War, some began to reassert their influence, but they remain small in number. The friendly feelings many people in the Islamic world have toward Japan should be seen as an asset. Japan must adopt a broad, strategic approach toward Afghanistan, bearing in mind the high level of goodwill that exists between the two nations.

By Nobumasa Akiyama, assistant professor at HPI

October 25, 2001

Bringing China into a Regional Security Framework

Title: "Coordinating U.S. and Japanese Responses to Chinese Military Modernization"

Speaker: Benjamin L. Self, senior associate, Henry L. Stimson Center

Self discussed how the Japan-U.S. alliance could stabilize the Northeast Asian region as China modernizes its military – a potential challenge to the international order. Although China says it has neither the intention nor the capability to rival U.S. power on a global scale, it will soon have the military capability to extend its influence into the neighboring areas, including the Taiwan Strait. In that sense, it has already offered us a glimpse of how it may challenge the international order. In response, Japan and the United States must cooperate to hedge China's increasing influence. Here, to hedge means not only to contain Chinese military power but also to prevent its growth and try to circumvent and decrease tension.

Self described the aims as follows: To maintain forces to respond to the growth of the People's Liberation Army; to help curb the mounting costs of Chinese military power by offering financial incentives; and to intensify the Japan-U.S. alliance by, for example, strengthening both countries' ability to defend sea lanes. An important aim is not to deter China *per se*, but to ward off a Chinese challenge, support democracy and reject a link between Japan's imperialistic past and present international security issues. The United States should defend the reliability of Japan.

But China should not be cornered. To avoid that, Japan and the United States should help bring China into the regional security order so that both Japan and the United States may build positive security relations with Beijing. The military power of Japan and the United States is needed to counter a Chinese challenge, but not to the extent that China sees it as a direct threat. Specifically, we need to address Chinese concerns over U.S. missile defense plans and reconstruction of its nuclear defense strategy.

In addition, confidence-building and establishment of a security community should both take the Japan-U.S. alliance as their starting point. Relations between Japan and the United States should be strengthened so China will be unable to oust Japan from its position as the United States' most important partner. Efforts to stabilize security relations with China and accelerate its integration into the regional order should commence on the basis of the Japan-U.S. alliance.

Self's speech was followed by a debate on the future direction of the Japan-U.S. alliance, relations between the United States and China, and the security order in Northeast Asia.

By Nobumasa Akiyama, assistant professor at HPI

U.S.-Middle East Relations after the War in Afghanistan

Title: "The War in Afghanistan and its Implications in the Islamic World"

Speaker: Daiji Sadamori, staff writer, Foreign News Department, The Asahi Shimbun

Following the HPI Research Forum held on October 2, we invited Sadamori, a journalist and expert on Middle East and U.S. affairs, to talk about the September 11 terrorist attacks and their aftermath. The following is a summary of his speech:

How has the international situation changed since the September 11 terrorist attacks? First, we must decide whether or not the terrorist attacks constituted a new kind of war, dubbed as "asymmetrical warfare." The number of victims was certainly greater than in previous terrorist atrocities. However, hijacking airliners and suicide attacks had happened before, and the similar patterns abound in the past conflicts. The September 11 attacks, though, were new in that the hijackers deliberately crashed fuel-laden aircraft. They did not live to see the results of their efforts, but it may be said that they succeeded. It may not be right to describe the attacks as a "new war," but we must nevertheless be vigilant against similar attacks on such targets as large oil tankers.

The terrorist attacks and the Gulf War had different consequences. First of all, there was no oil shock this time. Washington's strategy in the Middle East is said to have three pillars: stable oil prices, the maintenance of the status quo in the oil-producing countries in the Gulf, and the security of Israel. None of these has been affected by the events of September 11. Furthermore, the United States did not invoke the causes of humanity or democracy during the Gulf War because the nations involved, such as Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, were not democracies. If the United States had stated such ideals, it would have been rightly accused of hypocrisy. This time, however, President George W. Bush has talked of democratic government for Afghanistan, though no democratic government has ever existed in the Arab world or the Middle East.

Furthermore, the Arab world reacted to the recent attacks as one, whereas it was divided over the Gulf War. The United States and Britain should understand that Osama bin Laden has been a hero in the Arab world for some time and that his beliefs are still shared by a number of people. The Arabian Peninsula, where Mecca and Medina are located, is the most important and holy place for Muslims. Bin Laden says that the presence in

Saudi Arabia of the U.S. military, most of whose members are non-Muslims, is unacceptable. On the emotional level, many Muslims agree with him.

Third, there are problems with defining terrorism. The attacks, which were targeted at civilians, were of course an affront to humanity. But there exists another view of terrorism in the Islamic world that holds that terrorist attacks against Israel, seen as the unlawful occupier of Palestine, are a justified element of the struggle for liberation. The military wing of the Islamic fundamentalist group, Hamas, has repeatedly carried out suicide attacks, while other parts of the organization are active in the medical and welfare fields, of which many Arab governments can not afford to take care. Any attack on Hamas by the United States in its war against terrorism could be regarded by some as a declaration of war against the entire Islamic world.

Fourth, an unprecedented propaganda war is being waged in the current conflict. U.S. officials have often refused to answer questions in news conferences, saying that details of the operation need to be kept secret to protect their Special Forces and troops. The media blackout makes it easier for the United States to manipulate information. The country's media should assert their independence, but instead they are self-restraining. This is partly because the shock caused by the September 11 attacks is still keenly felt, but also because media organizations fear being labeled unpatriotic if they question Washington's actions.

The fifth point concerns the U.S. military presence in Saudi Arabia. About 500,000 U.S. troops were deployed in Saudi Arabia during the Gulf War. About 5,000 still remain there, generating resentment in the region. Those troops have kept a low profile since terrorists bombed barracks in Dhahran in 1996, killing 19 U.S. soldiers and injuring dozens more. Although the Saudi government refused U.S. requests to use the Prince Sultan Air Base in Saudi Arabia for its campaign in Afghanistan, the base is certainly being used as the campaign's central command center.

The United States could choose to withdraw its troops from Saudi Arabia. If that should happen, the terrorists would lose one of their justifications for attacking the United States. The Pentagon has an alternative plan that involves deployment of U.S. troops in Qatar instead of Saudi Arabia. The mere suggestion by Washington that it is ready to pull out of Saudi Arabia would have an immediate and favorable effect in the entire Islamic world.

Japan has a unique, if not ideal, opportunity to improve its relations with Saudi Arabia and to expand its economic activities there. For its part, Saudi Arabia continues to distance itself from the United States.

By Kazumi Mizumoto, associate professor at HPI

Research Project on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century

Discussions Preceding the Preparation of the Final Report

Members of HPI Research Project on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century met four times between September and December 2001. The project will publish a final report, tentatively titled "Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century," later this year. Members discussed the outline of each chapter. Some authors presented their own reports, while others presented those written by foreign contributors. Discussions followed each presentation. The following are the highlights of the discussions, accompanied by the tentative title of each chapter:

● 14th meeting (September. 14)

Topic: Chapter 1 "Nuclear Disarmament: From the 20th Century to the 21st Century"

Speaker: Mitsuru Kurosawa, professor, Osaka School of International Public Policy, Osaka University

Over the past 10 years, nuclear disarmament has made a certain amount of progress, including the conclusion of nuclear weapon reduction agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union/Russia. However, in the second half of the last decade, nuclear disarmament took a step backward due to the delay in the ratification of START II, Washington's refusal to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and India and Pakistan's nuclear tests.

Nevertheless, the final document adopted at the 2000 Nuclear Non-Proliferation (NPT) Review Conference, which included an "unequivocal undertaking" to eliminate nuclear arsenals, could serve as the basis for promoting further nuclear disarmament.

The challenge for the international community in the coming decade is to push forward with nuclear disarmament initiatives through the development of multilateral frameworks, including the CTBT, the further

promotion of U.S.-Russian nuclear reduction agreements, and diminishing the role of nuclear arsenals.

Topic: Chapter 19 "The United Nations and Nuclear Disarmament – Overcoming a Lost Opportunity"

Speaker: Masamichi Kamiya, visiting research fellow, Hiroshima Peace Institute

In the first half of the 1990s, the United Nations did not play a particularly active role in nuclear disarmament. This was because of the progress made in bilateral disarmament negotiations between the United States and Russia, and the approach of former U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who attached greater importance to peacekeeping operations. However, the U.N. Disarmament Commission (UNDC) and the Conference on Disarmament (CD) have drawn up catch-up initiatives in the disarmament sphere, all supported by current U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan.

The United Nations is now the most important forum for nuclear disarmament negotiations. The U.N. secretary general, the U.N. General Assembly, UNDC and CD should work together to further promote nuclear disarmament.

● 15th meeting (October. 12)

Topic: Chapter 10 "Nuclear Weapons Issues in the Middle East"

Speaker: Hirofumi Tosaki, research fellow, Center for the Promotion of Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, Japan Institute of International Affairs

While Israel is regarded as a *de facto* nuclear-weapon state, some states in the Middle East also possess other weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and/or seek to acquire nuclear arsenals. Therefore, in this region, it is

necessary to solve the nuclear weapons issues, together with other WMD ones. However, it seems quite difficult to achieve such a goal in one leap. Step-by-step, comprehensive, and long-term efforts by regional countries are vital towards achieving comprehensive peace and solving the issues surrounding nuclear weapons and other WMDs.

Topic: Chapter 18 “Denuclearization in the Southern Hemisphere; Prospects for Interregional Cooperation”

Speaker: Yoko Ogashiwa, associate professor, Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University

By the 1990s, nuclear-free zone treaties had been concluded in four regions in the Southern Hemisphere; Latin America, the South Pacific, Southeast Asia, and Africa. The U.N. General Assembly had earlier adopted resolutions calling for the denuclearization of the Southern Hemisphere. The nuclear powers responded differently to the declaration; Some supported it, while others opposed it or abstained from voting. Greater cooperation is needed among the four regions if a nuclear-free Southern Hemisphere is to be realized.

Topic: Chapter 7 “Present at the Creation: Nuclear Weapon Policies and Nuclear Disarmament Policies of the United Kingdom” (Author: Dr. John Simpson)

Speaker: Masamichi Kamiya

Simpson offered an analysis of Britain’s nuclear policies from the 1940s to the 1990s. He then offered his views on the country’s approach to nuclear disarmament through 2012 in light of external factors, including Britain’s relations with the United States and Europe, as well as domestic factors such as the economy and divergent opinions over disarmament. He suggested that Britain could become “a nuclear power without nuclear weapons.”

Topic: Chapter 5 “Nuclear and Nuclear Disarmament Policies of Russia” (Author: Ambassador Roland M. Timerbaev)

Speaker: Kazumi Mizumoto, associate professor, Hiroshima Peace Institute

Timerbaev offered a detailed description of Russia’s nuclear disarmament policies, including the reduction of strategic nuclear arms achieved in the 1990s. He made several suggestions for Russia to act on over the next decade, including promoting nuclear reductions in cooperation with the seven other nuclear-weapon states, including India, Pakistan, and Israel, while maintaining Russia’s position as a nuclear superpower on a par with the United States. He wrote that international organizations should control the nuclear arsenals of these nations, with abolition in mind, under the supervision of the U.N. Security Council.

● 16th meeting (November. 12)

Topic: Chapter 20 “The Role of Japanese and International NGOs in Nuclear Disarmament”

Speaker: Hiromichi Umebayashi, president, The Peace Depot, Inc.

NGOs have played an important role in nuclear disarmament. In the 1990s, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) issued an advisory dwelling on the illegality of nuclear weapons in response to NGO pressure. NGOs were also involved in the 1995 and 2000 NPT review conferences.

NGO campaigners drew up a model nuclear weapon convention to ban such weapons, urging the United Nations and states to start negotiation. In Japan, NGO members now have opportunities to speak directly with Foreign Ministry officials. NGOs will have to get the “unequivocal undertaking” to eliminate nuclear arsenals to be fulfilled with an eye on the next NPT review conference, while addressing issues at both the national and regional levels.

Topic: Chapter 2 “Toward Nuclear Disarmament” (Author: Rebecca Johnson)

Speaker: Mitsuru Kurosawa

Taking the abolition of intermediate range nuclear forces (INF) in 1987 as an important watershed in arms control, Johnson outlined the disarmament progress made since the INF Treaty. The 1990s provided opportunities for partnership between governments and NGOs, who played significant roles in bringing about negotiations on the CTBT, influencing the outcome of the NPT Review Conferences of 1995 and 2000, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), the Canberra Commission, and the strategies utilized by the New Agenda Coalition (NAC). Johnson noted that despite the recent deterioration of political conditions for NGO participation in information exchange and policy-making, it remained civil society’s mission to continue to warn of the dangers still posed by nuclear weapons and to seek effective ways to bring about progress in nuclear disarmament.

● 17th meeting (December. 28)

Topic: Chapter 3 “Shifting Paradigms: The Offense/Defense Debate and Nuclear Disarmament” (Author: Dr. Cathleen Fisher)

Speaker: Nobumasa Akiyama, assistant professor, Hiroshima Peace Institute

Since the end of the Cold War, the role of weapon systems has gradually changed from an offensive to a defensive one, a trend illustrated best by the U.S. national missile defense (NMD) program. However, this paradigm shift, which is incomplete and unstable, combined with the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in the United States, has contributed to a slowing of the movement toward nuclear disarmament. The progress of international arms control and disarmament will be determined by how Washington’s NMD program develops and how the international community views the shift from offensive to defensive weapons.

Topic: Chapter 8 “French Nuclear Policy – More Continuity than Change” (Author: Dr. Therese Delpech)

Speaker: Mitsuru Kurosawa

France attached less importance to nuclear weapons after the Cold War, and drastically cut its arsenal to perhaps fewer than 350 weapons, an adequate, if not ideal, reduction. Although the French government supports general and complete disarmament, it refuses to be party to multinational nuclear weapon reduction programs as long as the international political environment remains volatile. Since France still believes in nuclear weapons’ value as a deterrent, they will continue to play an important, though not central, role in the nation’s diplomatic strategies.

Topic: Chapter 11 “Nuclear Issues in North Korea”

Speaker: Nobumasa Akiyama

This chapter looks at issues surrounding the U.S.-DPRK (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea) Agreed Framework and KEDO (the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization), both of which temporarily quelled fears over North Korea’s nuclear programs. The chapter contains suggestions for diminishing the role that nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction play in North Korean policy. It also advocates reducing the risks of proliferation of WMDs by ensuring the steady implementation of the KEDO project and securing cooperation with neighboring countries, including Japan, China and Russia, as well as the United States.

Topic: Chapter 14 “Challenges of Nuclear Disarmament in Japan”

Speaker: Kazumi Mizumoto

Japan’s nuclear policy has four cornerstones: the non-nuclear principles, the nuclear umbrella, the active use of nuclear energy, and nuclear disarmament diplomacy. Until the 1990s, these principles had an uneasy coexistence. Japan’s task lies in developing comprehensive nuclear disarmament strategies while balancing the four principles.

Topic: Chapter 15 “The New Agenda Coalition Nuclear Disarmament Policies” (Author: Dr. Darach MacFhionnbhairr)

Speaker: Masamichi Kamiya

The New Agenda Coalition (NAC) was established in 1998 following efforts begun by Ireland the previous year, which brought together a number of like-minded governments concerned about the lack of resolve shown by the nuclear weapon states to eliminate their nuclear arsenals, as foreseen under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). MacFhionnbhairr describes the development of the New Agenda Declaration of 9 June 1998 and further steps by the NAC in the process leading to the successful conclusion of negotiations on the Final Document at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. He further examines the prospects for the implementation of the disarmament undertakings made in 2000 in the perspective of the review process and the next NPT Review Conference in 2005.

Topic: Chapter 16 “Ban on Nuclear Tests and Production of Nuclear Fissile Materials”

Speaker: Masahiko Asada, professor of law, Kyoto University

The prospects for the entry into force of the CTBT are very poor. However, it has imposed a legal obligation not to conduct nuclear test explosions (through the law of treaties) and provided a verification mechanism for monitoring the compliance with it even though the Treaty has yet to come into effect. Nonetheless, given the provisional nature of the situation described above, the early entry into force of the CTBT is essential. Regarding the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT), opinions are divided over the target materials and verification systems, and negotiations have not even started. Political hurdles must be removed to enable FMCT negotiations to begin as soon as possible.

By Kazumi Mizumoto, associate professor at HPI

Peace Activities and Patterns of International Intervention: A Discussion

The HPI Research Project on the Legitimacy and Rationality of New-interventionism met four times between September and December 2001. The following is a summary of the meetings:

The 11th meeting was held on September 18 at Toshi Center Hotel, Tokyo, and featured two speakers: Toshiya Hoshino, the project's leader and associate professor at the Osaka School of International Public Policy, Osaka University; and Akihiro Okochi, assistant director of the International Peace Cooperation Division of the Japanese Foreign Ministry.

In a speech about the concept of new interventionism, Hoshino categorized military interventions according to their motives and theoretical justifications and analyzed how ongoing discussions on the legality of existing international law, the political legitimacy of intervention, and the logic of power and interest interact to lead to an act of intervention.

Pointing out that the existing collective security system based on the U.N. Charter is designed to address conflicts between states, he argued that, when intervention in intra-state conflicts is viewed from a humanitarian viewpoint, we should subordinate national security to "human security." Based on this observation, he proposed the concept of "collective human security" to complement the current concept of U.N. Charter-based security.

In a presentation titled "International Peace Cooperation Law and New-Interventionism," Okochi discussed a future amendment to the International Peace Cooperation Law, or the so-called PKO Law, – the revised law's potential and the problems it may pose. He said the strict conditions governing Japan's participation in PKO activities are at odds with political realities and that the same strict conditions should not be imposed on the country's participation in international humanitarian relief efforts.

The indications are that, given the current international climate, the world is ready to adopt a more flexible approach to Japan's participation in PKO activities. The focus will be on the dispatch of PKO forces under Chapter 7 of the U.N. Charter and in the event that no cease-fire agreement has been reached. Under the existing law, PKO participation requires an interpretation of the law beyond the limits of its original mandate. Okochi said that this discrepancy should be addressed in the revised law.

At the 12th meeting held on October 15 at Toshi Center Hotel in Tokyo, Naoki Ishihara who had worked in the U.N. Headquarters PKO Finance Section and is now managing director of the Oral History Project of the Center of Excellence Program (COE) at the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, and Hiroshi Hayashi, chief of the research section of the Ground Self-Defense Force Staff College, spoke respectively on the "Administrative and Financial Aspects of UN Peacekeeping Operations" and the "Lessons from PKO in Cambodia and the Future of the Japanese PKO." Ishihara discussed the systemic problems posed by U.N. peacekeeping operations and how such problems are dealt with politically by the United Nations. He explained the PKO budgeting process from compilation to execution. Later, he and project members discussed the enhancement of the United Nation's PKO capabilities. Some participants noted that, while stronger administrative functions are important, the most crucial factor is the member countries' commitments to provide human, physical, and financial resources. More efficient PKO activities will be impossible without explicit consensus on such commitments.

Hayashi based his presentation on his PKO experiences in Cambodia and his research at the National Institute for Defense Studies, which examined major countries' plans for the dispatch of PKO troops. On the

dispatch of Japanese Self-Defense Forces, Hayashi said that ambiguities surrounding their use of arms had made their missions more difficult. However, he added that as long as the restrictions on Japan's PKO activities remained, it might as well continue with its own approach, as all countries adopt individual approaches toward the dispatch of PKO troops. He said Japan should give more consideration to active engagement in Asia where it is expected to play a bigger role.

At the 13th meeting, held on November 5 at Toshi Center Hotel in Tokyo, Yukie Osa, a project member and secretary general of the Association for Aid and Relief, and Hideaki Shinoda, research associate at the Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University, made presentations.

Osa reported on findings from a field study she conducted in Peshawar, Pakistan, on relief work for Afghan refugees. Hundreds of thousands of refugees have fled to Pakistan since the United States launched air strikes against Afghanistan, but most are living illegally in Pakistan's tribal area and so are not officially recognized as refugees. Fearing internal instability, the Pakistani government has designated the tribal area a refugee camp. However, security is poor since the area is effectively off-limits to the government and foreigners. As a result, it is extremely difficult to conduct relief work there. The large number of land mines that remain in Afghanistan further complicate humanitarian relief efforts.

In a speech on "The Issues and Implications of the 'War against Terrorism'," Shinoda placed Washington's use of force against al-Qaeda in an international context and gave his opinion on how U.S. actions would influence the future of international politics. His speech was followed by a discussion on the implications of the use of force in terms of both international law and international political realities, and how best to combine military action with humanitarian aid now that the Taliban regime has fallen.

The 14th meeting, held on December 14 at the Hiroshima Peace Institute, featured speeches by Professor Hiroshi Yoda of Kyoto Women's University, and Tomoko Kase, a former official of the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) at the Sarajevo Office of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). In this presentation on "Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and Its Democratization Strategy: A Clash of Civilizations?" Yoda discussed how useful such concepts as democracy and democratization strategies would be in the Islamic world, given their Christian origins and in light of OSCE's efforts to promote democracy and human rights in the Balkans where both Christian and Muslim sensibilities must be taken into account. He also explained how some Islamic nations define democracy in their constitutions.

Kase drew on her experience in the field to address issues arising from the growing number and variety of actors in humanitarian activities. She recommended improving efficiency through inter-organizational cooperation and using funds more effectively by avoiding overlaps between projects. She cited a number of problems that could be solved through better coordination, including the profit motive found in some humanitarian organizations, the involvement in projects for self-serving purposes, and the unequal distribution of aid resources among regions. It was also pointed out that measures are needed to prevent the over-dependence of aid recipients on humanitarian organizations.

By Nobumasa Akiyama, assistant professor at HPI

Recent Publications by HPI Researchers

President • Haruhiro Fukui

- "Japan," in Mark Kesselman, Joel Krieger, and William A. Joseph, eds., *Introduction to Comparative Politics* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 2000), pp. 187-239. Co-author: Shigeko N. Fukai.
- Review of Michael J. Green and Patrick M. Cronin, eds., *The U.S.-Japan Alliance: Past, Present, and Future*, in *Journal of Japanese Studies* 26:2 (Summer 2000), pp. 520-526.
- "Introduction," in Lowell Dittmer, Haruhiro Fukui, and Peter N.S. Lee, eds., *Informal Politics in East Asia* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge

University Press, 2000), pp. 1-19.

- "Informal Politics of Japanese Diet Elections: Cases and Interpretations," in *Informal Politics in East Asia* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 2000), pp. 23-41. Co-author: Shigeko N. Fukai.
- Review of Aurelia George Mulgan, *The Politics of Agriculture in Japan*, in *Social Science Japan Journal* 4:1 (April 2001), pp. 127-131.
- "Japan," in Joel Krieger, ed., *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*, 2nd edition (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 449-452.

Professor ● Christian P. Scherrer

- *Indigene Völker und Staat: Von Krieg und äußerer Einmischung zum Frieden durch Autonomie. Der Fall Nicaragua* [Indigenous peoples and state: From conflict and foreign interference to pacification through autonomy], 2nd ed. (Moers: IFEK, 2000).
- “Teaching and Researching Genocide from a Comparative Perspective,” in *The Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust* (Proceedings of Conference on Education, Remembrance and Research) (Stockholm: Regeringskansliet / Svensk Information, 2000), pp. 319-321.
- “The Challenge of Genocide Prevention,” *Prevent Genocide* (Washington DC, 2000), at: <http://preventgenocide.org/prevent/scherrer.htm>
- “Ethno-Nationalismus als globales Phänomen” [Ethno-nationalism as a global phenomenon], in Rupert Moser, ed., *Die Bedeutung des Ethnischen im Zeitalter der Globalisierung* [The significance of ethnicity in the era of globalization] (Bern: Haupt, 2000), pp. 17-90.
- “Structural Prevention and Conflict Management, Imperatives of,” in Lester Kurtz, ed., *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*. Vol. 3 (San Diego, London, etc.: Academic Press, 2000), pp. 381-429.
- “Die Vereinten Nationen und die Menschenrechte – von Fall zu Fall” [The United Nations and human rights – from case to case], *Widerspruch* 19 (Jg., Nr. 38, Jan. 2000), pp. 22-35.
- *War in the Congo* (Moers: IRECOR, 2001).
- Free Nagaland – NE India’s Unsolved Question (Analysis of current deadlock and compilation of interviews), *ECOR 20* (Moers: IFEK-IRECOR, 2001).
- *Racism and Xenophobia in the Enlarging Europe. Findings and Essentials for Anti-Racist Strategies* (Moers: IFEK-IRECOR 2001).
- *Peace Research for the 21st Century: A Call for Reorientation and New Research Priorities*. (Moers: IFEK-IRECOR, 2001) (Short version at: <http://www.transcend.org/>).
- “Rassismus, Fremdenfeindlichkeit und Diskriminierung in Europa. Zwölf Schritte für eine antirassistische Strategie” [Racism, xenophobia and discrimination in Europe. A twelve-step anti-racist strategy], *Widerspruch* 21 (Jg., Nr. 41, Dezember 2001), pp. 111-122.
- “Interstaatlicher Konflikt, Ethnizität und Massengewalt” [Intra-state conflict, ethnicity and mass violence], in Christoph Butterwegge and Gudrun Hentges, eds., *Migration und Flucht im Zeichen der Globalisierung* [Migration and refugee movements in the framework of globalization] (Opladen: Leske & Budrich, 2001), pp. 47-61.
- *Structural Prevention of Ethnic Violence. Regulating Conflict through Autonomy, Nationality Policies, and Self-governance* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002).
- *Genocide and Crisis in Central Africa: Conflict Roots, Mass Violence, and Regional War* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002).
- *Far from Oromia? Ethiopia’s existential antagonism remains virulent* (Analysis and compilation of interviews), *ECOR 21* (Moers: IFEK-IRECOR, 2002).
- *War against the Oromo and the Mass Exodus from Ethiopia. Refugees Voices* (Analysis and background to political crisis and forced migration) (Berlin: EPD, 2002). Co-author: Mekuria Bulcha.
- “Some Elements of a Theory of Ethno-nationalism: Causes, Structural Features, Remedies and Its Application on the Basque Conflict,” in Juan Gutierrez and Hernández Txomin, eds., *Nationalism, Conflict and Reconciliation* (Onati: IISL 2002).

Associate Professor ● Kazumi Mizumoto

- “Japan’s nuclear-free policy and its tasks,” in Hiroshi Yamada & Gen Kikkawa, eds., *Why Are Nuclear Weapons Not Abolished?: Nuclear Weapons and International Relations* (Kyoto: Horitsubunkasha, 2000), pp. 231-244.
- “Idealism and realism in nuclear disarmament proposals: Unsolved issues of the Tokyo Forum report,” *Hiroshima Peace Science* (Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University, 2000) No. 22, pp.115-135.
- “Trends and review of nuclear issues in 1999,” a paper submitted to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum A-bomb Study Group (2000), pp.1-13.
- “No progress in nuclear disarmament without U.S.-Russia agreement,” *Asahi Shimbun*, Hiroshima local page, May 19, 2000.
- “Concrete measures for the 21st century,” *Mainichi Shimbun*, August 5, 2000.
- “How to realize nuclear elimination?” (lead essay) *Gaiko Forum* (Forum

on Foreign Affairs) No. 145 (September 2000), p.8.

- “Trends and review of nuclear issues in 2001,” a paper submitted to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum A-bomb Study Group (2001), pp. 1-18.
- NIRA Research Report No. 20000005, *Japan’s proactive peace and security strategies, including the question of the nuclear umbrella* (National Institute for Research Advancement, March 2001).
- “Conciliation efforts needed,” *Asahi Shimbun*, Hiroshima local page, September 28, 2001.
- “Nuclear issues in the 21st century and the experience of the atomic bomb,” *Heiwa Kenkyu* (Peace Studies), (The Peace Studies Association of Japan), Vol. 26 (November 2001), pp. 39-48.
- “International community’s loss of rationality: Terrorism in the U.S. and military intervention in Afghanistan,” *Peace Culture*, No. 143 (Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation, December 2001), p.3.

Assistant Professor ● Ikuko Togo

- “Recent Trends in Humanitarian Intervention and its Significance: An Inquiry into its Contribution toward Democratization and Modernization,” *Kokusai Seiji* (International Relations) Vol. 125, (October 2000), pp. 115-130.
- Shiroh Shimaya, Ikuko Togo, and Katsuya Fukuoka, *International Comparative Analysis on Topology and Transfiguration of NGO/NPO Peace-keeping and Environmental Protection Activities* (Tokyo: BOC Publishers, March 2001).
- “Humanitarian Intervention and its theory of International Politics: striving for Humane Interest based on Goodness and Justice,” *Kokusai Mondai* (International Affairs) (April 2001), pp. 15-32.
- “Scenario for ‘Reconstruction of Afghanistan’ after Taliban,” *Chuo Kouron*, (December 2001), pp. 64-69. Reprinted in Korean quarterly journal, *Japan Forum*, No. 51, pp. 82-88.

Assistant Professor ● Nobumasa Akiyama

- “Security frameworks and conflicts along the Silk Road,” *World Trend* (Institute of Developing Economies, October 2000), pp. 20-23.
- “International environment surrounding the Silk Road and Japan’s commitment” (Research Institute for Peace and Security, 2000), p. 40.
- “The geopolitical significance of Georgia,” *Research on the Possibility of the Caspian Basin as an Oil-supplying Region*, Section 2, Chapter 2 (FY 2001 Contract Research for the Agency of Natural Resources and Energy, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, Research Institute for Peace and Security, March 2001), pp. 71-86.
- “Avoiding a marriage of convenience: Thoughts on a new Japanese state – NGOs and humanitarian relief in conflict,” *Peace Studies Bulletin*, No. 20 (June 2001), pp. 15-21.
- “Positive pacifism” *PRIME* (International Peace Research Institute, Meiji Gakuin University, September 2001), pp. 68-70.
- “Terrorism and war – the role of Japan,” *Asahi Shimbun*, December 1, 2001, p. 37.

Visiting Research Fellow ● Masamichi Kamiya

- “Disarmament through small arms,” *Yomiuri Shimbun*, March 30, 2000.
- “Prospects for the NPT Review Conference,” *Asahi Shimbun*, April 11, 2000.
- “Overview of the 6th Review Conference of NPT and the role of NGOs,” *United Nations Quarterly*, No. 21 (United Nations Association for Japan, August 15, 2000), pp. 7-17.
- “NGOs’ contribution to international regulations for small arms,” *Asahi Shimbun*, May 20, 2000.
- “The U.N. Conference on Small Arms – Hiroshima’s hopes for peace,” *Chugoku Shimbun*, August 4, 2001.
- “International cooperation for regulating small arms,” *Mainichi Shimbun*, August 20, 2001.



Hello from HPI

Dr. Christian P. Scherrer Professor

Scherrer specialized in conflict and peace studies since the mid 1980s. He gained a Master's degree in ethnology, sociology, and philosophy in 1982 and a Ph. D in social science in 1985 from the University of Bern. He was the head of the Ethnic Conflicts Research Project (ECOR) since 1987 and served as an international expert and consultant for NGOs and

U.N. organizations in the 1990s, as a senior researcher at Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (1997-99) and as research director at the Institute for Research on Ethnicity and Conflict Resolution (1999-2001). He was appointed professor at the Hiroshima Peace Institute effective on January 1, 2002.

Scherrer has contributed to theory and applications of peace research. During the period 1987-92, he conducted field research on ethnic nationalism in the Horn of Africa (focusing on Ethiopia, Eritrea and Sudan), Southeast Asia (mainly Burma, northern regions of Thailand and Yunan, China) and Central America (Nicaragua, Panama, and Guatemala) and Mexico. He investigated genocide in Rwanda in 1994-95 for the United Nations' High Commissioner for Human Rights and conducted in 1996, 1998 and 2001 fact finding missions and research in Tanzania,

Rwanda, and Burundi for UNESCO, UNV, UNDP, OECD-DAC (Development Assistance Committee), the government of Rwanda and IRECOR (the Institute for Research on Ethnicity and Conflict Resolution).

On the basis of his extensive empiric research Scherrer started to reevaluate and revise global conflict indexes, definitions and theoretical approaches. Recently, he proposed a wholesale reorientation of peace research, which aims at constructing a new comprehensive theory of contemporary mass violence and which involves a fusion of polemological research (on war) with comparative genocide research, studies into mass murder, and what has been named "democide" and "politicide," i.e., state terrorism and slaughter by government.

Scherrer states: "By experiencing life in the world's most deadly conflict areas I learned that there is nothing more valuable than peace and justice. But it was in Rwanda in 1994 where I investigated the worst crime against humanity in the late 20th century. This deeply shocking experience changed my life. Ever since I have tried to contribute to the prevention of violence and genocide and to the peaceful resolution of conflict - not only on a theoretical level but also in practice. Such activities range from policy advisory services to consultancies for the United Nations and other international organizations, as well as advocacy for threatened groups and civic organizations in a variety of countries and regions around the world."

DIARY

Nov. 1 - Feb. 28, 2002

Nov. 1-2 Nobumasa Akiyama attends Japan-Russia atomic energy cooperation workshop organized by Center for Global Communications (GLOCOM).

Nov. 1 Kazumi Mizumoto attends second meeting of working group of Committee for Studying Peace Policies, organized by Hiroshima Prefecture and National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA).

Nov. 5 HPI's project team on the Legitimacy and Rationality of New-interventionism holds its 13th meeting.

Nov. 10 HPI President Haruhiro Fukui delivers lecture, "Differences between Japanese and American universities: Systems, administration and personnel management," at Chugoku-Shikoku branch meeting of Japanese Association for American Studies, at Hiroshima University.

Nov. 12 HPI's project team on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century holds its 16th meeting.

Nov. 15 Akiyama delivers lecture at Hiroshima Nishi Rotary Club.

Nov. 16-18 Fukui delivers lecture at symposium on English training at college, held at Okinawa National Youth House and organized by National Institute of Multimedia Education.

Nov. 18-19 Mizumoto, Akiyama and Masamichi Kamiya attend 4th International Symposium on Korea and the Search for Peace in Northeast Asia, organized by United Nations Trust Fund (UNTF), at Kyoto International Conference Hall.

Nov. 20-22 Ikuko Togo attends international symposium on "Peace Education in Asia-Pacific Conflict Zones" in Seoul, South Korea, sponsored by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU). She gives lecture titled, "What East Asia should do toward building sustainable peace: 'The century of human rights' from Asia."

Nov. 21 Fukui attends meeting at Radiation Effects Research Foundation. Kamiya visits Arms Control and Disarmament Division of Japanese Foreign Ministry, and discusses 56th United Nations General Assembly 1st committee.

Nov. 22-24 Akiyama attends meeting on "The United Nations in the global governance era: East Asia and world peace," sponsored by Asia University Federation in Bangkok, Thailand.

Nov. 23 Fukui gives lecture at Peace Youth Summit, organized by Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in Tokyo.

Nov. 24-25 Fukui delivers lecture "Japanese politics and peace in Asia" at Korean Association for the Study of Contemporary Japan in Korea.

Nov. 27 Akiyama speaks at Hamamatsu Rotary Club.

Nov. 30 Mizumoto attends workshop on arms control, disarmament and security, co-sponsored by Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) and Center for Promotion of Disarmament and Non-proliferation.

Guest: Yoshifumi Okamura, director of Arms Control and Disarmament Division, Japanese Foreign Ministry on "Recent trends in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation."

Dec. 11-13 Akiyama attends NGO conference in Tokyo on the reconstruction of Afghanistan.

Dec. 14 Mizumoto attends second meeting of Committee for Studying Peace Policies organized by Hiroshima Prefecture and National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA).

HPI's project team on the Legitimacy and Rationality of New-interventionism holds its

14th meeting.

Dec. 21 HPI holds research forum. Daiji Sadamori, staff writer in the foreign news department of The Asahi Shimbun gives lecture on "The War in Afghanistan and its Implications in the Islamic World."

Dec. 28 HPI's project team on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century holds its 17th meeting.

Jan. 10 Mizumoto attends inaugural joint conference at HPI of Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy, China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) and HPI.

Jan. 25 HPI's project team on Nuclear Disarmament in the 21st Century holds its 18th meeting.

Jan. 29-30 Fukui serves as a commentator at workshop of National Institute of Multimedia Education in Chiba.

Jan. 29 Mizumoto attends third meeting of working group of Committee for Studying Peace Policies organized by Hiroshima Prefecture and National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA).

Feb. 5 Fukui speaks on the problems of peace in the 21st century at Hiroshima City Hall Auditorium.

Mizumoto and Kamiya attend inaugural conference on "The future of conflict prevention in Asia and the Japan-China relationship," co-sponsored by Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy, China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) and HPI and held at International House of Japan in Tokyo.

Feb. 7-15 Akiyama visits Japanese Embassy in Vienna, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Austrian Institute for International Affairs (OIIP) and meets staff members of Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in Vienna, and visits U.N. High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Finnish Foreign Ministry, and Tampere Peace Research Institute in Helsinki, and attends seminar on East Timor in London.

Feb. 8 Mizumoto attends World Partnership Forum in Hiroshima organized by Japanese Foreign Ministry, and Hiroshima Prefecture and Hiroshima City.

Feb. 17 Mizumoto gives lecture on the role of Hiroshima in the 21st century as part of Hiroshima Project organized by Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.

Feb. 20 Mizumoto attends Peace Policies Symposium organized by Hiroshima Prefecture and National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA).

Feb. 21 Akiyama gives presentation on Japan's Security policy after the September 11 terrorist attacks at international conference, "Leaping for the Future: Peace and Prosperity in the Korean Peninsula" organized by Kim Dae-Jung Peace Foundation, Seoul, Korea.

— Visitors to HPI —

Nov. 15 Fay Beauchamp, professor of English, Community College of Philadelphia.
Dec. 20 Liu Jinqin, Zhang Fengzhou, Fei Yongyi, Ru Guangrong and Wang Yidi, all are members of Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament.

Jan. 11 Purnendra Jain, professor of Adelaide University.

Jan. 22 Subramani, professor of literature at University of South Pacific in Fiji.

Jan. 25 Chung-Suk Koh and four other officials of Jeju Development Institute.

Jan. 28 Michiko Tsuchihashi and three other officials of Hiroshima Religious Cooperation and Peace Center (HRCP).

HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Vol.4, No.3 March 26, 2002

Copyright 2002 HPI All rights reserved

Issued by Hiroshima Peace Institute, Hiroshima City University

TEL +81-82-544-7570 FAX +81-82-544-7573

Hiroshima Mitsui Bldg. 12th Floor, 2-7-10 Otemachi, Naka-ku, Hiroshima 730-0051, JAPAN E-mail: office-peace@peace.hiroshima-cu.ac.jp

Printed by Tokatoo Print Media co., ltd.