

国際交渉：核拡散防止問題と交渉教育

International Negotiation: Nuclear Nonproliferation & Negotiation Education

御手洗 昭治

Shoji Mitarai

以下の小稿は、1996年に首都ワシントンで開かれた「国際未来研究学会世界大会」の席で口頭発表した依頼原稿の一部を、大幅に加筆したものである。

1997年7月3日、米国のエネルギー省はネバダ州で第一回の臨界前実験を実施した。実験場所は、ネバダ核実験の地下300メートルに掘られた坑内に造られた長さ9メートル、幅4.5メートル、高さ3メートルの実験室で直径約30センチの円筒形実験装置の内部で高性能火薬を爆発させ、その空気圧縮により衝撃波をコイン状の核兵器用プルトニウムにあて、衝撃波の影響を約四百種類のセンサーで調べるものであった。

同省は実験終了後、「実験は成功した。既存の核兵器の劣化状態を調べる科学実験で、核爆発につながる核物質の連鎖反応は全く発生してない(毎日新聞)」と発表した。

これは、フランスが1994年に、世界の多くの市民の願いを無視する形で同国が「ムルロア環礁」核実験を行なった後の第二回目の核実験を強行したのに比べれば、規模こそ小さく批判も少なかったが、核軍縮に逆行するという反発の声が世界で高まった。

特に日本政府は、世界で最初の国として翌日の7月4日に、爆発を伴うあらゆる核実験を禁止する包括的核実験禁止条約（CTBT）の批准書を国連に送付することを決めた。

東西冷戦中は、超大国による大量殺りくの大きな危険があった。脅威は今は後退したが、核兵器が廃絶されない限り、永遠にはなく

ならない。米口の核兵器削減「交渉」などの取り組みは評価できるが、究極の目的は、交渉力をベースにすべての国から核兵器を廃絶することであろう。以下では、核拡散防止問題について、国際交渉の一端である交渉教育に関連させながら考察してみたい。

The Need for Nuclear Issue-oriented Education

When the Cold War was over, many political scientists and observers expressed optimism. But today they argue that the great and super powers are not dead yet. Rather they proclaim that with the end of the Cold War, we are entering a new age of great powers, more like the 19th century than the rest of the 20th century and we continue to live in a nuclear world. A number of countries, most prominently North Korea, are endeavoring to acquire nuclear capability. The uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear weapons can destabilize entire zones. Should a conflict occur, there is no question of the disastrous consequences which would affect the entire globe.

Much has been achieved recently in the area of nuclear disarmament following the START-I agreement in 1991 between Moscow and Washington, and the START-II agreement in 1993—limiting their nuclear warheads to 3,000–3,500 each by the year 2003 through negotiations.

A noteworthy accomplishment was the unconditional extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty at the New York Review and Extension Conference in the spring of 1995. The five full-time members of the U.N. Security Council—the U.S.A., Britain, France, Russia, and China, plus 173 other nations and Taiwan signed the NPT.

Another major breakthrough was that the Group of 7 (the world's seven richest democracies), plus Russia, agreed on

April 20, 1996 in Moscow to end nuclear tests by the fall of 1996. They also pledged to take new steps to keep nuclear material out of the wrong hands. The most notable achievement was the pledge to try to sign an agreement by September 1996—well within the deadline set by global leaders—banning all nuclear explosions. Ever since the beginning of 1994, a series of negotiations have been taking place in the context of the Geneva Disarmament Conference vis-a-vis a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty which would have a desirable effect from the global environmental standpoint.

While the setting-up of a comprehensive system of cooperative security and disarmament continues to be a central theme and requirement for all responsible nations, we should not forget that there are still at present 496 civil nuclear power plants in operation or under construction in 32 countries. Moreover, we must face the reality that the international control mechanisms such as the International Atomic Energy Agency are not equipped with the authority and resources to prevent the spread of nuclear know-how and technology. Even at the Moscow summit mentioned earlier, we should not forget the fact that there was no progress toward closing the Chernobyl power plant, site of the world's worst nuclear accident 10 years ago. The Group of 7 reaffirmed a commitment to appropriate \$3.1 billion in aid to Ukraine to close Chernobyl. Furthermore, a nuclear dispute between Washington and Moscow cast a shadow, with President Yeltsin restating that Russia would provide nuclear technology and training to Iran.

Recently, China turned up the heat on June 8, 1996, announcing it would conduct another nuclear test at its Lop Nor test site in the western Xinjing Uygur Autonomous Region and she

also detonated nuclear devices on May 15 and August 17, 1995 after joining other U.N. member nations in extending the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

The U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution last December (1995) calling for an immediate end to all nuclear testing, and France which was under severe criticism announced in January 1996 that she would end all her nuclear testing.

When considering political and technical difficulties posed by nuclear testing and disarmament nonproliferation, many still point to the fact that we will be forced to live with the existence of a minimum stock of nuclear weapons and the risk of their illegal production and expansion.

As Genscher suggests, the exercise of this stabilizing function ought to be incorporated in an international control mechanism, the guarantors of which must include countries which themselves do not possess nuclear weapons. Of course, this also could be a method of establishing trust ensuring that the power position of the nuclear countries which guarantee nonproliferation and test-bans could not be misused.

The agreement to allow the nuclear powers to maintain adequate minimum stocks of nuclear weapons is reality today. This is proof of the trust necessary to achieve nuclear disarmament in today's world. But a new nuclear arms race and nuclear powers should be prevented.

Although there are other possible resolutions to this issue outside education, the assumption of this study is that formal education is the most important single way of effecting the necessary changes by teaching about nuclear issues. It is our obligation to help youngsters and the populace in general to understand the realities of the conflicts, including the nuclear

threat, and also enhance democratic values, including the critical analysis of public policy.

Almost fifty years have passed since the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And in October 1995, when Prime Minister Murayama highlighted the Constitution in a five-minute speech to a special session of the U.N. General Assembly to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the U.N., he emphasized that “it is time we accelerated our efforts toward the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. . . . I thus find it all the more deplorable that nuclear testing continues at this juncture. I strongly call for the immediate cessation of nuclear tests (indirectly criticizing France and China at that time) . Mr. Murayama also said that “...Firmly resolved that the scourge of war must never be repeated.” Japan adopted its peace Constitution as the U.N.’s 50th anniversary coincides with the 50th year since the atomic bombing tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The arms race and attendant technological innovations have progressed at an enormous pace, but evidence of change in thinking regarding nuclear issues is still meager. A study conducted by Christie and Hanley indicates that “instead of spawning a new form of thinking, American education has tended to minimize the value of nuclear education (Nuclear War Education).”

In the mid-1980’s, the educational unit that created a commotion was “Choices.”

One of the controversial sections was reported to be “A Unit on Conflict and Nuclear War.” Their study also indicates that while other units and curricula dealing with war are available, no other educational project generated as much heat as “Choices” on the attitudes and psychological well-being of young people,

particularly-adolescents.

Providing more detailed information on the unit is beyond the scope of this paper, but it must be noted that there were some researchers who argued that the unit is politically biased and induces fear in the learner. Their argument centered around the point that the aim of the unit is to advance a left-wing position in its portrayal of the United States as the villain in the arms race. The unit also did not escape criticism from former President Reagan who used his "evil empire" speech and its rhetoric against the former Soviet Union. Gary L. Bauer, deputy undersecretary of education, portrayed the content of the unit as material intended to produce Pavlovian resistance to the notion of peace through strength.

It should be added that not only conservatives, but also liberals were in agreement that policy decisions about the nuclear war education should be based on the ways in which instruction along these lines affect learner's thoughts, feelings, and behavioral patterns. Nuclear war education, as represented by "Choices", was not harmful to adolescents. Instead participation in "Choices" turned out to be an asset to learners in many ways, the most notable of which included, what negotiation scholar Ralf White terms "fear reduction," helped promote optimism about the probability of avoiding nuclear confrontation, and decreased their frequency of worry about the possibility of nuclear war.

Final Remarks

Knowledge of nuclear issues, particularly from a psychological point of view, is important as well as worthwhile since it gives youngsters a sense of control over experiences they had while growing up in the nuclear age.

In this regard, Japan and Germany—major industrial advanced nations which have renounced the production or possession of nuclear arms—are put in a position of considerable responsibility in the field of nuclear war education.

And those who have gone through Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the Holocaust should voice their opinions because they know something about the capacity of man for suicide and self-destruction that most people don't know. As Samuel Pizar, the author of "Of Blood and Hope" and "Weapons of Peace" advocates, we have an obligation to draw some lessons more quickly than others to sound a warning to others. The world stands at the threshold of an apocalypse, and where if not from Auschwitz, and where if not from Hiroshima and Nagasaki can come the warning to humanity.

In his view, the humankind has survived until now moments of great crisis. They have survived through courage, decency, and a belief in the capacity of the mind.

Since education conducted at the elementary and secondary school levels, and at the collegiate level too, tends to lag decades behind. It is usually content with levels of knowledge attained in the preceding generation results in passing on already outmoded perceptions and attitudes. The human race, as Reischauer put it, has muddled through with reasonable success up until now with education based on a backward looking approach. But this is no longer adequate. Change is so fast and drastic that future generations, if given an education based on the outmoded perceptions and attitudes of the preceding generation, cannot adjust in time new conditions in our fast-moving society. We have witnessed many historical instances when national leaders or policy makers with the general public

behind them responded to new international political problems and global issues with obsolete perceptions and methods. This theory can be applied to nuclear issue-oriented education in the context of global conflict studies. What we need is much closer cooperation between(1) curriculum designers, textbook authors, and educators; and (2) these groups and experts in the study of negotiation in line with global studies because the gap between the leading edge of scholarship and elementary and secondary education represents a serious time lag.

Educational institutions along with the U.N. Security Council have a crucial role in accomplishing nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation. They must bear the chief responsibility for ensuring world peace and global security in the future.

Post Script

While the author was working on this article, the news-Japan has become the first of the 44 nations needed to ratify the CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty) for it to go into effect-was broadcast throughout the world on July 4, 1997.

Japan's prompt decision to promote a drive to persuade opponents to the CTBT to support the treaty came as a surprise to many foreign observers.

In fact, the CTBT, which was endorsed at the United Nation's General Assembly session last September, must be ratified by 44 nations. The five declared nuclear nations-the United States, Russia, China, France, and England-and all the other so-called nation states are believed to have nuclear clear potential before it can take effect.

Of the 44 nations, India has been extremely critical of the CTBT, for it allows the five nuclear powers to conduct nuclear tests which do not involve nuclear explosions. But the United

States, as of July 3, 1997, conducted in Nevada a nuclear test which involved nuclear explosions. In contrast to the series of nuclear tests done by France in 1994, the explosion test was much smaller in scale. However, the news created a great deal of commotion around many parts of the world.

While Pakistan has emphasized that it would not sign the treaty unless India would do so, it is heartening to hear that Japan, known to be the only nation that has suffered under nuclear attacks, has become the first of 44 nations needed to ratify the CTBT for it to go into effect. (July 30, 1997)

参考文献

Boulding, Kenneth E. "Conflict and Defense" (A General Theory (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1962).

Christie, D.J. & Murphy, T. (August 1990) From Fearful Doves to Fearless Hawks: Some Development Trends--paper presented in the 98th annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston MA.

Christie, D.J & Hanley, C.P. Some Psychological Effects of Nuclear War Education on Adolescents During Cold War II. (Political Psychology, Vol. 15, No. 2. 1994, pp. 177-198).

Genscher, Hans-Dietrich. "Editorial/Opinion: Interpreting the World (Chikyuu o Yomu)" in the Yomiuri Shinbun pp. 1-2, Dec. 18, 1995).

Kelman, Hebert C. "A Behavioral Science Perspective on the Study of War and Peace" in Perspectives on Behavioral Science edited by R. Jessor (Westview Press, Boulder Colorado, Chapter 12, 1991).

Kimmel, P.R. "Learning about Peace: Choices and the U.S. Institute of Peace as Seen from Two Different Perspectives"

- (American Psychologist, 40(5), pp. 536 -541).
- 木村汎 「ボリス・エリツイン」 (丸善 1997年).
- 毎日新聞 「米が臨界前核実験」 (1997年7月3日).
- Martel W.C.& Pendley, W. "Nuclear Coexistence" (Air War College: Studies in National Security No.1., 1994).
- Mitarai, Shoji. "Age of Transcultural Mediators: Challenges" (Tokyo: Sogo Horei, 1996). "Lecture Notes on Mediators, including Linus Pauling, Samuel Pizar, Albert Einstein, E.O. Reischauer, and others" (unpublished material at Sapporo University, 1996).
- Pauling, Linus. "No More War" (N.Y.: Dodd Mead, 1961).
- Reischauer, E.O. "Toward the 21st Century" (N.Y.: Vintage Books, 1974).
- White, Ralf. "Empathizing with Rulers of the USSR" in Political Psychology (4, No. 1, 1983).