

For Human Survival

— The Tasks of Marxism to Prevent Nuclear Extinction —

Shingo SHIBATA*

Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences, Hiroshima University

1. Implications of the 1978 U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, and its Limitations
2. The Urgent Need to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons — Marxists at the Crossroads
3. The Elimination of Nuclear Weapons and the Outlook on Overturning the System

1. Implications of the 1978 U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, and its Limitations

One sombre characteristic of our time, without precedent in the history of the human race, is the possibility that this could very well turn out to be the end of human history, a possibility that appears to be coming closer to materialization. Anyone who rejects this as based on groundless apprehensions should recall a warning given by Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein, whose sincerity and objectivity can not be called in question. "The best authorities are unanimous," they declared, "in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race." And they added, "we have found that the men who know most are the most gloomy." (Russell-Einstein Manifesto, 1955.) Now, a quarter of century later, what would Russell and Einstein have to say? The nuclear arms race accelerating at a rate beyond compare with their days! And what would they say in the

* Research Associate, Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University
Originally published in Japanese in *The 1978 Yearbook for Marxist Studies*, Tokyo 1978.

light of the present build-up of monstrous nuclear arms, a world system of omnicidal proportions, with such weapons deployed everywhere: underground, on the land, under the sea, on the sea, in the air and in outer space?

Human extinction can not be considered as just a remote possibility. During the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, the President of the United States took the risk of adopting a policy and putting it into effect, the end result of which he knew would be, to quote one responsible high official, "the specter of the death of the children of this country [the U.S.] and all the world."¹⁾ Now the nuclear strategy of the U.S. Government has gone over to a first-nuclear-strike-strategy, which even Mr. Barry Goldwater describes as extremely dangerous.

Faced by this unprecedented crisis of humanity, however, a growing number of people have taken action and are taking action throughout the world to free humanity of this threat to their existence. One outstanding action was the holding of the International Symposium on the Damage and After-Effects of the Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the summer of 1977 in Tokyo, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, under the auspices of the International Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). The symposium proved to be a prelude to a veritable tidal-wave of world-wide campaigns for the abolition of nuclear weapons. In May and June of the following year, the United Nations convened its special session devoted to disarmament, the first in its history, for which great credit must go to the initiative of the non-aligned states.

In 1978, directed toward this UN special session devoted to disarmament, twentyone million, one hundred and seventyeight thousand, four hundred, and fiftythree (21, 178, 453) Japanese people affixed their signatures to petitions demanding the abolition of nuclear weapons, and a delegation of more than five hundred persons was sent to New York to present the massive volume of signatures to the United Nations.²⁾ In the United States

there was a great growth of the "Mobilization for Survival" movement, which submitted to President Carter the signatures to a petition to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons, and with other pressing demands.³⁾

The rapid growth of such "mobilization for survival" movements throughout the world was one of the factors that contributed to positive results being achieved by the UN special session on disarmament.

In the first place, the UN special session recognized that mankind is confronted with a crisis that could mean extinction, and that nuclear weapons have to be abolished if human life is to be assured of existence. The final document adopted by the UN special session devoted to disarmament reads:

"Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on this earth." (Final Document: Para. 11)

"Removing the threat of a world war – a nuclear war – is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation. (Para. 18)

"The principal goals of disarmament are to ensure the survival of mankind and to eliminate the danger of war, in particular nuclear war." ". . . Effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority. To this end, it is imperative to remove the threat of nuclear weapons, to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race until the total elimination of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems has been achieved, and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons." (Para. 19–20)

"The most effective guarantee against the danger of nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons is nuclear disarmament and the complete

elimination of nuclear weapons.” (Para. 56)

In the second place, the UN special session resolved that the United Nations should play a central role in bringing about total nuclear disarmament, that the machinery for disarmament should be more democratic, that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), which the two major nuclear powers (the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.) had dominated as co-chairmen, had not been effective and should be dissolved, and in its place a Committee on Disarmament (CD) should be set up, associated more closely with the United Nations, and on which all states should be represented. The final document reads:

“The United Nations, in accordance with the Charter, has the central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament. Accordingly, it should play a more active role in this field.”

(Para. 114)

“All the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations. Consequently, all States have the duty to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament. All States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations.” (Para. 28)

“In spite of the best efforts of the international community, adequate results have not been produced with the existing machinery. There is, therefore, an urgent need that existing disarmament machinery be revitalized and forums appropriately constituted for disarmament deliberations and negotiations with a better representative character. For maximum effectiveness, two kinds of bodies are required in the field of disarmament – deliberative and negotiating. All Member States should be represented on the former, whereas the latter, for the sake of convenience, should have a relatively small membership. (Para. 113)

“The General Assembly establishes, as successor to the Commission originally established by resolution 502 (VI) [of 11 January 1952], a Disarmament Commission composed of all Members of the United Nations.” (Para. 118)

In the third place, the UN special session confirmed that disarmament, nuclear disarmament in particular, was essential if solutions are to be found to problems facing the developing countries, and that the role of the non-aligned states should therefore not be ignored in working for nuclear disarmament. The final document places the following emphasis:

“In a world of finite resources there is a close relationship between expenditure on armaments and economic and social development. Military expenditures are reaching ever higher levels, the highest percentage of which can be attributed to the nuclear-weapon States and most of their allies, with prospects of further expansion and the danger of further increases in the expenditures of other countries. The hundreds of billions of dollars spent annually on the manufacture or improvement of weapons are in sombre and dramatic contrast to the want and poverty in which two thirds of the world’s population live. This colossal waste of resources is even more serious in that it diverts to military purposes not only material, but also technical and human resources which are urgently needed for development in all countries, particularly in the developing countries. Thus, the economic and social consequences of the arms race are so detrimental that its continuation is obviously incompatible with the implementation of the new international economic order, based on justice, equity and cooperation. Consequently, resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures should be used in a manner which will help to promote the well-being of all peoples and to improve the economic conditions of the

developing countries." (Para. 16)

In the fourth place, the UN special session confirmed that not only governments but also the peoples and non-governmental organizations of the world should play a decisive role in effectuating nuclear disarmament. On this score, the final document says:

"It is essential that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the dangers in the present situation. In order that an international conscience may develop and that world public opinion may exercise a positive influence, the United Nations should increase the dissemination of information on the armaments race and disarmament with the full cooperation of Member States." (Para. 15)

"Throughout this process of disseminating information about the developments in the disarmament field of all countries, there should be increased participation by non-governmental organizations concerned with the matter, through closer liaison between them and the United Nations." (Para. 104)

"In order to enable the United Nations to continue to fulfil its role in the field of disarmament and to carry out the additional tasks assigned to it by this special session, the United Nations Centre for Disarmament should be adequately strengthened and its research and information functions accordingly extended. . . . The Centre should also increase contacts with non-governmental organizations and research institutions in view of the valuable role they play in the field of disarmament." (Para. 123)

It was in respect of these points that the UN special session on disarmament made an especially positive contribution. Nevertheless, it failed to take such specific steps as would ensure the implementation of these positive

points. Of very special importance is the need to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons, but this remains unconfirmed in the final document.

In the light of paragraph 23 of the final document, this appears even more strange. It reads:

“Further international action should be taken to prohibit or restrict for humanitarian reasons the use of specific conventional weapons, including those which may be excessively injurious, cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects.”

Are there any weapons that could be classed as more “excessively injurious” or that “cause more unnecessary suffering or have more indiscriminate effects” than nuclear weapons? Why were nuclear weapons not included among those weapons which should be eliminated for humanitarian reasons?

It must be said that the UN special session on disarmament, in failing to emphasize the need for a convention outlawing the use of nuclear weapons, could not go beyond its own self-imposed limitations.

2. The Urgent Need to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons — Marxists at the Crossroads

In the preceding section, we have noted both the significance and the limitation of the 1978 UN special session devoted to disarmament. But limitations notwithstanding, the positive significance of that session should by no means be under-estimated: it should be used fully in the struggle for human survival.

Among the many tasks which confront mankind at the present time, two are to be distinguished from each other as a matter of principle. The first, arising from the possibility that humanity and the very possibility of its future could be extinguished, is to rid the world of nuclear weapons once and for all, as a highest priority, thereby preventing human extinction and assuring mankind of a future. The second is how to build a better society for the future, when the future of humanity has been assured. Unless the first

undertaking is successful the second would be futile, no matter how sophisticated the theories and programs that are elaborated.

In considering the first task, it has to be confirmed that the governments of the imperialist countries, notably the U.S. Government, have consistently opposed the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons, and that the arms race has been instigated by the U.S. Government, whose policy has been a major driving force in the nuclear arms expansion race.⁴⁾ With this as our premise, it must still be pointed out, as a matter of added significance, that there have been and are serious conflicts among Marxists or self-claimed "Marxists" as to whether the elimination of nuclear weapons should be set as a task, and even if there is agreement that such weapons must be eliminated, by whom, and by what method can this be done? In this connection, it cannot be denied that the very advent of nuclear weapons became an important factor contributing to the division of Marxists and the international Communist movement, which, of course has made the elimination of nuclear weapons all the more difficult. In this respect, even after the task of eliminating nuclear weapons was accepted, there have been two basically conflicting policy lines on how and by whom the task can be done.⁵⁾

The first of these, followed by the bloc consisting of the Soviet Union and most of the East European socialist countries (adhered to by the World Peace Council, though the World Council itself is not a Marxist organization), fundamentally places the two great nuclear powers, the U.S. and the Soviet Union, in the center, attaches major importance to U.S. -Soviet diplomatic negotiations (more correctly to be called secret diplomacy) and accepts such negotiations as a *fait accompli*. It is thus big-power centralistic. The method based on this policy line is represented by the "Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty" signed in 1963 and effective since then; the "Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty" signed in 1968 and effective since 1970; and more recently by SALT, all characterized by partial, progressive, and "arms coordination"

measures. Protagonists of this line contend that successive, partial and progressive measures of "arms control" (or rather, "arms coordination") could be expected to lead eventually to the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. Their response is negative to the appeal for the immediate outlawing of the use of nuclear weapons and to the demand for recognition of the right of all states, big and small, to determine this issue.

The second policy line properly places the responsibility of the movement for the elimination of nuclear weapons on the non-aligned countries and the mass movements in the capitalist countries, for whom the NGOs speak; it upholds the independence, liberty, equality, and solidarity of all nations based on the principles of non-alignment, and the principles of the democratic mass movement. The method to be followed in keeping with this policy line conflicts with the partial and progressive measures and the big-power centralistic "arms coordination" program; it says that the most urgent task of highest priority is to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances whatsoever, by the conclusion of an international treaty to this effect. It is fully committed to "nuclear disarmament," as against "arms coordination," and is the policy advocated and supported by the Japanese peace fighters, including Marxists.

As is well known, not only the U.S. Government, the Japanese Government, and the Governments of NATO countries, but also those "Marxists" who stand for the first policy line, have repeatedly branded the second policy line as "unrealistic." The author himself had the experience at one international conference on nuclear disarmament of "Marxists" who stood for the first policy line spending most of their time condemning the second policy line as "unrealistic." But when one comes down to realities, only when a convention outlawing the use of nuclear weapons is concluded can the development, testing, production, stockpiling, and deployment of such weapons become no longer necessary, and the ways leading to the cessation,

reduction and prohibition of the production of such weapons become clear and progressively more concrete, and not vice versa. In 1975, according to U.S. Congressional Records for the Senate, the nuclear arsenals of the U.S. and the Soviet Union alone held in stock an astronomical volume of destructive power, enough to wipe out all human life twenty seven times over. In these circumstances, even if the testing of nuclear weapons ceased and production stopped, and even if a treaty were to be signed reducing the existing stockpiles of such weapons by half, the technological "renovation" of missiles and other strategic delivery systems would still be going on, and the crisis of human existence would still have to be overcome, so long as the use of nuclear weapons is not outlawed. These considerations make it clear how unrealistic is the first policy line and how realistic is the second. In view of the grim reality that the series of "partial measures" taken so far have resulted only in the escalation of the nuclear arms race, and in the light of the history and lessons of the movements for the abolition of nuclear weapons and of the final document of the 1978 UN special session on disarmament, it cannot be denied that the first policy line has proved to be bankrupt, and even carries within it the danger of the nuclear arms race being further accelerated.⁶⁾ It is therefore no exaggeration to say that humanity has no choice but to adopt the second policy line.⁷⁾

In this approach to the goal of nuclear disarmament by the second policy line, persistent resistance can be expected not only from the governments of the monopoly capitalist states, the U.S. Government in particular, but also from those who stand for the first policy line, represented by the Soviet Union. There are great difficulties also even among those who represent the second policy line.

In the first place, the Japanese mass movement, one of the major forces among world movements for the abolition of nuclear weapons, was able to collect more than twenty million signatures for submission to the United

Nations. Nevertheless, this movement still lacks organizational solidarity, and does not constitute a majority in Japan. It has therefore not been successful in winning the Japanese Government to its position, and stopping American nuclear weapons being brought into Japan, nor has the government demanded in the international arena that the use of nuclear weapons be outlawed. American "Mobilization for Survival" is still far from becoming a majority voice in the U.S., too.

Secondly: while governments of the non-aligned states have proved to be a major force in the promotion of the second policy line, in most of these countries hardly any democratic mass movements have been organized for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and attempts at organizing democratic mass movements as such have mostly been suppressed. Many of these governments are involved in the arms race with conventional weapons, and armed conflicts and hostilities arise among them from time to time, and conventional weapons built up by them have often been turned against their own peoples.

Thirdly: in the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe, especially in NATO countries, NGO-oriented mass movements for the elimination of nuclear weapons have not been organized in strength enough to meet the demands of the situation. In the months leading up to the UN special session on disarmament in 1978, no word was heard from these countries showing any impressive organization of popular movements having taken place, directed specifically to pressuring their respective governments and the United Nations to ban nuclear weapons. The so-called Eurocommunist parties, to the best of my knowledge, did not place adequate importance on the UN special session on disarmament, and did not undertake the full organization of mass movements demanding the abolition of nuclear weapons. Even more than that: Far from taking the initiative for the elimination of nuclear weapons in the event of a coalition government being established in

France, the French Communist Party went so far as to advocate the continued possession of nuclear weapons by France.

Fourthly: whereas movements for the elimination of nuclear weapons cannot depend for their existence on the governments of the big nuclear powers, but should go on developing as democratic mass movements of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), some such organizations in countries other than Japan, the U.S., and Western Europe are, in the main, supported financially by their respective governments. Can such organizations claim to be "non-governmental organizations"? While the role of NGOs is increasing in the United Nations as well as in the organization of international conferences and other forms of action, NGOs in fact include both genuinely *non-governmental* organizations supported financially by the masses and de facto "governmental organizations." The latter often play the role of a "speaking tube" for the first policy line, and oppose the build-up of democratic mass movements undertaken by genuinely *non-governmental* organizations advocating the second policy line.

As we can see from the above, difficult conditions do exist within movements which represent or should represent the second policy line. It is clear that nuclear weapons cannot be eliminated unless these difficulties are overcome. How fast and on how broad a scale can ALL the forces working for the elimination of nuclear weapons on the second policy line unite their strength? It would be no exaggeration to say that this will be a major determining factor in deciding whether or not there is a future for humanity.

3. The Elimination of Nuclear Weapons and the Outlook on Overturning the System

Even assuming that the difficulties such as we have mentioned within the movements are overcome and a convention outlawing *the use* of nuclear weapons is concluded (such a convention must by all means be concluded, we contend), the convention alone will not guarantee nuclear disarmament or

the elimination of nuclear weapons. For nuclear weapons actually to cease to exist, the following *minimum* problems will have to be resolved:

(1) How to scrap nuclear weapons under strict international inspection? Specifically, how to control and deal with the uranium and plutonium that will have to be extracted from the vast number of nuclear warheads? It cannot be allowed either to be dumped into the sea or left in deserts as heaps of uranium and plutonium. Simply shouting, "No nukes!", will solve nothing. Studies are needed to find out and employ the surest and the most reliable methods of control and disposition.

(2) How, under strict international inspection, to control and treat radioactive substances produced in existing nuclear power plants?

(3) This raises the problem of how to strengthen the functions of control and inspection to be assumed by the United Nations and NGOs, without infringing the right of national self-determination? Toward this end, how can the existing principles and machinery of the United Nations, which give the five nuclear powers the right of veto, be democratically renovated, on the principle of equality of nations? Here, the point at issue is five-power-centralism or the existing principles and machinery of the United Nations, which will have to be rebuilt.

(4) How to anticipate and overcome the obstinate resistance, or even an attempted coup by the military of big imperialist nuclear powers?

(5) In the event of nuclear weapons actually being scrapped, an unprecedented depression could be expected to result from the break-down of monopoly capital of the arms industry, which has produced such weapons, American state monopoly capitalism, and world capitalism in general. How can unemployment be prevented from expanding seriously, with medium and minor firms going bankrupt, and the people's livelihood being ruined? How can the munitions economy be converted to a peace economy? How can the political and military machinery standing in the way of conversion be democratically regulated?

(6) How to work out a democratic economic program, a program for the development of resources and energy, a program for the progress of science and technology, and a program for peace education, programs that would make the preceding undertakings possible? How to establish a people's majority and form a consensus both at national and international levels?

(7) How to dismantle nuclear-capable military blocs and bases and bring these works under international and democratic supervision?

These are but some of the tasks that must certainly be faced, along with many others that will have to be tackled. What is already clear, taking all into consideration, is that unless these problems, stated as a minimum, are solved, humanity can never be freed of nuclear weapons (the world system of omnicidal instruments). On the contrary, all mankind, including Marxists, existing socialist countries and their peoples, will continue to face the possibility of extermination.

So far as this writer knows, not only "Marxists" of the Soviet Union and the East European countries but also Eurocommunist theorists, far from having solved them, have yet to set themselves to these tasks. Needless to say, neither Marx, Engels, Lenin, nor Gramsci was able to foresee the possibility of the ending of world history by the invention of nuclear weapons. It is a qualitatively new situation, and some of the propositions advanced by Marxism now have to be re-examined and, if need be, rectified in the light of this.⁸⁾ The tasks arising from the struggle for human survival now call for Marxism to rectify and enrich some of its propositions.⁹⁾

The task of eliminating nuclear weapons to ensure human survival is more than just one among many tasks confronting humanity. It constitutes a major condition which, if not fulfilled, will bring to naught all other problems. It is our greatest task. Only by fulfilling it, can the way toward democracy and the anti-monopoly revolution in advanced countries be cleared, in order to make possible the transition to socialism. Only thus can the

difficulties faced by the non-aligned countries (developing countries) as well as by the present socialist countries (backward socialist countries) be overcome. In other words, the successful carrying out of this task is the only guarantee of a future for the human race. It is thus the most important and central task affecting the whole destiny of humanity, which, in turn, will make possible the completion of the second task, that of building a better future.

Notes:

- 1) See Robert F. Kennedy, *Thirteen Days*, New York, 1969. For a discussion of the most serious implications of the policy of President John F. Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis, see John Somerville, *The Peace Revolution*, Westport, Conn. and London, 1975.
- 2) Over twenty million Japanese people gave their "SIGNATURES FOR COMPLETE NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT" to be presented to the United Nations." The petition reads:
"So that there will be no more Hibakusha;
In order to build a peaceful world without nuclear weapons;
We request the following of the United Nations:
* to make known to the people of the world the horrors of the Hiroshima-Nagasaki atomic bombing and the suffering of the Hibakusha
* to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons as a crime against humanity
* to hold a world disarmament conference, and as soon as possible to make treaties completely prohibiting the use, testing, manufacture, stockpiling, proliferation and deployment of nuclear weapons."
- 3) "A petition to President Jimmy Carter on the occasion of the Special Session on Disarmament of the United Nations," drafted and sponsored by the American Mobilization for Survival, reads:
"Mr. President, fulfill your campaign pledges. Cut military spending. Move us toward a world of *zero* nuclear weapons.
1. RESOLVE to join other nations in outlawing the use of nuclear weaponry as a crime against humanity.
2. PLEDGE that under no circumstances would the U.S. be the first to use nuclear weapons.
3. END all research, development, testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and launching systems, including the neutron bomb, the cruise missile, the M-X missile and the Trident submarine.
4. INITIATE major reductions of our nuclear weapons stockpile.
5. STOP the export of nuclear technology and actively pursue development of non-nuclear energy sources at home and abroad.

6. HALT all arms sales abroad – especially the sale of conventional weapons to dictatorial and repressive regimes.
7. CUT the military budget by 15% this year and shift the money into areas of human need.
8. GUARANTEE decent and productive jobs for those now employed in military and nuclear industries.

Mr. President, these are eight immediate *initiatives toward* complete and general disarmament that our country can take without risk to our security. They would spur other nuclear powers to take similar action. People of the world are waiting for some nation to take the first step – let it be us.”

- 4) In this connection, it is noteworthy that NATO opened its session on May 30, 1978 in Washington, D.C., at the very same time as the UN Special Session on Disarmament was meeting in New York. President Carter addressed the opening ceremony of the Washington meeting, stressing the need for strengthening and modernizing the NATO forces (e.g. with neutron bombs). Following the opening ceremony, full-scale deliberations took place behind closed doors in the State Department. The NATO session confirmed that military expenditures of the NATO countries for 1979–1984 would be increased by 3 per cent annually. It also approved a total of 117 recommendations which included, among others, measures for: (1) the strengthening of a combat-ready system capable of deploying armed forces at any time and at any place; (2) increasing the offensive power of air forces; and (3) the updating of nuclear weapons. The NATO session again revealed the dangerous and provocative stance of the highest officials of NATO governments, led by the U.S.
- 5) The Government of the People’s Republic of China had once stood for a correct position in advocating the convocation of a world summit conference to be participated in *by all states*, not just by nuclear powers, for the purpose of achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons. From about the mid-1960s, however, the Chinese leadership began a backward shift of its nuclear policy, switching to a position antagonistic to the world people’s movements for the eradication of nuclear weapons. From the early 1970s, they began to follow U.S. global policy, and went so far as to encourage the most reactionary, corrupt, fascist regimes throughout the world. Present actions show the present Chinese leadership to be neither Marxist nor socialist, but big-power hegemonist and social imperialist.
- 6) For elucidation of the arms control negotiations by the two great nuclear powers, the U.S. and the Soviet Union, standing in the way of achieving genuine nuclear disarmament, see Alva Myrdal, *The Game of Disarmament: How the United States and Russia Run the Arms Race*, New York, 1976. For a disclosure of the true nature of SALT, see Barton J. Bernstein, “SALT: The Dangerous Illusion,” in *Inquiry*, July 24, 1978.
- 7) As can be seen from the demands quoted in footnotes 2) and 3) above, the NGO mass movements in Japan and the U.S. have no illusions whatsoever about arms control and SALT as subscribed to by the U.S. and the Soviet Union. These movements have sternly denounced the nuclear policies followed by their respective

governments, and have taken an independent position, differing from the policies of the Soviet Government and of the World Peace Council. No grass-roots organization in Japan has ever placed its hopes in the outcome of SALT.

- 8) Although Marx, Engels, and Lenin argued that technological development under capitalism and imperialism would be accompanied by great suffering, and destruction of the people, they could not foresee that such would become so serious as to mean human extinction. Today, however, we are witnesses of two possibilities before us. One is the possibility of human extinction that could mean the end of world history, and the other is the possibility of humanity overcoming this crisis, so that it can move from capitalism to socialism.

Not only as a Marxist but also as a member of the human family, the writer is of course eager to see that the latter possibility is brought to reality, although the existence of the former cannot be denied. The danger of this former possibility should be brought home to everyone, and allout efforts should be made to prevent it. In so doing, Marxists should vigorously seek a path of cooperation with non-Marxists, for the mission to prevent mankind from destroying itself cannot be fulfilled by Marxists and socialists alone. It can be done only with the participation of all members of the human family. For all humanity to take part in this "mobilization for survival," such thoughts and theories as will make it possible should be formulated and promulgated, including in particular the reconstruction of the theories of fundamental human rights and modern democracy, theories that are most fitted to this new situation.

A re-evaluation of various political and ideological positions is needed, also of different schools of social science, of manifold styles in the arts, and of a wide range of religious teachings, the sole criterion being the prevention of human extinction, so that all such can find their own proper places in the "mobilization for survival" movement.

On problems posed to Marxism by the human extinction crisis, John Somerville's book cited in footnote 1) above is a pioneering work. In *'Eurocommunism' and the State*, London, 1977, S. Carrillo, Secretary-General of the Communist Party of Spain, also argues that by the advent of nuclear weapons, some of the Marxist propositions – the proposition, for instance, that war is the continuation of politics by other means – should be rectified. He quotes Marx:

" . . . proletarian revolutions . . . criticise themselves constantly, interrupt themselves constantly, in their own course, come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin it afresh, deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltrinesses of their first attempt." (Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, in: Marx/Engels, *Selected Works*, London, 1968, p.98)

From such a standpoint, Carrillo points out that, by their very nature, proletarian revolutions revise themselves, that in this spirit there exists "a Marxist, revolutionary *revisionism*," and that Lenin *revised* certain theses of Marx revolutionarily. In this work Carrillo presents problems quite challenging to the traditional Marxist way of thinking; it is a work that is to be valued positively in many respects. Carrillo, however, says that nuclear weapons have so far acted as a "nuclear deter-

rent” and that “nuclear deterrent strategy” and an equilibrium of nuclear military power between the U.S. and the Soviet Union have advanced coexistence between the two powers. If such a distinguished Marxist as Carrillo holds this conception of “nuclear deterrent strategy,” the Japanese movement for the elimination of nuclear weapons will have greater significance, and Japanese Marxism a greater international role.

- 9) Of themes that need to be examined and studied from the Marxist standpoint, or which demand that Marxism re-examine some of its own propositions, the following can be pointed out:

Do “socialist countries”, by reason of their character, pursue “general and complete disarmament”? Why has the Soviet Union *regressed* in its nuclear policy from “*elimination* of nuclear weapons” to “*control* of nuclear arms”? Why does the Soviet Union stand for the afore-mentioned first policy line and resist the second policy line? Why has “big-power nationalism” emerged in the Soviet Union and China and not been overcome? What attitude should Marxists take toward the development of nuclear weapons in “socialist countries” which adopt such a position? How should the movement for non-alignment be defined from the standpoint of the world-wide class struggle? Why is the movement for non-alignment more progressive than “socialist countries” in the struggle for the elimination of nuclear weapons? How should the present United Nations and a democratically renovated United Nations be defined in the light of the Marxist theory of the state? How can international inspection to be undertaken by the United Nations be made compatible with the principle of the right to national self-determination? How should the NGO movement be defined in the light of Marxist theories of mass movements, of united fronts, and of the class struggle? What new problems has the NGO movement presented to Marxism? What problems have been posed by the movement for the eradication of nuclear weapons to the theory of revolution in advanced countries? While “nuclear disarmament” is a categorial imperative, is so-called “general and complete disarmament” (in which the elimination of conventional weapons is included) feasible before the accomplishment of socialist revolution on a world-wide scale, including the revolution in advanced countries, and even prior to the future withering away of states? If such “general and complete disarmament” is not practicable, should it be rejected as an illusory slogan? If it is to be pursued as a practicable task, should some of the propositions advanced by the Marxist theory of the state be rectified? Is it possible for NGOs in socialist countries to continue their existence even when their positions are different from those of their respective governments? If they cannot exist under such circumstances, is it possible to speak of the NGO movement in socialist countries? All these questions need to be answered in the light of the present new situation.