

JAPANESE COMMUNIST PARTY

Excerpts from the Draft Resolution Presented to the 26th Congress

GRASPING THE WORLD TREND AND HOW TO ENGAGE IN IT

Shift in the world structure is now showing its great potential

The most important changes in the 20th century were the complete collapse of the colonial system, the world-wide acceptance of the right of national self-determination, and more than 100 nations gaining political independence as sovereign states. These changes were what should be termed as a sea change in the world structure. An outstanding feature of current world affairs is that this shift is now showing great potential as a driving force to foster world peace and social progress.

The world is now breaking away from the era of great powers in which a handful of big powers dictated world affairs, heading for a new one in which every country, regardless of its size or power, participates in world politics on an equal footing. When the JCP delegation attended the Review Conference of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 2010, we saw representatives from emerging and developing countries playing leading roles actively as the president of the Conference, the chairperson of the Main Committee I, the U.N. High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, and so on.

There is a growing movement toward a realization of an international order of peace based on the U.N. Charter. In 2003, the U. S. and some other countries illegally went to war against Iraq without U.N. Security Council resolution to authorize the use of force. But ten years later, in 2013, the attempted military intervention led by the U.S. against Syria was thwarted by fierce international public opposition. As the matter was handed to the U.N., the Security Council finally adopted unanimously a resolution that required Syria to remove chemical weapons in the country and paved the way for a diplomatic solution to the conflict. Though the Syrian situation is likely to continue on a perilous course, the adopted resolution was “historic” as was described by U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon. This has shown the reality of the current structure of international politics where even the most powerful is not allowed to openly defy the U.N. Charter to arbitrarily resort to the use of force.

The global economic order is also changing. With the framework of the summit of the major advanced nations, launched in 1975 as the G6 and developed into the G7 and later the G8, increasingly unable to address global issues, the global economic crisis in 2008 prompted the G8 to give way to the G20 incorporating emerging and developing countries. Moreover, the G20 itself is now said to have its own limitations. Even a G192 is advocated as a framework in which all the U.N. member countries participate. As emerging and developing countries have been increasing their share in the world’s gross domestic product (GDP) year by year, a major shift in the balance of economic powers is underway. Such a trend has been pointed out globally in such reports as the “Perspectives on Global Development 2010 – Shifting Wealth” by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) or the “Human Development Report 2013 – The Rise of the South” by the U.N. Development Program. The era in which a small number of powerful nations dominate the world economy is over.

ANALYZING U.S. STRATEGY BASED ON THE JCP PROGRAM

Based on the party program, the JCP 24th and 25th Congress Resolutions provided a multi-faceted analysis of U.S. strategy in various areas. We have paid close attention to two aspects of U.S. strategy: persisting in military hegemonism and placing new emphasis on diplomacy to address and solve international problems. This two-pronged approach is becoming more important to utilize in order to understand the current U.S. strategy.

1) Persistent military hegemonism and diplomatic efforts

Looking at the U.S. Obama administration's global strategy over the past 4 years, we clearly see that the U.S. strategy continues to hold those 2 aspects that were pointed out in our previous resolution, even though U.S. global influence is on gradual decline. While the Obama administration has inherited the military hegemonism as the basic strategic line of successive U.S. administrations, at the same time, it puts more emphasis on diplomatic negotiations to solve issues both bilaterally and multilaterally in its global strategy.

U.S. air strikes using armed drones in other countries have caused a serious international problem. In September 2013, the U.N. published a report for the first time concerning the U.S. drone attacks in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen and some other countries. Among others, Pakistan suffered at least 330 drone attacks causing more than 2,200 casualties, of which more than 600 were identified as civilians or probable non-combatants, according to the report. U.S. special operation forces have also intensified their extraterritorial activities, such as the assault on and the killing of Al-Qaeda leader Osama Bin Laden by the U.S. navy SEAL team on Pakistani soil. President Obama said, "The world is a better place because we have borne the burdens of leadership." The inclination to military hegemonism of the U.S. is deep-rooted.

The Obama administration, on the other hand, declared the end of the Iraq War in December 2011 and U.S. forces withdrew from Iraq. He has also made clear his policy to withdraw U.S. combat troops from Afghanistan by the end of 2014. During the military intervention in Libya in 2011, the U.S. participated in the aerial campaign where most of the sorties were done by the British and the French. However, the administration chose to follow a path for a diplomatic solution to the Syrian crisis through the U.N. Security Council. It now pursues a diplomatic solution as a serious and practical option for Iran's nuclear issues as well as North Korea's.

2) The so-called rebalance of U.S. strategy toward Asia-Pacific

The dual features of the U.S. strategy adapting both military hegemonism and diplomatic efforts also appear in its so-called strategic "rebalance" toward the Asia-Pacific region.

The U.S. is trying to strengthen its military alliances with Japan, South Korea, and Australia as the first pillar in its Asia strategy. Its strategy continues to be based on the long-held assumption that a strong U.S. military presence is indispensable in maintaining and enhancing U.S. influence in the region.

At the same time, the U.S. has expanded diplomatic engagement as a basic component of its strategy to increase its influence in China as well as the Association of Southeast Asia Nations (ASEAN), which has been promoting and developing a regional community of nations for peace. The U.S. policy toward China is not the so-called containment policy that it had adopted against the former Soviet Union. The U.S. and China agreed at a summit meeting in June 2013 to develop their relationship by building "the new model of relations between great powers," bearing the two components of "competition and cooperation."

ADVANCE OF REGIONAL COMMUNITIES OF NATIONS FOR PEACE - DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AND LATIN AMERICA

It is significant that regional communities of nations for peace have developed and evolved in Latin America and in Southeast Asia as bearers of an international order of peace based on the U.N Charter.

1) A remarkable current for peace in Southeast Asia

The Southeast Asian nations have made great efforts to develop the ASEAN after the U.S.-centered military alliance, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), collapsed.

The ASEAN has developed multi-layered frameworks to create peace and security and expanded them by including countries outside the region. These frameworks include the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC), the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the East Asia Summit (EAS), the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, and the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea (DOC). They have become important instruments working for peace in the region and beyond.

The TAC was signed in 1976 as a code of conduct governing relations among the states in the region with the goal of reaching peaceful resolutions to conflicts or tensions without resorting to the use of force. Since 1987, it has been open for membership of other non-Southeast Asian countries and it now has 57 member countries covering almost all of Eurasia and a large part of Americas representing 72% of the world population, becoming a huge current in world affairs.

Underlying concepts throughout these developments are following:

- An inclusive regional community of nations for peace having all nations in the region as its members, open to the rest of Asia and the world, and rejecting the concept of potential enemy that military alliances often incorporate;
- A concept of security through peaceful means such as dialogues, confidence-building and pursuing peaceful solutions of disputes, breaking away from the security concept solely dependent on military means and deterrence; and,
- A pursuit of cooperative development with diversity among nations, recognizing and respecting differences in political and social systems, in cultures, and in stages of economic development.

It is true that there exist a number of international disputes in the Southeast Asia. While the U.S. is trying to enhance its influence over the region, China is also making efforts to extend its influence across the region.

Even under such circumstances, the ASEAN has formed its own freestanding group that rejects hegemony by any big power. They are committed to peaceful means to find solutions and preventing disputes from escalating to war through dialogues that they hold more than 1,000 times a year. The ASEAN is now extending this current for peace beyond the region to the entire Asia-Pacific. This forward-looking effort has great potential to establish regional peace and provides multifarious lessons we can learn from.

2) A new architecture for peace born in Latin America and the Caribbean

In 2010, the heads of 33 Latin American and Caribbean states declared the creation of the Community of Latin America and Caribbean States (CELAC). After three years of preparation, the first summit of the CELAC was held in January 2013.

In 2010, the 33 countries agreed to act based on principles such as respect for international law, sovereign equality of states, renunciation of the use and threat of force, and dialogue that promotes peace and regional security as well as solidarity, social inclusion, complementarity and voluntary participation.

In addition, the first CELAC summit in 2013 put emphasis on embarking on a path of gradual regional integration based on pluralism and mutual respect for sovereignty.

It is also remarkable that the CELAC has been taking initiatives for global peace such as adopting in 2011 the special communiqué on the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which was reaffirmed at its first summit in 2013.

In addition, in 2012, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Venezuela, and Bolivia withdrew from the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Pact), a military alliance that once served as an excuse for U.S.

interventions in and invasions of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean region. Having been dysfunctional since Mexico withdrew in 2004, it is now on the verge of total collapse.

The encouraging developments in this region testify that a regional community of nations for peace, pioneered by the ASEAN, has universal significance and is being watched in every part of the world.

STRUGGLE FOR A WORLD WITHOUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The last JCP Congress Resolution proposed two core tasks in bringing forth a world without nuclear weapons, namely an immediate start of international negotiations for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and breaking away from the nuclear deterrence theory. These proposals have been proved correct and are now increasingly being brought forth as viable proposals in international politics in the last four years.

Now the focal point of international discussion is a nuclear weapons convention, which intends to totally ban and eliminate nuclear weapons. The commencement of international negotiations for such a convention is now recognized as a realizable goal.

The 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) affirmed that all states need “to make special efforts to establish the necessary framework” to achieve “a world without nuclear weapons.” Review Conference President Libran N. Cabactulan pointed out that the conference has brought into focus a nuclear weapons convention hitherto hidden in the shadows.

It is also significant that the First Committee of the 68th U.N. General Assembly in 2013 adopted with overwhelming majority, i.e. more than two thirds of votes, a resolution calling for the swift commencement of negotiations for a comprehensive convention to ban and eliminate nuclear weapons, proposed by the Non-Aligned countries as well as one proposed by Malaysia and other countries.

There are two striking developments.

The first is the joint statement at the U.N. General Assembly First Committee in October 2013, signed by 125 countries on the humanitarian consequence of nuclear weapons. It pointed out that nuclear weapons bring about “unacceptable humanitarian consequences” by their “destructive capability and indiscriminate nature,” stressing that “it is in the interest of the very survival of humanity that nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances” and that “the only way to guarantee that nuclear weapons will never be used again is through their total elimination.” By agreeing on the statement that opposes the use of the weapons “under any circumstances” and calls for their total elimination, the international community is now paying renewed attention to the inhumane and atrocious nature of nuclear weapons, which hibakushas and the peace movement in Japan have been persistently pointing out to the world. This is a positive development towards a “world without nuclear weapons.”

The second is that the recent move to eliminate chemical weapons in Syria has prompted an increased demand for outlawing nuclear weapons and concluding a nuclear weapons convention. The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), which opened for signatures in 1993 and entered into force in 1997, is now joined by 190 states, an overwhelming majority of the nations in the world, including Syria. The latest development in Syria has strengthened an argument that says “Now that we managed to ban chemical weapons totally, why can’t we eliminate nuclear weapons that are the most destructive and inhumane of all weapons?” This logic is beyond dispute.

At the 2015 NPT Review Conference held 70 years after the atomic bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the JCP will make a determined effort in bringing about an agreement on starting negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention, as a political party in the country which once suffered the nuclear attacks, in solidarity with anti-nuclear weapons movements in Japan and throughout the world.

STRUGGLE FOR A DEMOCRATIC INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

With the world changing structurally and the power of emerging and developing countries growing significantly, an era when the international economy cannot be controlled only by advanced capitalistic countries has emerged. A new democratic international economic order is keenly needed in tune with the drastically changing world.

What is most important at present is to establish an international economic order based on equality and mutual benefit, which respects differences in social systems and stages of economic development as well as socio-economic realities without imposing particular economic models such as so-called “American standards” from the outside. This now becomes the real agenda in world politics. The Leaders’ Statement in the G20 Pittsburgh Summit in September 2009 noted, “We recognize that there are different approaches to economic development and prosperity, and that strategies to achieve these goals may vary according to countries’ circumstances.” This recognition is important.

In particular, democratic rules are urgently needed to govern the international economy and democratically regulate large multinational corporations on following points:

- Rules to stop abusive movements of speculative money. The money game operated by speculative capital has caused serious damage to the real economy in many countries and pushed up prices of crude oil and grains, putting heavy strains on people’s lives. Since the global financial crisis of 2007-08, the G20 countries started considering various financial regulations, some of which have been already enforced. Moreover, 11 member states of the European Union have agreed to introduce a financial transaction tax. Such measures should be expanded.
- Rules to stop tax avoidance by multinational corporations. The G20 has given this issue a high priority, calling on the member countries “to ensure that international [tax regulations as well as domestic tax regulations] do not allow or encourage multinational enterprises to reduce overall taxes paid by artificially shifting profits to low-tax jurisdictions.”
- Rules to stop international competition in lowering corporate tax rates. Recently, many countries have cut corporate tax rates in order to attract foreign investment to such extent that governments’ revenues dry up and amounts of sovereign debts soar. This situation can be described as “Multinationals prosper or nations perish.” It has proven to be a myth that the more profitable corporations become with corporate tax cuts, the more prosperous nations become with increased tax revenues. This “harmful tax competition” among nations, as was repeatedly warned about by the OECD, was also a focus of discussions at the G20 summit in 2010 as a practice that needs to be reversed. Germany and France jointly proposed at the 2011 EU summit to introduce a minimum rate for corporate taxes. The international community should work together to urgently stop the corporate tax reduction competition and raise the present excessively lenient corporate tax rates.
- Rules to stop global competition in labor cost cuts. The fiercely competitive environment in a globalized economy fuels international competition to cut labor costs which undermine the foundation for a sound growth of the world economy as well as national economies. This “race to the bottom” in reducing labor standards world-wide triggers ruinous abuse of workers who are the actual source of economic growth, only to end up in a diminished industrial vitality. It is remarkable that the G20 Leaders’ Declaration in September 2013 put emphasis on “growth through quality jobs,” pointing out that “creating more productive and better quality jobs is at the heart of our countries’ policies aimed at achieving strong, sustainable, and balanced growth, poverty reduction, and increasing social cohesion.” The declaration also called for effective measures to ensure “a sustained decline in informal employment.” It is important to have international rules strengthened to stop the competition to see who can cut labor costs the most.

PRESENT AND FUTURE OF MEASURES AGAINST GLOBAL WARMING

The U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) published in September 2013 a new report of the Fifth Assessment Report, summarizing the scientific opinions on global warming. It forecasts global temperature to rise by 4.8 degree Celsius and global sea level to rise by 2.82 meters at the maximum (both relative to 1986-2005). The world leaders already agreed to limit the rise in global temperature within 2 degrees Celsius above the pre-industrial revolution level. If the temperature increases more than this limit,

there will be serious adverse consequences to the ecosystem with threatened human survival. The latest report argues that climate change prevention is a pressing task for the survival of humanity. Japan has also experienced a series of global-warming induced phenomena, including new highs in maximum temperatures, frequent occurrence of unprecedentedly heavy rains and super-force typhoons.

With the First Commitment Period (2008-2012) under the Kyoto Protocol to reduce greenhouse gas emissions coming to an end, the international community gathered at the 17th and 18th Conferences of Parties (COP17 & COP18) held respectively in Durban, South Africa, in 2011 and Doha, Qatar, in 2012. Through these meetings, it was agreed that: i) a Second Commitment Period is set for the period from 2013 to 2020; and ii) a new international framework after 2020 under the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) will be agreed upon by 2015. In addition, the developed countries agreed to contribute USD100 billion a year by 2020 to help developing countries to combat and cope with climate change.

However, Japan, Russia, and New Zealand have withdrawn from the Second Commitment Period, and the U.S. and Canada refuse to join as they are the non-signatories to the Kyoto Protocol. As a result, major emitting countries whose aggregate emission amounts to more than one fourth of the world total refuse to accept any reduction obligation during the upcoming period.

Moreover, although it was agreed that the new framework starting from 2020 be applied to all the signatories and that developing countries also be obliged to reduce their emissions, the developed and the developing countries continue to be at odds over the concrete targets.

The JCP proposes as follows:

- Developed countries, which are historically responsible for global warming should bear the following “deal responsibility” under the principle of the “common but differentiated responsibility,” - i) pursuing ambitious reduction targets themselves, and ii) demonstrating to developing countries alternative development paths with greatly reduced carbon footprints and providing them with adequate technological and financial assistance to pursue such paths.
- Given that emerging countries are becoming major carbon emitters, with that China emerging as the largest emitter with one fourth of the global carbon dioxide emissions and India emitting 5.4%, developing countries are expected to voluntarily join in a legally-binding international emissions reduction framework.
- Citing the increased dependence on thermal power in the aftermath of the Fukushima nuclear disaster, the Japanese government has thrown away its target to reduce emissions by 25% by 2020 from the level of 1990. It will declare in the international meeting the “temporary” target to reduce emissions by 3.8% by 2020 from the 2005 level. This is actually an emissions “increase” target if compared with the 1990 level. This is totally irresponsible for the 5th largest greenhouse gas emitting country. The increased use of thermal power stations during the emergency situation could not be avoided. However, the problem is that the Japanese government has put nuclear power at the center of its energy policy, neglecting to shift to renewable energies and a low-energy consumption society.

The government should make a political decision to immediately realize the goal demanded by citizens for “zero nuclear power plants” and make a rapid and massive shift to renewable energy. It also should set an aggressive emissions reduction target and fully implement it. We have to drastically overcome the present energy-wasting social norms accepting the continuance of “mass-production, mass-consumption, mass-disposal,” extraordinarily long working hours, and the so-called “24-hour society.”

NUCLEAR POWER GENERATION AND ENERGY POLICY- DEVELOPMENT OF JCP POLICY ON NUCLEAR POWER GENERATION AND OUR PRESSING TASKS

The nuclear accident at the Tokyo Electric Power Company’s Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant drastically changed the public perception of nuclear power generation. A “zero-nuclear Japan” is now urgently demanded by the general public.

Since the mid-1950s when nuclear power generation became a controversial issue in Japan, the JCP has continuously pointed out that the current nuclear power generation technology is flawed and hazardous, and opposed the construction of nuclear power plants. The JCP has waged struggles to oppose the building of nuclear power stations in various part of the nation. Also in the Diet, it has questioned the government pro-nuclear power policy pointing out the dangerous risks inherent in nuclear power plants. In doing so, it has raised such issues as the nuclear power promotion deeply relying on the “nuclear safety myth”; the lack of an independent nuclear regulatory body; the absence of a safe method to dispose of spent nuclear fuel; and the risk of a station blackout or meltdown in the event of an earthquake or tsunami.

The massive earthquake and tsunami that hit the Tohoku region in March 2011 vindicated the JCP’s warning on the likelihood of a nuclear meltdown disaster in a most tragic manner.

Learning from the experience of the Fukushima nuclear crisis, the JCP has made a series of proposals, developing its policies on nuclear power generation and energy.

In June 2011, the JCP put forward a proposal for a swift departure from nuclear power generation. The proposal pointed out that: when a nuclear power plant causes a serious accident emitting a vast amount of radiation, the human element is unable to bring it under control immediately and the damage continues to spread geographically, socially, and chronically without limit; these “extraordinary hazards” of nuclear accidents will become most serious in Japan, one of the most quake- and tsunami-prone nations in the world; there is no such thing as “safe nuclear power plants” and; it is impossible for “Japanese society to coexist with nuclear power generation.” In August 2011, the JCP published a proposal on measures to protect the health of children and adults from radioactive contamination.

With the Fukushima nuclear crisis becoming ever graver and public opinion and movements against the restart of nuclear reactors hugely developed, a majority of the public have come to support the creation of a “zero-nuclear Japan.” Meanwhile, the operations of nuclear power stations throughout Japan stopped for a significant period of time.

Taking into account these developments, the JCP in September 2012 published a proposal for “immediately realizing zero nuclear power plants.” The proposal pointed out that Japan has no need to restart idled nuclear reactors and that reactivation of nuclear reactors will further increase “nuclear wastes” which we have no way to dispose of. The JCP proposed that the government “make a political decision to immediately shut down all nuclear power plants and realize ‘zero nuclear power plants’ now” and “cancel its policy of reactivating idled nuclear reactors, and begin the process of decommissioning reactors while suspending operations of all nuclear reactors.”

- The government should make a political decision to immediately realize “zero nuclear power plants.” The ongoing Fukushima nuclear disaster is demonstrating the “unique risks” of nuclear accidents as the JCP pointed out. Far from being put under control, the disaster has been ongoing with radioactive water increasing. This massive amount of radioactive water is threatening to overflow and will seriously contaminate the ocean. Japan is facing a major emergency. The JCP urges the government to make a political decision to accomplish “zero nuclear power without delay” and simultaneously make all-out efforts to reconstruct Fukushima.

- Aiming to overcome the critical situation of the radioactive water leakage issue, the JCP in September 2013 issued an urgent proposal and demanded the government to implement all-out efforts. In the proposal, the JCP demanded the government i) to formulate a basic principle of “preventing the sea from being polluted with radioactive materials”; ii) to publish the results of investigations into the current status of radioactive water leakage, retract the “accident under control declaration,” and create a public awareness of the emergency; iii) to cancel plans to reactivate or export nuclear power plants and concentrate all human and physical resources on solving the radioactive water leakage issue; and iv) to liquidate TEPCO which lacks the capability of coping with the accident and establish a structure in which the state directly takes charge of efforts to control the accident, compensate for damage, and decontaminate.

- The restart of suspended nuclear reactors and exports of nuclear power plants should be cancelled. The Abe government together with business circles began calling for the resumption of operations of offline nuclear reactors and are scrambling to sell Japan-made nuclear power plants to other countries. Under a situation where

the nuclear accident is still in emergency state, resuming operations and exporting nuclear power generation is unacceptable. The “new safety standards” for nuclear power plants fail to set the numeric criteria for preparedness for quakes and tsunami at each nuclear power plant, allow construction of plant facilities on active faults if they are invisible, leave planning of evacuation to each municipality. It is unacceptable for the government to use such sloppy “standards” as an excuse to move forward on reactivation of suspended nuclear power plants.

- Massive introduction and development of renewable energy should be promoted. Without relying on nuclear energy, the government should formulate and implement a plan to expand energy saving efforts and drastically shift to renewable energy. During a transitional period of 5-10 years, during which we have to utilize thermal power to secure adequate energy, we will introduce renewable energy in a massive scale and promote the shift to a low energy society. Contrary to the claims by pro-nuclear power forces that renewable energy is “unstable” and “costly,” its supply will be stabilized and its cost reduced as the usage expands and the variety of renewables on-line increases. As to the argument claiming higher costs, nuclear power generation is an ultimate example of expensive energy as amply shown in the Fukushima accident. Japan’s potential output from renewable energy sources is 40 times more than the generation capacity of nuclear power plants in the country. A major shift to such energy would open the door for the bright future.

The struggle seeking a “zero-nuclear Japan” is a vital part of the struggle to dismantle the so-called “community of interest benefiting from nuclear power generation” and to establish an “economic society governed by rules.” It also entails breaking Japan’s energy subservience to the U.S. The JCP regards this as part of our struggle to end the adherence to the “two aberrations” stipulated in the party Program.

“Unique risks” of nuclear accidents are common to all other nuclear power plants in the world. Human history witnessed three major nuclear disasters - the 1979 Three Mile Island accident in the U.S., the 1986 Chernobyl accident in the former Soviet Union, and the 2011 Fukushima accident in Japan. We believe that a call for “zero nuclear power plants” will attract the majority of people on the earth in due course. The decommissioning of all nuclear reactors and the handling of “nuclear waste” will be a monumental project for human beings to tackle using all available knowledge and wisdom. Having experienced the Fukushima nuclear accident, Japan should take the initiative in pushing forward an international project for a “world without nuclear power plants.”

END SUBSERVIENCE TO THE U.S. FOR AN INDEPENDENT AND PEACEFUL JAPAN

Sixty years after the Japan-U.S. security treaty entered into force, Japan’s abnormal politics characterized by subservience to the U.S. underpinned by the treaty is facing a crisis of legitimacy and creating a serious contradiction with the public.

1) Amend abnormality concerning the US bases in Okinawa and the rest of Japan

Since 2010, virtually all the Okinawan people have voiced their opposition to the Futenma base relocation within Okinawa. Ignoring this, however, the Japanese and U.S. governments have been imposing the base relocation to Henoko as the only possible solution. Despite their lip-service to “relieving Okinawa from its base burden,” they are actually pressing an array of measures to increase the burden. They include: building a huge state-of-the-art military base in Henoko; deploying the vertical takeoff and landing aircraft Osprey and letting them freely fly all over Okinawa; deploying stealth fighter jets to Kadena Air Base; and greatly increasing the numbers of Marine Corps deployed there. The contradiction between the Okinawan people and the U.S. military bases has long passed the limit of endurance.

Osprey issues are not limited to Okinawa. With the Osprey participating in the joint military exercises in Shiga Prefecture as a start, there are plans to conduct flight practices all over Japan, including low-altitude flight training along seven flight paths as well as plans for their additional deployment. If this comes about, its danger and damage will be immense.

The Marine Corps, the Carrier Strike Group, and other U.S. forces in Japan are not here to protect Japan but to project themselves quickly to hotspots using Japan as their forward base. The past U.S. Defense Secretaries and Japan's ex-Defense Minister admitted to this fact.

We will strive to put an end to the abnormal status of Japan as a U.S. forward base of operations by unconditionally removing the U.S. Futenma base; cancelling the Osprey deployment; stopping the outrageous low-altitude flight training of U.S. aircraft; sending back the U.S. Marines stationed in Japan; stopping the homeporting of the U.S. Carrier Strike Group; and fundamentally revising the Japan-U.S. Status of Forces of Agreement (SOFA).

2) Withdraw immediately from the secretive and promise-breaking TPP talks

The TPP is an agreement intended to impose U.S.-style liberalization in trade and investment along with market fundamentalist policies as the rule among its participants. It will bring about enormous damages to all aspects of the Japanese economy and people's lives, including agriculture, food safety, and healthcare, destroying our economic sovereignty. This amounts to an agreement that will ruin Japan by handing the country to the U.S. on a platter.

The Abe government has been pushing forward with the TPP participation by doubly breaching its public promises. First, despite its commitment to providing detailed information, it has plunged into highly secretive negotiations to conclude the deal. Second, even though it pledged to "protect what should be protected" and to keep import tariffs on "5 key farm product categories," it has started to consider removing tariffs on those very items.

Japan should immediately pull out from the TPP negotiations that are being held behind closed doors in breach of government promises. The JCP will work to build equitable and mutually-beneficial international economic relations based on respect for each other's sovereignty in regard to food and economy.

3) Create a majority opinion that supports abrogation of the Japan-US security treaty

While we develop joint struggles fought around these highly contentious issues based on cooperation with members of various social strata, we, at the same time, work to create a majority opinion that supports the abrogation of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. In this effort, it is important to inform the public about the positive changes that can be brought about by its abrogation, as shown in our "Diplomatic Vision" document ("Abrogation of Japan-U.S. Security Treaty Would Open Up New Horizon," May 12, 2012).

- When we get rid of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, the Japanese people will be freed from the oppressive presence of the U.S. military. Under the Security Treaty, relocation of an individual base is possible only when both governments reach an agreement. However, we can end the Security Treaty by exercising our right under Article 10, giving notice to the U.S. of our intention to abrogate the treaty. A Japan without U.S. bases will stop serving as a launching pad for U.S. wars. We would be able to use the taxpayers' money and land that are now used by U.S. forces for the well-being of the general public.

- We can turn Japan from a launching pad for U.S. wars to a "launching pad for peace" based on Article 9 of the Constitution. Only by ending the Japan-U.S. military alliance will Japan be able to become a serious advocate for a shift away from a military build-up to disarmament in East Asia. Japan can emerge as a country that offers a positive contribution to establishing "an international order to create peace based on the U.N. Charter," achieving "a world without nuclear weapons," and other tasks to bring forth global peace through independent and peaceful diplomacy.

- In regard to relations with the U.S., the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty should be replaced with a Japan-U.S. friendship treaty to be concluded on a basis of equal footing. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) now has 138 member states (including the observer states) representing a population of 5.4 billion, and is developing as a major current in world politics. The goals of the movement are to reject military alliances while maintaining neutrality,

establish peaceful international relations based on the U.N. Charter, abolish nuclear weapons, and make the international economic order more equitable and democratic. After abrogating the Security Treaty, Japan should join the NAM which has become a main current in the world history. It would be a great contribution to the peace and progress of the world.

ON PROSPECT FOR FUTURE SOCIETY IN JAPAN

How do we look at the “countries aiming for socialism”?

We have been frequently asked by the public whether the future society the JCP is aiming for is the same as the present Chinese society. It is a valid question and is important to outline how we view the current situation in China, Vietnam, and Cuba and how we envision the prospect for future society in Japan.

When we look at the present and future of China, Vietnam, and Cuba, the following two points are important.

1) Not countries “that have reached socialism”

The first point is that these countries are not “countries that have already reached socialism,” but “countries aiming for socialism” or countries “beginning on a new quest for socialism” (JCP Program).

For example, China has become the world’s second largest economy by overtaking Japan, and its influence in the world economy is growing year by year. At the same time, China’s per capita GDP is still one eighth of the level of developed capitalist countries. The Chinese government recognizes itself as a developing country with a large proportion of its population remaining poor.

Thus, as for China, it is currently tasked with building a developed economy as a foundation for socialism before it enters a socialist stage. In building such an economic foundation, China has chosen to introduce a market economy. This reasonable approach has been vindicated by the economic development it has achieved since the beginning of its “reform and open-door” policy. With it, however, capitalist influence from both outside and within has increased to the extent that various negative social problems including corruption, income and social inequality, and environmental destruction has become widespread.

When we view the future of China, we must not ignore that this country will have to make efforts for a fairly long time in fighting poverty, narrowing the income gap, and protecting the environment in the midst of a growing economy, while searching for solutions to the question of its political system and form of democracy.

There might be various ventures searching for a new path, with trials and errors or even failures. There can possibly be a recurrence of past hegemonistic or great-power chauvinistic behaviors. If they commit such a grave mistake, it might be possible that they would be in danger of decisively straying from the path toward socialism. We hope that the “countries aiming for socialism” will never repeat such fatal mistakes as the former Soviet Union had made.

The JCP has had frank discussions with the leaders of those countries about their “political and economic problems” (JCP Program), while upholding a principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of others. We have conveyed to the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party our candid opinions regarding a future political system in China, the anti-Japan demonstrations, the Tibet issue, and the Senkaku islands question at the appropriate occasions.

2) Inevitably being put into contrast with capitalist countries

The second point is that, even though they still belong to the category of developing countries in terms of their social developmental stage, the “countries aiming for socialism,” with their political and economic influence growing in the world, are inevitably and increasingly put into contrast with capitalist countries on various counts, including:

- How is the concept of “the people are sovereign” realized socially and politically?
- How much priority is given to improving people’s living standards in their economic policy?
- Do they make an effort in promoting human rights and freedom in accordance with international norms that they themselves have agreed to?
- How seriously are they pursuing the establishment of a world order that does not allow hegemonism to show its face in international relations?
- What positive contribution do they make to abolishing nuclear weapons, combating global warming, and solving other issues faced by humanity?

Regarding hegemonism, we should also remember how sternly Lenin warned the leaders of Soviet Russia after the revolution not to take a great-power chauvinistic attitude towards neighboring countries.

We earnestly hope that China, Vietnam, and Cuba as countries “beginning a new quest for socialism” will shine a light on the possibility of creating more advanced achievements in these problems in comparison with capitalist countries.

FUTURE SOCIETY IN JAPAN OFFERS GRAND POSSIBILITIES

When we advance towards a socialist Japan, our given social conditions will open up grand possibilities. China, Vietnam, and Cuba are beset with “political and economic problems to solve” because they started their nation-building in economically, socially, and politically backward societies. In addition to this, China and Vietnam were devastated during the wars of aggression by foreign imperialism, whereas Cuba has long been subject to the protracted unlawful U.S. economic embargo.

1) Economic strength as a condition for transition to future society

Japan’s transition to future society will proceed under different conditions.

When Japan successfully completes a democratic revolution within the framework of capitalism and embarks on a path towards socialism, it will inherit the enormous economic strength created by its developed capitalist economy. Thus, Japan will not go through a rapid economic growth sequence accompanied by increasing social contradictions as is seen in China today.

The present Japanese economy is well able to afford to provide all the public with “the minimum standards of wholesome and cultured living” as stipulated in the Constitution of Japan. One reason why it actually does not do so is that tyrannical rule of the business circles and large corporations is causing a widening of the socio-economic disparity. Another reason is that the present stage of capitalism is organized in an extremely wasteful way which is exemplified by repeated economic crises, the lifestyle of “mass production, mass consumption, and mass disposal,” and a bloated finance economy.

Socialization of the means of production will liberate the economy from the narrow framework of “profit-first approaches” specific to capitalism and redirect the “driving force for production and the economy” away from the “capitalist quest for profits” to the “development of society and of the material and spiritual life of members of society.” This will lead to the abolition of exploitation and elimination of the wasteful components of the current capitalist economy. This process will enable the Japanese economy, with its present strength, to ensure “the minimum standards of wholesome and cultured living” to all Japanese citizens, and to realize shorter working hours for all workers. Thus, it will lay the foundation for the human development of all members of society, and pave the way for a dramatic progress of the society and economy.

2) Freedom, democracy, and political system as conditions for transition to future society

In terms of freedom, democracy, and political system, the road toward socialism in Japan will be different from the road taken by China and other countries aiming for socialism.

The political systems of China, Vietnam, and Cuba adopt a de facto single-party system and their constitutions set forth the “leadership role of the communist party.” This is partly because the forces aiming for socialism in these countries came to power through non-parliamentary paths, fighting revolutionary wars. Even in the case of taking power through a non-parliamentary path, prohibition of opposition political parties is not a general principle of revolution, as was rightly demonstrated by Lenin in the early stages of the Russian revolution. At the same time, we should look at the current political system in these countries in the context that they started their revolutions in societies without parliaments or democratic experience.

In Japan, this would not happen. The JCP clearly states in its program that whether in a democratic revolution needed at present or socialist transformation in the future, we will proceed step by step by seeking public consent through elections and receiving the backing of a parliamentary majority.

The JCP Program stipulates as follows:

- “A socialist/communist Japan will inherit and further develop all valuable gains of the capitalist era, including those of democracy and freedom;”
- “The freedom of various ideologies and beliefs as well as political activities, including those by opposition parties, will be rigorously protected;” and,
- “Giving privileges to a particular political party as the ‘leadership’ party in the name of ‘socialism’ or defining a particular outlook on the world as ‘state-designated philosophy’ is an act that has nothing in common with socialism and therefore must be categorically rejected.”

This is our declaration to the Japanese people about the prospect for a socialist Japan as expressed in our program. However, it entails more than that. If a future society is built on a society where popular sovereignty and fundamental human rights are enshrined in the constitution and where parliamentary democracy exists, as in Japan, it is a matter of historical certainty that any such future society will fully inherit and greatly advance on those democratic achievements.

The human race has not yet seen an economically powerful advanced capitalist country proceeding towards a socialist/communist society. Such a transformation of a society with a more advanced baseline will open up immense and grand possibilities. With a firm conviction of this future vision in mind, let us go forward!