

2801

JPRS: 2801

3 June 1960

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

TRANSLATIONS OF CHINESE COMMUNIST
ARTICLES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

19980109 077

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:
PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

U.S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

JPRS: 2801

CSO: 3617-N

TRANSLATIONS OF CHINESE COMMUNIST
ARTICLES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Article</u>	<u>Page</u>
A Review of International Situation and A Look at the Future	1
Recognizing the True Face of Capitalist Inter- national Law From a Few Basic Concepts	18
A Year of Intensified Development of National Democratic Revolution in Cuba	38
Seeing America Through the 14th General Assembly of the United Nations	54
What is Eisenhower Peddling?	61

A REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND A
LOOK AT THE FUTURE
(From 1959 to 1960)

[This is a full translation of an article written by Kuo Wen-yen appearing in Kuo-chi Wen-t'i Yen-chiu, Peiping, No 1 3 January 1960, pages 1-8.]

I

Now that the glorious year of 1959 is over, people are entering the 1960's of the 20th Century with full confidence.

The special characteristic of the international situation during 1959 was that the balance of power was more and more in favor of peace, democracy and the socialist camp and more and more unfavorable to the imperialist camp, so much so that the imperialist bosses could not help but clamoring also for peace and making gestures of relaxation on certain issues for the time being.

This favorable international situation is the result of the incessant struggle on the part of the peace-loving peoples of the world who look upon the socialist camp as the leading force.

In fact, this favorable situation has been in existence for a long time, but it did not become so evident until 1959. Let us trace not too far back. In 1957 Chairman Mao Tse-tung pointed to the prevalence of east wind over the west wind as the special characteristic of the world situation at that time. The development of international situation in 1958 further bore out the correctness of Chairman Mao's wise conclusion.

During the year 1958, the world force of peace and the imperialist force of war were engaged in three major clashes. The first was the clash touched off by the revolution in Iraq, the second was our heavy artillery bombardment of Quemoy and Matsu, and the third was caused by the Soviet Union's request to end the occupation of West Berlin.

In these contests, the force of imperialism suffered serious defeat and setback. These three major world events fully proved Chairman Mao's wise conclusion: "The American imperialists are bent to think that a tense world situation is favorable to themselves, but the fact shows to the contrary that the world tension manufactured by the United States leads to a situation running against the wishes of the American people and, at the same time, serves the purpose of mobilizing all peoples of the world to rise against American aggressors." (See Chairman Mao's speech at the Supreme National Conference, 8 Sep 1958.)

The imperialists created tension, but tension did not seem to be of any benefit to the imperialists. They are not only situated in an inferior position as far as relative strength is concerned, but also plagued by increasing internal contradictions within the imperialist camp.

The Berlin issue, for instance, has caused further disintegration of the imperialist camp. Taking advantage of this situation, the Soviet Union has finally made it possible for its leader to visit the United States, resulting in important agreements with the President of the United States helpful to the relaxation of world tension. Furthermore, the peaceful struggle vigorously promoted by the Soviet Union caused a definite relaxation on the international scene in 1959.

II.

How did the further change in the relative strength of the world powers show during 1959? Let us discuss this question in three respects:

(1) The socialist camp has far surpassed the imperialist camp in strength. The former is viable and flourishing, and the latter is ridden with crisis. The former is well consolidated and unified, and the latter is bogged down by contradictions one after another. The former is already up to the moon and the latter can only sigh at a distance. How sharp is the contrast!

The steady growth of the strength of the socialist camp stems first of all from its economic construction which developed by leaps and bounds. The 21st Congress of the Soviet Communist Party convened in early 1959 mapped out the Seven-Year Plan (1959-1965) and declared that the Soviet Union had entered a new historical epoch for all-out Communist socialist construction.

The rate of increase of the Soviet Union's industrial output during 1959 far exceeded the average annual target set forth in the Seven-Year Plan. The total value of the Soviet Union's industrial output during 1960 is expected to be 8.1 percent higher than that of 1959. Steel production will reach 64.9 million tons.

In the two years between 1959 and 1960, USSR steel output can increase by 10 million tons. It took the U.S. 12 years to increase its steel output by the same amount. (See the report on the Development of Soviet National Economy made by K'o-hsi-chin, Vice Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers, 27 October 1959). Many facts indicate that the Seven-Year Plan cannot only be fulfilled but also be fulfilled far in excess of the planned targets.

Under the illumination of the Party's general line of socialist construction, a leap forward and sustained leap forward in economic construction has appeared in our country. Enthusiastically in response to the call of the Eighth Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in 1959, the people throughout the country warred against rightist tendencies, gathered striving strength, brought about a new high tide in the "production-increase and practice-thrift" movement and productive construction. The principal targets scheduled to be fulfilled in 1962 were fulfilled in 1959. It goes without saying that the continued leap forward situation is already a fact in 1960.

Other socialist countries are also accelerating their socialist construction. From the east coast of Korea to the Elbe River in Germany, all members of the socialist camp are engulfed in a high tide of economic construction. The speed of construction of these socialist countries far exceeds that of the capitalist countries. For instance, during the seven-year period from 1952 to 1958

the industrial output of the Soviet Union increased by 110 percent, the average annual rate of increase being close to 11.5 percent.

During the same period, the total industrial output of the United States increased only by 11.7 percent, the average annual rate of increase being 1.6 percent. In the peaceful competition to come, the historical tendency that the Soviet Union will surpass the United States, China will surpass England and the socialist camp will surpass the imperialist camp could not have been clearer than during 1959.

The growth of the strength of the socialist camp still depends upon the incessant strengthening of political and cooperation. The solidarity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and the solidarity of the international Communist movement with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as the nucleus is one built upon Marxism-Leninism and is, therefore, the strongest.

The Conference of Communist Party and Workers Party Representatives held in Moscow in 1957 summed up the experience of international Communism in the last one hundred years, especially that of the October Revolution, and laid down a political ideological foundation for the solidarity of the socialist camp and international Communist movement.

During the last two years, the Communist parties of different countries have been helping each other in their common struggle and uniting with each other for the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

During 1959, many socialist countries celebrated their respective tenth or fifteenth founding anniversaries-- occasions for displaying their strong socialist armed forces. In a word, the unity within the socialist camp is solid. The attempt of the imperialists and contemporary revisionists to split the socialist countries can only strengthen this solidarity.

On the other sides, the capitalist camp is laden with crises and contradictions, and the process of its disintegration is worsening day by day.

The economic crisis of 1957-1958 brought about a weakening in the strength of the imperialist countries, resulting in the decline of industrial output in West Germany, France, Italy and Japan. There was an increase in America's industrial output during the first half of 1959, but this increase was short-lived. The production fell back again in July, and the output figure in October was 4.5 percent lower than that in June. This shift in the relative strength sharpened the contradictions within the capitalist camp, and the economic crisis weakened American imperialism.

The international competition between the monopolist groups of such principal capitalist countries as the United States, Great Britain, West Germany and Japan became noticeably keener after the crisis. This kind of competition showed up in commodity and capital exports, raw material control, currencies and international finance. Although the competition was directed at the United States, the split of Western Europe into the "common market" headed by West Germany and France and the "European free trade area" headed by Great Britain indicated that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization--a mainstay of the imperialist camp headed by the United States--is in the process of falling apart.

The outflow of gold from the United States during 1958 and 1959 signified the weakening of America's control over the capitalist world. It is true that the United States has an annual favorable trade balance of about US\$3.5 billion, but foreign "aid" and loans amount to US\$2.5 billion, private capital exports amount to two billion, and overseas military expenses amount to about US three billion. The last three items add up to 7.5 billion. The result is an unfavorable balance of payment to the amount of \$4 billion a year.

For maintaining its reactionary rule over the capitalist world, the United States can neither cut down its foreign "aid" and loans, nor reduce private capital export, not to mention overseas military expenses.

Under such circumstances, if the United States permits a continued flight of gold, the value of the American dollar on the world market will be rocked to its foundation. At present the United States has taken various

measures to stop the flight of gold, but these measures can hardly get her out of the predicament position.

In this increasingly sharp economic competition, the monopoly capitalist blocs within the capitalist camp are now putting a large amount of investment into fixed assets and carrying out modernization and automation in industrial plants in an effort to increase labor productivity, cut down cost, and strengthen their competitive position.

Under such circumstances, they take hostile actions against the workers, both employed and the unemployed, thus intensifying domestic class contradictions and causing an unprecedented rise of labor strikes in many capitalist countries. The protracted three-month long steel strike in the United States during which half a million of American steel workers insisted on their demands represented a high tide of the revolutionary struggle by the worker class in the capitalist world.

In order to exploit a maximum amount of profit, the monopoly capitalists, through international cartels, continued to restrict the production of raw materials during this period, limit the export quota of raw material, keep the price of raw material at a low level reached during the economic crisis, thus causing the worsening of economic conditions in raw material-producing countries.

Subsequently, the contradiction between imperialism and nationalism and that between the different classes within the imperialist countries became intensified. The clamoring for so-called "aid" to economically under-developed countries is designed, on the one hand, to soften the combat morale of national states against aggression and colonialism and, on the other hand, pave the way for tighter political and military control over these countries.

During the first half of 1959, the fixed assets investment in capitalist countries was slightly increased and industrial production was also slightly on the increase. But the excessive capabilities of industrial equipment and the phenomena of restrained operation became a more and more serious problem as days go by, reflecting the ever-increasing sharp contradiction between blind industrial expansion and the limited market demand.

Economists on American monopoly capitalism are predicting that another economic recession may come again in the second half of 1960 or 1961. Although it may be hard to predict the exact time, yet the occurrence of another economic crisis is apparently inevitable.

The sharp economic contradiction within the imperialist camp is bound to be reflected in international politics. While United States is trying hard to control west European countries through NATO, the latter strive to free themselves from American control. A struggle between "control" and "anti-control" thus take place. After the British Prime Minister's visit to the Soviet Union, an atmosphere of relaxation began to appear in East-West relations despite America's policy of tension.

Charles de Gaulle of France began to claim for "independence." Conrad Adenauer of West Germany was actively engaged in the revival of German militarism and expansion of influence, striving for hegemony in Western Europe.

By the end of August 1959, Eisenhower visited Western European countries and in December attended a western summit conference with the head of state of Great Britain, France and West Germany in an effort to ease the internal contradictions among themselves. The result, however, was that the countries of the imperialist camp became more disunited.

The communique issued at the conclusion of the Eighth Session of the Sixth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party pointed out: "The imperialist camp is ridden by contradictions. The so-called 'unity' among the imperialist countries is in the process of falling apart. This process may last a considerably long time, but the general trend is inevitable". The development of the internal situation within the imperialist camp during 1959 has proved the correctness of this analysis.

From the above comparison of the political and economic situation of the two camps, anyone can see which side is in a favorable position. If we compare the scientific and technological development of the two camps, United States is now left far behind the Soviet Union. After putting three satellites into orbit around the earth, the Soviet Union in 1959 successively launched a

satellite around the sun, a rocket to the moon (Lunik I), and "an automatic inter-planetary space station" (Lunik II), which photographed the far side of the moon, until then a mystery to mankind. This is a climax of modern science development. The amazing scientific development in the Soviet Union has greatly increased the strength for the defense of peace.

(2) The force of national independence movement further surpasses the force of colonialism. During the year past, the tidal wave of national independence movement and people's democratic movement supported by the socialist camp surged high and wide, engulfing almost the whole of Africa and Latin America.

During 1959, the national independence movement in Africa gained momentum. Even the London Daily Telegraphy had to admit that the development in Africa had a world-shocking significance.

A few features of this movement deserve our attention. First, the movement reached a high tide everywhere. At present 11 of the 50 countries and territories in Africa have basically won political independence and 31 are striving for independence. During 1959, violent anti-colonialist struggles broke out throughout the length and breadth of Africa. Since the beginning of 1959, big-scale mass struggles have taken place one after another in Congo--until recently a tranquil place. The national liberation wars of Algeria and Cameroons have won brilliant victories, while Anti-colonialist struggles of various kinds have also widely unfolded in Nyasaland, South Africa and Kenya.

Second, more and more countries are dissatisfied with the so-called "self-government" granted by colonial countries, and seek complete independence. A year ago when France proclaimed the establishment of the "France Community" only Guinea refused to participate. More countries are now demanding that they be freed from the bondage of the "Community." The Senegal and Sudanese Republics formed the Mali Federation in defiance of France and sought independence. In areas where national independence movement is rather weak such as Nyasaland, people are now dissatisfied with self-government under the so-called "Federation of Central Africa" and openly demand independence.

Third, the non-worker class in Africa is now playing a more active role in the anti-imperialist struggle. A few years ago, democratic labor legislation was the principal objective of African labor movement. Since the founding of the General Union of the Workers of Dark Africa, complete independence has become the principal mission of the labor movement in West Africa.

It is evident to everybody that in countries where the labor movement is well organized, the national independence movement is better organized and pursued with more resoluteness. The fact that the United Kingdom and France were compelled to agree to the independence of Cameroon and Togoland in 1960 is inseparable from the highly developed labor movement in West Africa.

In the face of the tidal wave of anti-colonialism, the Western colonial powers seek to put up resistance, dispatching armed forces from time to time to suppress the mass movement. Quite aware that armed forces alone cannot stop the development of national independence movement. The colonial powers resort more to political deception. For instance, in last September, the de Gaulle Government proposed a so-called "new plan" for Algeria, and the Belgian government promised Congo "independence by stages."

In Latin America, the national democratic movement has also undergone rapid development during the last year. The success of the Cuban revolution signified that the national democratic revolution in Latin America has reached a new high tide. Following the overthrow of the Batista dictatorship on 1 January 1959, the Cuban people consolidated their already gained political independence and, at the same time, strove for economic independence.

In spite of threat and enticement by reactionary forces from outside, the provisional revolutionary government of Cuba dissolved the old political machinery and put arch-war criminals on trial. It established and consolidated a people's armed forces; proclaimed and gradually carried out a comparatively progressive land program; severely attacked American imperialist interest in Cuba; promulgated a petroleum law, a mining law, etc.; and limited the aggressive activity of American monopoly capitalists in Cuba. Time and time again the brave Cuban people thwarted the barbarous intervention and threat of American imperialism.

The rapid development of the Cuban revolution has greatly promoted the national democratic revolution in Latin American. Under the encouragement of the victory of Cuban revolution, people's armed struggles and mass movements rise one after another in Paraguay, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua and Haiti, where the totalitarian regimes are doomed.

At the same time, anti-United States struggles of bigger scale exploded in more countries. In Panama, a big movement to regain the sovereignty over the Canal Zone was started in November, 1959. In Argentina, general strikes against American monopoly capital and the Frondizi regime's reactionary measures took place one after another. For instance, the strike that occurred in September 1959 was joined by more than 4,000,000 people. Even in the American colony of Puerto Rico, a colorful anti-American movement was started in 1959.

The unprecedented rise of the national independence movement in Latin America has been a major reason that accounts for the failure of a series of intrigues engineered by the United States to frustrate the Cuban revolution.

In Asia and the Middle East, national democratic movement continues to develop. During 1959, a counter-current against rightist tendencies hit a few national states dominated by the bourgeois class, indicating the sharpening of class struggle and the deepening of national democratic movement. The time-tested progressive forces of the national states in Asia are being augmented, and show a determination to carry on the anti-imperialist and anti-feudalist struggle to the very end.

The new-born Iraq Republic repeatedly warded off intervention by domestic and foreign reactionary forces, defended national independence and liquidated the remnants of imperialist forces. In southeast Asian countries, the progressive forces of the people continued to strive for national independence, democracy and freedom despite the threat of rightist reactionaries.

The development of world situation in 1959 clearly indicated that the forces of national independence movement and people's democratic movement definitely surpassed those of colonialism. The political forces in some

uncommitted areas may be complicated in nature or may cause trouble during the course of progress, yet people's heroic struggle will finally win a decisive victory. No force can prevent a viable development of national democratic movement, and no force can save colonialism from total collapse. Even the imperialist themselves cannot but admit that they are on the brink of an unfathomable abyss.

(3) The proletarian class and the broad masses of people in imperialist countries are seeking to improve their economic life, safeguard their democratic rights and restraint armament and war preparations. The movement for safeguarding peace thus further forged ahead.

The closer the imperialists approach their doomsday, the more ferocious they attack their own people and provoke war with foreign countries. The fanatic actions on the part of the imperialists can only invite strong resistance by the actions on the part of the imperialists can only invite strong resistance by the proletarian class and the broad masses of the people in their own country. During the year past, the class struggle in imperialist countries became sharper and labor movement went through further development. Labor strikes rose one after another, involving more people and took longer time to settle.

For protecting their own interest and taking retaliation against the capitalists, the American worker class launched stormy labor strikes last year. According to the American Labor Department, 3,225 labor strikes occurred during the first nine months of 1959, involving 1,770,000 persons. The long steel workers' strike, which persisted for nearly four months, is rare in American history. A severe jolt to the monopoly capitalists, this strike had a far-reaching effect on American political and economic lives.

In Western Europe, the struggle of the worker class also underwent great development. According to the British labor department, Great Britain was hit by 1,597 labor strikes during the first nine months of 1959 which involved 507,100 persons. More labor-days were lost during those nine months than the whole year of 1958. The April strike of some 100,000 printers in England was especially a labor struggle of great significance.

In France, Italy and Japan, the struggle of the worker class underwent similar development. In July 1959, Italy saw the biggest seamen's strike in the history of Italian labor movement. The worker class in Japan heroically devoted themselves to the struggle for political and economic rights and to the opposition of a U.S.-Japanese mutual security pact.

The labor strike in imperialist countries, although essentially economic in nature, is now taking on more and more political significance. Through actual struggle, the workers have come to the realization that only by striving for democratic rights and opposing aggressive wars can they seek improvement of their economic life. Not long ago, the representatives of the Communist parties in 17 West European countries exchanged opinion on the problem of unity among the workers and the masses in their joint fight for peace, democratic rights and improvement of workers' material welfare, and subsequently issued an appeal to the working people and democratic elements all over the world. This conference has undoubtedly augmented the combat strength of the workers' class and the broad masses of European people in their struggle for economic and political rights and safeguard of peace.

The socialist camp, the force of the national democratic movement and the broad masses of the people within the imperialism. The steady growth of this army, the strength of which has by far surpassed that of the imperialists, has deterred the imperialists from taking rash actions. This has been the fundamental reason why the world situation was somewhat relaxed during 1959.

III

It was the drastic change in the relative strength and the superiority of the force of peace over the force of war that compelled the United States to ease world tension. The United States talks loud about peace and masquerades as the "messenger of peace," but imperialists, after all, are imperialists. They have abandoned neither tension-manufacturing nor preparations for war, not to mention their aggressive ambitions.

Although the U.S. has agreed to hold a East-West summit conference to resolve the Berlin question, she has not shown any sincerity in seeking a settlement. It goes without saying that it continues to establish guided missile bases everywhere in the world, arm the West Germans and strengthen the NATO nations.

In the Far East, the United States continues to occupy South Korea and our territory--Taiwan, control South Vietnam, support the Laos reactionary ruling bloc in a civil war, and renamed the Bagdad treaty organization the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). It is particularly worth while to point out that the U.S. is actively arming Japan in preparation for the signing of a new U.S.-Japanese mutual security treaty in January 1960. The U.S. is also trying to revive Japanese militarism and use Japan as a pawn in its aggression in Asia, especially China. Are these deeds compatible with the peaceful intentions claimed by the United States?

Clamoring for "peace" and "relaxation," the United States has never taken any action towards these goals in any place. An article written by Sulzberger in the 25 November, 1959 issue of the New York Times frankly admitted that America's recent talks about peace were but a gesture and that its aggressive diplomatic policy had not changed at all. Sulzberger pointed out that "it is wrong to say Herter's policy has replaced Dulles' policy." He said the U.S. State Department's policy was still the same without any substantial change at all.

In some respects, the U.S. has made some gestures of temporary relaxation, but it has no real intention to relax world tension. While talking about peace, it actually expands its armament in preparation for war. Why should the United States behave like this?

First of all, it is favorable to the imperialists, especially the American imperialists, to have a temporary relaxation. The United States has over-extended itself. In a world as big as this, it wants to establish missile bases everywhere.

In a world as eventful as this, the United States wants to interfere with everybody's affair. The result is chaos and tension. This has been fully proved by events of 1959.

No sooner had American troops been withdrawn from Lebanon, they rushed to Quemoy and Matsu.

Hardly before the Quemoy and Matsu incident was over, the Berlin crisis occurred. The United States provoked war everywhere and got beaten everywhere. The voice of complaint rose in unison both at home and abroad. For the sake of softening opposition at home and abroad, consolidating military bases, controlling its satellite countries and readjusting relations with its allies, the United States itself is in dire need of a temporary relaxation.

To paralyze the combat morale of the peoples all over the world, the United States must clamor for "peace." When it is made known that even the United States had become a peace-loving country, who is then the target of attack in the struggle against imperialism and for the defense of peace? America's brutal behavior during the 14 years since the end of World War II has won her no friends among the peoples all over the world. Under such circumstances, what can be more deceptive than talks of peace to divert people's attention!

The imperialists are fully aware that one of the most significant events in contemporary times which will determine the destiny of the world is the national democratic movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. This movement is so powerful that it is more and more difficult to stop it. Standing by the side of the Asians, Africans and Latin Americans are the formidable socialist camp and the broad masses of European people.

In the face of such a situation what can the imperialists do? The logic of the robber is that if robbery does not work, thievery might do. Paralyze the adversaries; dissolve their army; and use deception.

The United States used precisely this kind of tactics to drive a wedge between China and the Soviet Union, alienate China from the Afro-Asian countries, isolate China, and attack China. They forget that the Chinese-Soviet solidarity and the solidarity of the whole socialist camp, built on the foundation of Marxism and Leninism, cannot be destroyed by any force on the world.

Although the American imperialists use the rightist bourgeois class of various national states to start anti-Chinese movements one after another, the friendship between the Chinese people and the peoples of Asia and Africa is indestructible.

By so doing, they can only let the people of these countries see more clearly the reactionary face of the rightist elements and push the national democratic movement to a higher gear. As to attacking China, we have been under attack for so many years. Instead of going down, we are growing stronger day by day. What other consequences this attack can have?

America's clamoring for peace is actually for the purpose of covering up its continued armament expansion and for gaining time to catch up with the Soviet Union in scientific and technical development, particularly in the development of guided missiles. It is not true that the United States does not want to fight a global war. It is rather because of its disparity with the Soviet Union in strength, and uncertain about the outcome that the United States dares not take rash action.

Therefore, the United States wants to ease world tension and, at the same time, step up its preparations for war during the time gained. Of course, whether the United States can catch up with the Soviet Union or not is another question. From the above analysis, we can see that an imperialist have two hands: one is hard and the other soft; one is used for threat and the other for enticement; one is for robbery and other for theft; one is for peaceful or non-violent methods and the other is for violent methods or war; one is for attack from without and the other is for subversion from within; one is for "direct aggression" and the other for "indirect aggression;" one is for peace and the other for preparation of war.

Under different circumstances, the imperialists may use one hand or the other, but the use of either hand at an appropriate time is by no means inconsistent with their overall long-range policy. In fact, the alternate use of apparently different measures is rather well coordinated and mechanically related. Nevertheless, one alternative is subordinate to the other. By virtue of the

nature of imperialism, non-violence is subordinate to violence; clamoring for "peace" is subordinate to the policy of strength, temporary relaxation is subordinate to preparations for war. We are wrong if we fail to see the "two hands" of the imperialists. It will be even worse if we should mistake their subsidiary policy for their main policy.

No matter which hand the imperialist may play, his purpose is to destroy socialism and enslave the peoples of the world. In an address delivered in New York City on 31 January 1959 at a New York State Bar Association award dinner, John Foster Dulles stressed that "law and justice should be established as the decisive and essential substitutes for peace."

He added: "What is vital here is to recognize that the renunciation of force under these conditions implies, not the maintenance of status quo, but peaceful change." What did he mean by change? Of course, he did not mean change of capitalism into socialism but change of socialism into capitalism. Dulles' words not only revealed the stubborn stand of imperialism, but also reflected the growth of the strength of world socialism.

Due to the fact that the imperialist force is more and more isolated, and put in a predicament position, the United States no longer dares to start world war and cannot help but resorting more heavily to the use of deception to achieve its ambition of aggression and expansion. This not only shows the cunningness of the imperialists but also betrays their weakness.

The development of the international situation during 1959 proved that the balance of power was favorable to us and unfavorable to the imperialists. In general, the international situation is somewhat relaxed. The clamoring for peace on the part of the imperialists, regardless of what intention they might have, showed that they found themselves in a more difficult position. Now that we are crossing the threshold of 1960, we ought to say that the general situation is good. The intrigues of the imperialists may still work, but due to the fact that the cloak of peace can no longer cover up aggression and war preparations, the market for such intrigues is shrinking rather than expanding. As long as we keep our heads cool,

persist in unity and persist in struggle, we can definitely win bigger victories on the international front during 1960.

RECOGNIZE THE TRUE FACE OF CAPITALIST
INTERNATIONAL LAW FROM A FEW BASIC CONCEPTS

[The following is a complete translation of an article written by Ying T'ao appearing in Kuo-chi Wen-t'i Yen-chiu (International Study), Peiping, No 1, 3 January 1960, pages 42-51.]

Editor's Note: Many readers have found the article "A Preliminary Criticism of Capitalist International Law" published in the third issue of 1959 of this magazine very helpful and hoped for publication of more articles of a similar nature. From this year on, this periodical is planning to publish more articles for a systematic criticism of capitalist international law. Naturally, these questions call for intensive study.

There are many treatises on capitalist international law which may vary in arrangement and order, but they are essentially the same in content. In general, these treatises consist of the following parts:

(1) The foundation and development of international law. This part deals with the conception, legal force, origin, application and development of the law of nations. Discussions of these topics are characterized by an attempt to justify the capitalist international law as just, righteous, transcending class interest, ever-lasting and an indispensable code of behavior in international society in order to attain the purpose of stupefying the people of the world and serving the interest of imperialist aggression.

(2) The subjects of the law of nations.

Aside from states, the capitalist international law regards international organizations and individuals as subjects of international law in order to facilitate capitalist intervention in other country's domestic affairs. States are classified as "civilized states,"

"non-civilized states," "sovereign states" and "semi-sovereign states."

Only "civilized states" and "sovereign states" are considered as subjects of international law, while "uncivilized states" and "semi-sovereign states" are not considered as "complete" or "normal" subjects of the law of nations and, therefore, subject to protection or even partition. A legal basis is thus created for imperialists to invade and enslave colonies and vassal states.

(3) The objects of the law of nations.

This part deals with the modes of acquisition of territory, the legal status of aliens, etc. Here the capitalist international law tries to defend imperialist annexation of other country's territory by considering "inchoate titles of discovery," "conquest," etc., as "legal modes of territorial acquisition." Undermining the concept of equality, the imperialist countries use so-called "international standard" as a basis to obtain for their nationals in foreign countries special privileges and to suppress people of small and weak nations.

(4) International relations and transactions.

This part deals with the establishment of diplomatic relations and conclusion of treaties. Fully reflecting the desire of the ruling class of imperialist powers, the capitalist international law interprets many unreasonable things as general principles of international law and forces small countries to observe. For instance, capitalist international jurists insist that the signatories to a treaty must carry out all obligations provided in the treaty even though it is an unequal treaty, thus enabling the imperialist powers to maintain their already obtained interests.

They distort the generally accepted democratic principles of international law to facilitate imperialist aggression. For example, in compelling weak nations to carry out international obligations provided in unequal treaties concluded under duress and coercion, the imperialist powers invoke the principle "pacta sunt servanda." This kind of action is not only permitted but also legalized by the capitalist international law.

(5) Settlement of differences between nations.

The capitalist international law classifies the methods of settling international disputes into two categories; one is amicable and the other compulsive. Negotiation, mediation and arbitration are classified as amicable methods of settling international disputes, while retorsion, blockade and intervention are considered as compulsive methods of settling international disputes.

No matter what method is used, the purpose is the same; that is, to attain the interest of capitalist powers in the course of settling disputes and to attain their illegal objective by means of so-called "legal" methods.

The so-called amicable methods of settling disputes such as negotiation, mediation and arbitration are actually not "amicable" at all because settlements are usually reached under the pressure of capitalist powers and the parties involved are not in an equal position.

As to the compulsive methods, they are the exclusive weapons of the capitalist powers which the weak nations can ill afford to use. Undoubtedly, the weak nations can only suffer under compulsive settlement of international differences.

(6) War and neutrality.

The capitalist international law, on the one hand, permits the capitalist class to start war to achieve aggressive purposes and, on the other hand, painstakingly lays down so many rules for hostilities and neutrality in a futile attempt to cover up the true nature of the imperialist aggressive wars with such beautiful terms as humanity and justice to paralyze the morale of the people in their anti-aggression struggle.

Here we can see that a strong sense of class interest pervades all parts of the capitalist international law.

It must be pointed out here that a large part of capitalist international is devoted to technicalities. For instance, in the part dealing with international relations and intercourse, lengthy discussions are given to the rank and appointment of diplomatic envoys, the procedure of

presenting credentials and establishment of embassies and consulates. In the part dealing with settlement of international disputes, war and neutrality, technical rules take up most of the space chapter after chapter.

A similar way of treatment exists in other parts. Of course, it is necessary to introduce technical rules and regulations as codes for international intercourse, but over-emphasis on such rules and regulations in the capitalist international law is motivated by other intentions. On the surface, the technical rules and regulations followed by different countries seem to be the same, but in applying these rules, every country has its own political purpose in mind.

If one looks only at the formalities casually, one cannot detect the inherent sense of class interest. The lengthy discussion of technicalities and the lumping together of such technicalities with political principles by author of capitalist international law is a deliberate attempt to put the cart before the horse, and to confuse people's concept of international law.

I. Concerning the Definition of International Law

The capitalists are reticent about the class characteristics of their international law. This is reflected by the definitions of international law given by capitalist writers.

Oppenheim, an author on capitalist international law, said: "The law of nations is the name for a body of customary and conventional rules (as distinguished from tradition, morality and rules of international courtesy) which are considered legally binding by civilized states in their intercourse with each other." The German capitalist international law scholar Franz von Liszt defined international law as a collection of rules and regulations about the rights and obligations of civilized nations. There is a host of other definitions, but they are more or less the same as the two cited above.

From its definition, we can see that capitalist international law was created for those so-called "civilized nations," rather than for the family of nation in the spirit of democratic legislation. These rules were formulated on the basis of customs and conventions observed by "civilized nations" in their intercourse with each other in disregard of the principle of equality as far as other countries are concerned. That capitalist international law is defined as a body of rules about the rights and obligations of "civilized nations" implies that the so-called "uncivilized nations" are put on a different status.

One would naturally query: What are the criteria for so-called "civilized nations" and "uncivilized nations"? Among the existing nations, which are the "civilized nations" and which are "uncivilized nations"? According to the capitalists, only nations with Christian civilization are "civilized nations," while non-Christian nations, essentially Oriental countries, are "uncivilized nations."

Oppenheim said that before World War I, China, Persia, Burma, Abyssinia and other eastern countries were still "uncivilized nations." "At that time," Oppenheim wrote, "their civilization had not yet reached that condition which was necessary to enable their governments and their population in every respect to understand, and to carry out, the rules of international law." (See Part one, Volume I of Oppenheim's Law of Nations, page 36).

It is evident that their criterion for so-called civilization is neither history nor culture. Even though China has 5,000 years of history, she is not considered as a civilized country. The expulsion of Oriental countries from the exclusive club of "civilized nations" reflects precisely the interest of the imperialist monopoly capitalist class.

It ought to be pointed out here that not all Christian countries are equal. In the light of the history of the development of international law and the foreign relations of imperialist countries, the so-called "civilized nations" refer only to the imperialist nations, or the Western capitalist powers. Indeed, the capitalist international law reflects only the desire of the ruling class of big capitalist powers.

In the Western world, the suppression of the weak by the strong and the annihilation of the small by the big are not only tacitly condoned by capitalist international law but also cloaked with a mantle of legality. Many Oriental countries which degenerated into colonies and semi-colonies only have the obligation to accept partition and plundering without any privilege of legal protection.

Whenever the imperialists extend their devilish arms to socialist countries, the latter are branded as below "moral" standard and "uncivilized." That the capitalist class describes international law as a body of rules concerning the rights and obligations of "civilized nation" without mentioning protection to "uncivilized nations" betrays that the capitalist international law was written with some ultimate objectives in mind.

We wish to point out further that although capitalist international law may in certain period of time and under certain circumstances have a restraining effect upon the "civilized nations" in the intercourse among themselves, it is essentially a weapon used by "civilized" countries to control and oppress the "uncivilized" countries.

The Chinese people know this only too well because in the past the imperialists enjoyed extraterritoriality in China on the pretext that China was "judicially backward" and "uncivilized." Establishing "spheres of influence," proclaiming the "Open Door Doctrine" and "equal opportunity for all countries," and even trying to partition China, the imperialists treated China as a "backward" and "uncivilized" country. Even now, the deprivation of China's legal position in the United Nations is based on the insulting assertion that China has not yet reached the civilized standard to carry out international obligations.

II. Concerning the Basis of International Law

There are many theories about the basis of international law, but all of them avoid to mention class interest as a basis. The most popular theory nowadays is the theory of "common consent" which says that international law is built upon the "common consent" of the members of international

society, or the "common consent" of equal sovereign states. Another theory is called the theory of "biological principle" which says that international law is built upon a natural order transcending the norm of law, and the duty of legislators is to write these rules into law. Historically, international law had once been interpreted as reflecting the will of God, or born out of "direct or indirect teachings of God."

The advocates of "common consent" theory expound with great effort on negotiation and treaty to show that international law is really the result of "common consent" of many nations, big and small. However, the fact is not so. The aggressive nature of capitalist class dictates that all negotiations and treaties be based upon strength, permitting no equal and free expression of will by small national.

The so-called "common consent" is reached under duress, and the small nations are always the victim. It is a well-known fact that a large number of unequal treaties were concluded with the "consent" of small nations as a result of armed threat by imperialist powers. Today, the United States is forcing many weak nations to give consent to treaties unilaterally advantageous to the United States. For example, in implementing such post-war policies as "Truman Doctrine," "Marshall Plan," "Point Four," "Eisenhower Doctrine" and other aggressive programs, the United States concluded a series of agreements with European, Asian and African nations, including Great Britain and France. Rigged to fit American domestic legislation, these agreements imposed many obligations encroaching upon the sovereignty of other nations and detrimental to their national interest. Can we say that these treaties are the results of "common consent" between the United States and its victims?

Furthermore, the matter is not so simple, due to the unbalanced development of capitalism, the relative strength of imperialist powers varies from time to time.

Inasmuch as "common consent" cannot be easily reached at anytime, the interpretation of "common consent" among members of international society is made flexible by capitalist international law scholars. They say: "The so-called common consent means only the express consent or

tacit consent on the part of the majority of the members of international society. The individual members who hold a dissenting opinion are unimportant. In the eyes of those who observe the will of the whole society of nations and not the will of a few, the dissenting opinion may be ignored." (See Oppenheim's Law of Nations, Part I, volume I, page 14.)

It is even more absurd to say that international law is based on "biological principle" because "biological principle" deals with natural phenomena while international law deals with social phenomena. The two are incomparable. There are four reasons why the capitalist class wants to introduce this theory: First, the capitalists want to cover up the fact that capitalist international law represents their will, and to mislead people to regard capitalist international law as indispensable.

Second, the capitalist scholars want to lift arbitrarily a legal concept to the realm of natural concept which transcends class interest with a view to establishing the perpetuity and inflexibility of capitalist international law.

Third, the capitalist scholars wish people to believe that imperialist aggression and conquest of weak nations is in perfect accord with Darwin's theory of "the origin of species by means of natural selection, and the preservation of favored races in the struggle for life."

Fourth, the capitalist scholars want people to believe that their brutal atrocity is justifiable by biological and natural laws. In short, all these theories are introduced by capitalist scholars for the interest of the capitalist class. As to the theory of "the will of God," it is no less than an attempt to sanctify the wishes of the capitalist class and to hoodwink the people of the world.

III. Concerning the Problem of the Source of International Law

On the sources of the law of nations, capitalist international jurists classify the sources into "substantial sources" and "formal sources." Their interpretation of substantial sources is metaphysical, categorically different from the interpretation given by jurists who hold the viewpoints of historical materialism.

The capitalists talk about "substantial sources" in complete isolation from social materialistic basis, regarding "the psychology of judges," "ideal law," and "moral rules" as "substantial sources." Whenever the capitalist jurists talk about sources of international law, they mean "formal sources." In view of this fact, we shall devote the following to the discussion of these sources.

In his book International Law, Oppenheim said: "Many writers confuse the conception of 'source' with that of 'cause,' and consequently made many mistakes." He explained: "This mistake can be avoided by going back to the meaning of the term 'source' in general. Source means a spring or well, and has to be defined as the rising from the ground of a stream of water. When we see a stream of water and want to know whence it comes, we follow the stream upwards until we come to the spot where it rises naturally from the ground."

"On that spot, we say, is the source of the stream of water. We know very well that this source is not the cause of the existence of the stream of water. Source signifies only the natural rising of water from a certain spot on the ground, whatever natural causes there may be for that rising. If we apply the conception of source in this meaning to the term 'source of law,' the confusion of source with cause cannot arise. Just as we see streams of water running over the surface of the earth, so we see, as it were, streams of rules running over the area of law."

"And if we want to know whence these rules come, we have to follow these streams upwards until we come to their beginning. Where we find that such rules arise into existence, there is the source of them." (See L.

Oppenheim's International Law, Part I, Volume I, pp 18-19) This general capitalist interpretation of the sources of international law by Oppenheim is but a circumlocution around terminology without mentioning the deep social reasons.

Based upon the above interpretation, capitalist international jurists classify the following as sources of the law of nations: (1) treaties; (2) custom; (3) decisions of tribunals, and (4) writings of authors. They consider treaties and conventions as the principal sources of international law and the decisions of tribunals and writings of authors as subsidiary sources.

What they are concerned about is limited to the manifestations of international law. They wish others to study the technicalities rather than the substance. Although technicalities are important to the tracing of the sources, yet research for the substance of sources is of more academic importance.

However, the capitalists don't want people to go any deeper into the matter than a superficial study. The reason is very simple--capitalist international law has a strong class characteristic. Should the capitalists let people pursue the study of the sources of international law to the very end, all the weaknesses of capitalist international law will be exposed.

In our opinion, the substantial source of capitalist international law is the foreign policy of the capitalist class, or the will of the ruling class of big capitalist powers.

Since the capitalist international jurists say that the principal source of international law is treaty, may we ask where does the treaty come from? Numerous international treaties made during the capitalist age can prove that they were all concluded under the guidance of the foreign policy of capitalist powers, in conformity with the wishes of the capitalist class and through shrewd diplomatic maneuvers and brutal aggressive actions.

For instance, the capitalist international jurists used to refer to the Covenant of the League of Nations and other documents of such nature as an important source of international law. But the "League of Nations" was but a tool of the imperialists, and the "Covenant"

was signed after World War I merely for preserving the already gained interests of the victorious nations, for maintaining the kind of international order desired by the powers and for furthering the suppression of weak nations. The capitalist international jurists also count unequal treaties imposed by imperialists on weak nations as sources of international law. The implication of this is only too evident for everyone to see.

They say that custom is also an important sources of the law of nations. The so-called custom is formed by capitalist powers in their intercourse with other countries. For instance, the rules concerning sea blockade and the disposal of war contraband enunciated in the "Paris Declaration" have gradually become the accepted and frequently invoked rules for hostilities on the sea. The "Paris Declaration," after all, was made by Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, Czarist Russia and other world powers.

The capitalists have never included and will never include the heroic resistance of weak nations and colonies against their oppressors, the anti-aggression movement of socialist countries, anti-imperialist wars, instances of anti-intervention and other righteous actions as sources of international law and give their support. Again the implication is very clear.

They say that the decisions of tribunals constitute a subsidiary source. But who made the decisions? The frequently quoted decisions are mostly those from the courts and arbitration organizations of imperialist powers or international tribunals and arbitration organizations under the control of imperialist powers. In conformity with whose wishes these decisions were made? And in accordance with whose legal standard these decisions were executed? Evidently, it is the wishes and demands of the capitalist powers that form the bases of these decisions.

They say the writings of authors also constitute one of the subsidiary sources of international law. But the so-called "authors" refer to capitalist-trained scholars whose "theories" are introduced solely for carrying out the will of the capitalist class. Defending the foreign conduct of the capitalist class by legal arguments, these "authors" reject and attack the theories of other scholars who have a sense of justice and progressive ideas. Again

the implication of using the "theories" of "authors" as a source is all too clear.

In disregard of the true source of international law, capitalist international jurists freeze the "source" at the level of formality in an attempt to incorporate all the selfish motives of the capitalist class into law and to establish the greedy and covetous ambition of the capitalist class as the bases of law.

IV Concerning the Problem of the Relationship Between International Law and Municipal Law

In the writings of capitalist international jurists, there are many theories about the relationship between international law and municipal law. In form, the two are entirely different. They differ in range of dominion, in legislative procedure and in binding force, but both reflect the will of the ruling class. They are used by the ruling class to implement its external and internal policies. The class characteristics of the two are identical.

In the early stage of capitalism, the internal and external policies of the capitalist regimes, especially the revolutionary regime in France after the Revolution, had displayed collectively an anti-feudalist tendency. In order to destroy the feudal legal system at home and in international society and to establish a new system in its place, the French revolutionary regime not only proclaimed a series of domestic statutes through its congress, but also declared many principles of international law.

These principles were perfectly in accord with the interest of the rising capitalism at that time. From then on, through numerous practices in their foreign conduct, the capitalists built up a set of international rules, but the rejection or adoption of these rules depended entirely upon the self-interest of the capitalist class in various countries.

In Britain, for instance, international rules which are to the advantage of Britain are applied as a part of her

municipal law. The United States is flexible on the application of international law. If her domestic legislation is found in conflict with an international rule which existed before the domestic legislation, then the domestic legislation shall prevail.

If an international rule is established with her participation or under her sponsorship, any subsequent domestic legislation found in conflict with such an international rule shall be revised. Although Britain and the United States differ in their method of reconciling international law with municipal law, national interest is their sole criterion. The principle followed by the United States is more realistic to meet the changing situation.

At the end of the 19th century, capitalist jurists represented by Triepel of Germany and Anzilotti of Italy held a dualist view toward international law and municipal law. Regarding international law and municipal law as two separate, independent and paralld legal system, Anzilotti stated that the law of nations can neither as a body nor in parts be per se a part of international law. Just as municipal law lacks the power of altering or creating rules of international law, so the latter lacks the powers of altering or creating rules of municipal law.

If international law is adopted as a part of the law of the land, the municipal court cannot be considered as bound by international law. When international law is found in conflict with municipal law, the latter shall prevail. The dichotomy drawn by capitalist jurists between international law and municipal law serves to cover the fact that both are reflecting the will of the capitalist class.

This kind of doctrine was beneficial to the capitalists, especially to the capitalist class in Italy at that time because it provided a budding capitalist country like Italy with a legal ground to contest the validity of international law which reflected only the will of big capitalist powers. Therefore, it aroused the resentment of the representatives of big capitalist powers who held a monistic doctrine is regard to the relation between international law and municipal law.

The monists stress that when the municipal court of a country applies a statute law of that country in conflict with international law, it only shows the weakness of international law and international organization. They add that although the decision of the municipal court of a country is in conformity with the municipal law of that country, that country will still be held responsible for its international obligations.

At one time, the doctrine of "external law" was popular in Germany and other imperialist countries. According to that doctrine, municipal law should prevail over international law. When the two are found in conflict, the municipal law should be applied. The same doctrine maintains that the only guarantee for national sovereignty is force. This is entirely an absurd legal reason given by Germany and other imperialists for launching aggressive wars against other countries.

During the two world wars, especially World War II, many capitalist international jurists and politicians gave publicity to the theory that international law was supreme to municipal law. They described international law as above municipal law and as a special law which has a decisive effect upon municipal law. For instance, capitalist international jurist Kelsen (an Austrian by birth who moved to the United States after Hitler's invasion) wrote: "Since the validity of the municipal law and domestic order of each country depends upon international law and international order and the latter determine the range of dominion of the former, international law must be placed above municipal law."

He maintained that there were no problem which could not be solved by international law but there were many problems which could only be solved by international law. Another Austrian capitalist international jurist Verdross put it even more clearly: "Without exception, international law is always above those municipal laws which are in conflict with it."

Moreover, he said: "Only within the limit of international law can municipal law have the freedom of development." Although the presentation of different capitalist jurists is different, their central theme is the same; that is, putting international law above municipal

law and favoring the use of international law for settling domestic disputes. In other words, although international law was not created by individual states, the capitalist jurists want it have binding force on individual states.

Here, two questions arise: (1) Who made the international law which is supposed to be above municipal law? (2) On what basis is this kind of international law created? In other words, whose will and interest does this kind of international law reflect? To these questions there can be only one answer; that is, the law-makers in a capitalist society are members of the capitalist class who control the government machinery, and the law they make reflects the will of the capitalist class. When we say "capitalist class" we refer to the monopoly capitalist class of a few big powers, not the capitalist class of all countries, because only the capitalist class of big powers has a strong influence over international organizations.

Whatever instrument a capitalist power compels a weak nation to sign, be it a treaty, an agreement, a resolution or a rule, it always reflects the will, interest of the capitalist power and their desire. Therefore, the capitalists use the supremacy of international law as a pretext to attain their ambition of world domination.

Recently, we have often heard the American imperialists talking preposterously about such things as "world state" and "world constitution" which, in fact, are but derivations of the theory of "supremacy of international law."

What they call world constitution is the kind of international law which will reflect the will of American monopoly capitalist class. After conferring upon international law the prestige of "world constitution," then the so-called "world state" established after the pattern of the United States can order other countries around and dominate the whole world on the authority of "world constitution." This is the real intention of giving international law supremacy over municipal law.

The United States is currently engaged in all kinds of activities to promote this idea. For instance, in 1949, while the first meeting of the U. N. International Law Committee was engaged in the discussion of the draft "Declaration of the Rights and Obligation of States," the

United States goaded the Panamanian representative to propose that "all states are under obligation to observe international law and the supremacy of international law over the sovereignty of individual states in their conduct of foreign relations." (Article 14 of the draft declaration). This is but an attempt to legalize the desire of American jurists.

In short, no matter what they say--supremacy of international law over municipal law or supremacy of municipal law over international law, monistic theory or dualist theory--capitalist international law reflects the will of capitalist class and its change is solely determined by class interest.

V. Capitalist International Law As A Science

Capitalist international law as a science consists of international principles and conventions. The so-called "principles" are those principles in accord with the external political measures of the capitalist class, while the so-called "conventions" denote the customs, decisions of tribunals and rules derived from treaties concluded among the capitalist countries. The science of capitalist international law as such has not only to explain and defend the foreign conduct of the capitalist class but also to seek legal justifications for the future actions of the capitalist class.

Since the principles and conventions of international law are the bases for the study of international law, international law as a science can also promote the development of such principles and conventions. The relation is precisely the same as the relation between legal theory and legal practice in capitalist society. In the course of the development of international law as a science, there are several schools of thought. The principle schools are as follows:

Naturalist School: When the capitalist class was leading the revolution against feudalism, the naturalist school was very popular. It maintained that the only source of international law was natural law and that inter-

national law was built upon "human nature," "reason" and "justice" rather than custom or treaties. What the naturalists called "human nature," "reason" and "justice" reflected the desire of the capitalist class to defy the feudalist monarchs who claimed "I am the state" and "my order is the law."

That the capitalist class denied customs and treaties as international law is due to the fact that a new capitalist class had just emerged and had not yet created its own customs and treaties while the existing customs and treaties of the feudalist ruling class were not in accord with its interest.

Positivist School: After the capitalists consolidated their position in many countries and set up their own customs through the conduct of foreign relations and conclusion of treaties, the positivist school became popular. Not only recognizing treaties and customs as the bases of international law, the positivists considered international law far more important than natural law. Some of them even denied the existence of natural law. If we say that the capitalist class had at one time used the theories of the naturalist school to oppose the feudalist bondage during the period of capitalist revolution, then we can say that it used the positivist doctrines to deal with its new opponents in order to keep the latter from breaking the framework of their own legal concept.

Grotius School: When free capitalism developed into imperialism, the positivist theories can no longer provide legal justifications for the aggressive action of the capitalist class. So the Grotius School, a middle-of-the-road school, began to appear. It is essentially a combination of the naturalist school and positivist school, attaching equal importance to positive international law and natural international law.

This school maintains that "when the rules with states as the subjects are found inadequate, international law may supplement itself by principles of righteousness and theories of law." This is to say that when the existing treaties and custom are adequate to defend the aggressive action of the capitalist class, then invoke the existing treaties and custom. When they are inadequate, then use natural law, such as "righteousness," "reason," and "human

nature" to explain away the aggressive action of the capitalist class. By so doing, the imperialist aggression against other countries can be justified by both types of law.

School of Norms: After World War I, the aggressive ambition of the monopoly capitalist class increased, and the imperialists wished to dominate and enslave the whole world. To reflect their desire, two more schools of international law emerged--the "school of norms" and "the school of social solidarity". The "school of norms" classifies legal powers into many exclusive categories called norms which as a whole constitute an integral legal system.

Within this system, international law as a supreme legal order has primacy over municipal law, and should be observed by all countries. This school negates state sovereignty, saying that sovereignty is the source of all international disputes. Asking all countries to give up sovereignty, this school advocates "world state" "world government" and "world constitution." Evidently, this school wishes to clear the way for imperialist aggression against other nations and for imperialist hegemony over the whole world.

School of Social Solidarity: This school maintains that all parts of the world are inter-related, and the social intercourse between peoples of the world forms a long chain of events. Individuals are brought together by "mutual inter-dependence" which is caused by people's similarities and division of labor.

Either from the standpoint of the nature of international intercourse or from the standpoint of the causes of such intercourse, the contact between states is in no way different from that between individuals. States are but the boundaries in international intercourse, which must be carried out by individuals.

Therefore, the advocates of the school of social solidarity come to the conclusion that only persons are the subjects of international law and states are not. In their opinion, state sovereignty is a fiction and "the source of international individualism and international anarchy."

To eliminate this source of evil, a "world government" must be established to abolish national states. Their conclusion is exact the same as that reached by the school of norms. Today, the American imperialists are doing their best to promote this doctrine.

It must be pointed out, it is not surprising at all that there is such a great diversification of theories about international law. The reasons that give rise to such a situation can be deduced as follows: (1) The capitalists of different countries have their own governments and their own legislative and judicial organizations. (2) The capitalist of different countries have their own interests in mind. As their interests differ, contradictions naturally arise.

As the capitalist international jurists speak on behalf of the capitalist class of their own country, the diversification of theories reflects precisely the contradiction between the capitalist class of different countries. For instance, the difference between the continental school and Anglo-American school reflects the conflict of interest between continental countries on the one hand and Britain and the United States on the other.

Even within the capitalist class of one country, several groups are formed because of the conflict of interest. This accounts for the fact that the capitalist international jurists hold widely different views toward one problem for they represent the interest of different groups of the capitalist class.

However, it must be stressed that their viewpoints clash only on issues of secondary importance, and generally agree on the basic interests of the capitalist class. The superficial difference in their opinion has not only not confused the aggressive objectives of the imperialists on the international scene, but also given the imperialists the convenience of using different theories to attain their aggressive purposes under different circumstances. To the capitalists, the more theories the jurists introduce, the better it is for their interest.

Through the above analysis of a few basic concepts, we can see clearly that capitalist international law is the super-structure of capitalist economy in the same manner as

the ancient international law was the super-structure of slave economy and feudalism economy. Just like the ancient international law which reflected the will of the slave owners and feudal lords, the modern capitalist international law reflects the will of the capitalist class.

Specifically speaking, capitalist international law is designed to meet the needs of the foreign policy of the capitalist class at different stages of the development of capitalist economy, and applied through diplomatic intrigues and brutal practices.

At the same time, capitalist international law is also an effective weapon to protect the interest of the capitalist class and to promote its diplomatic policy. During the early stage of the development of capitalism, capitalist international law had played a progressive role, but as soon as capitalism international law had played a progressive role, but as soon as capitalism established itself, international law has been used by capitalist powers as a tool to trample on the weak nations.

Nothing can be more reactionary than today's capitalist international law which is under the control of the capitalist bloc headed by the American imperialists. It is used as a weapon against the socialist states, the peoples of national states, colonies semi-colonies, and even smaller capitalist states. Its ferocious face is more and more clearly exposed before the peoples of the world.

A YEAR OF INTENSIFIED DEVELOPMENT
OF NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION IN CUBA

[The following is a complete translation of an article written by Ho Tso appearing in Kuo-chi Wen-t'i Yen-chiu (International Study), Peiping, No 1, 3 January 1960, pages 16-23.]

The national democratic movement in Latin America has been roaring like a surging wave with increasing strength. The dictatorial regimes in Latin America supported by and allied with the United States are collapsing one after another.

From 1957 to date, the dictatorial regimes in Colombia, Venezuela and Cuba were overthrown through people's struggle. The struggle in Cuba is particularly intensified, signifying a new climax in the people's struggle in Latin America.

I

Like other Latin American countries, pre-revolution Cuba was a raw material supplying country under American imperialist control. For the sake of American economic interest, Cuba was forced to engage solely in sugar production. Sugercane plantations take 56 percent of the nation's arable land. The value of sugar production constitutes 25 percent of the total value of national production and 30 to 40 percent of national income. Sugar constitutes more than 80 percent of Cuba's exports.

Although Cuba ranks seventh in population in Latin America, the total American investment in Cuba is only next to that in Venezuela and Brazil. According to estimates made by American newspapers and periodicals, direct private American investment in Cuba has exceeded \$1,000,000,000 not to mention government loans and indirect private investments.

About a half of American capital is invested in sugar industry and the rest in utilities and communications. According to conservative statistics released by the U. S. Department of Commerce, American capital controls 90 percent of electric power, 100 percent of telephone and international wireless communications facilities, 50 percent of railways and 40 percent of sugar production in Cuba. American capitalists also monopolize Cuba's mining rights and processing industry, while American banks control Cuban finance and absorb 25 percent of all bank deposits.

The profit rate of American interests in Cuba runs as high as 30 to 40 percent. From 1952 to 1957, American monopoly companies earned a total profit to the staggering amount of US\$750,000,000. Depending heavily on the United States economically, Cuba used to ship two-thirds of her exports to the United States, and receive three-fourths of her imports from the United States. Using the monopoly position, the U. S. slashed sugar price and set up sugar import quota at will. In 1958, Cuba lost US\$70,000,000 because of a decline in sugar price.

American economic aggression against Cuba is also reflected on land ownership, for big American sugar refineries are also big sugarcane plantation owners. By various cruel means, they seized 160,000 caballerias of land (each caballeria equals 13.64 hectares), constituting 25 percent of Cuba's total arable land, or 75 percent of fertile land.

In fact, feudalist land relationship is the pillar of the American policy of promoting single-product economy in Cuba. The big plantations established during the Spanish colonial days were not in anyway discouraged but rather became closely associated with colonial plundering as American monopoly capital entered Cuba.

The big plantation system and single-product economy have greatly retarded Cuba's national industry. Aside from sugar industry, Cuba has no heavy industry. Even her light industry is undeveloped. According to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the total value of Cuba's industrial products other than sugar was only 10 to 15 percent of national income in 1950. Even this small amount of industrial output is the product of foreign capital-dominated factories.

Politically, Cuba had been under imperialist control for a long time. With United States support and the acquiescence of the right wing elements at home, Batista came into power through a military coup. His regime represents a ruling bloc consisting of big landlords, big importers, sugar magnates, bankers and agents of imperialist enterprises.

Collaborating with the imperialists, the Batista regime sold out national interest and suppressed labor movement and progressive forces. As soon as Batista came to power, he tore the comparatively progressive Constitution of 1940 into pieces, dissolved the Congress, outlawed all political parties and democratic organizations and ruled by terror. No less than 20,000 progressive elements were slain during his regime.

Diplomatically, Batista completely followed America's cold war tactics. In exchange for American support, Batista extended the leases for concessions and offered the most convenient terms for American monopoly imperialists to seize Cuba's natural resources. He also helped American enterprises seize land from Cuba peasants. Two weeks before the collapse of his regime, he signed a bill exempting foreign companies from capital tax, profit tax and excessive profit tax.

Under the dictatorial rule of Batista and the exploitation of American imperialism, the plight of the Cuban workers was miserable. According to official figures, among Cuba's total population of 6.5 million, about one million are unemployed. Sugar production is essentially a seasonal industry, concentrated in the first four months of the year. Even during the busy season, the number of unemployed amounted to 650,000 to 700,000. Of the 500,000 sugar workers, only 53,000 were steadily employed and the rest were hired only on temporary basis.

The average income for a peasant family of six in Cuba was 45 pesos a month, while food alone cost 20 pesos each person a month. There was little security for the economic interest of the middle class. Unable to compete with foreign capital, the medium and small enterprises in Cuba were doomed. The standard of living for professional people and workers were declining day by day. In short, the Cuban people could not stand their misery any longer.

The sharp political and economic contradiction between the interest of the vast member of Cuban people and that of the monopoly capitalist bloc and its agents created by the Batista dictatorial regime is the basic reason for its collapse. The Cuban revolution is but an inevitable result of the development of the gradually accumulated force of the Cuban people, who did not yield to Batista. On the contrary, the industrial workers called strikes or conducted other forms of struggle while the peasants launched guerrilla warfare. Not long after these two forces merge together, the dictatorial rule was overthrown and the revolutionary government was established.

The leader of the "July 26 movement" and the Cuban guerrilla forces is Fidel Castro. He and 80 youths crossed the sea from Mexico, and landed at Oriente Province. After an encounter with Batista's forces, only 12 men were left. They went into Sierra Maestra where they established a military base for guerrilla warfare with the assistance of Cuban people.

The Cuban People's Socialist (Communist) Party organized workers and peasants to join the revolutionary forces and mobilized people to give economic help to the cause. Accepting the suggestion of the Cuban Communist Party, Castro issued a proclamation calling upon all anti-imperialist, anti-dictatorship and patriotic forces to strengthen their unity.

In July 1958, Castro's representatives and representatives of other Cuban anti-dictatorship organizations signed the "Caracas Agreement" in Venezuela which unified all anti-dictatorship forces. The Cuban revolution was thus made a general revolution of the Cuban people.

In December, 1958, the revolutionary forces routed Batista's army and won a decisive victory in the Battle of Santa Clara. Finally in conjunction with the general strike and uprising called by the Cuban Communist Party in Havana, the revolutionary forces overthrew the dictatorial regime on the New Year's Day of 1959.

II

The Cuban revolution is a national democratic revolution. In the year past, the new Cuban government has attained brilliant achievements in political and economic reform. Under the support of the Cuban People's Socialist Party and the broad masses of the Cuban people, the new government pushed the revolution further ahead regardless of America's barbarous intervention and provocation. In abolishing the old government machinery, implementing land reform, fighting American intervention and safeguarding national economic independence, the new government has shown its determination and thoroughness.

The revolution dealt a severe blow to the interest of American monopoly capitalist bloc. More significantly, it gave great encouragement to national democratic movement elsewhere in Latin America, and its influence is being more deeply felt far and wide day by day.

As soon as the new government was established, it dissolved the Congress and the Special Court, reorganized judicial organizations, dismissed all governors and mayors appointed by the old regime, liquidated Batista elements in government agencies and schools, and recalled all diplomatic representatives. The new government also liquidated Batista's officers in the army and established an armed force with the revolutionary army and worker-peasant warriors and officers as the hard core.

Meanwhile, despite the noisy protest made by the reactionary elements at home and abroad, the new government put 600 major war criminals on trial, confiscated the property of major war criminals and corrupt elements, and deprived all senators, representatives, members of City Council, mayors and all political leaders, who had either supported or collaborated with the dictatorial regime, of their political rights for 30 years.

The new government also proclaimed the restoration of people's rights, restored freedom to political parties and civic organizations, released political criminals, permitted political criminals and exiles to return to Cuba, abolished news censorship, dissolved the "Bureau for Suppression of Communist Activities," abolished the

investigation bureau and other secret service agencies, issued a statement against racial discrimination and purged trade unions of traitors and lackeys of imperialists.

Since the establishment of the new government, the cabinet has been reshuffled five times and two-thirds of the personnel have been changed, resulting in the weakening of right wing influence and a corresponding strengthening of the left wing. The dismissal of the former president Manuel Urrutia Lleo in July 1959 was a great victory for the revolutionary force. In November, the Government named Raul Castro as Minister of Armed Forces, Augusto Martinez Sanchez as Minister of Labor, and Ernesto Guevara as the president of the National Bank of Cuba. This had a good effect upon the intensification and further consolidation of the Cuban revolution.

During the last year, the Cuban government under the support of the vast member of people persisted in the suppression of intrigues and sabotage by counterrevolutionary elements both at home and abroad. Scores of counterrevolutionary cases have been unearthed. In November 1959, the new government adopted resolute measures in crushing the rebellion led by the military chief of the Camaguey Province Major Hubert Matos, and arrested 38 soldiers who participated in the rebellion.

Immediately afterwards, the Cuban cabinet decided to restore five revolutionary courts for trying counterrevolution cases. Meanwhile, Castro called upon all workers, peasants and other patriotic elements to take military training and form a militia force so as to safeguard the fruit of revolution and maintain social order.

III

After the success of the revolution, Cuba carried out a land reform program whose essential objective is to abolish the plantation system. According to 1946 data, 2336 big plantation owners controlled 317,000 Caballerias of land. This means that 1.5 percent of the land owners control 46 percent of the total arable land in the country. At the same time, 110,000 peasants each of whom

possesses less than two caballerias, own a total of only 76,000 caballerias of land. In other words, 70 percent of the land owners possess only 12 percent of the total arable land of the country.

Besides, there are some 62,000 peasant households which own less than three-fourths of a caballeria. Nearly 60 percent of the peasants in Cuba do not own any land at all. They cannot help but rent land from plantation owners and turn in a quarter to one half of their harvest to the landlord.

The high concentration of land ownership in the hands of a few has not only forced the landless peasants to become tenants on big plantations but also hindered the effective use of land in Cuba. According to statistics, the total area of land under cultivation is only 21.7 percent of the total farmland.

The land owned by American corporations are mostly kept idle, the utilization rate being sometimes less than 10 percent. In pursuance of profit, American corporations are only interested in developing sugarcane plantation and creating a single-product economy for Cuba which destroys the normal growth of Cuba's agriculture.

For alleviating the poverty of the vast member of peasants, for liberating agricultural productivity and for expanding domestic market so as to achieve independent development of Cuban national economy, Cuba is in need of a land reform.

As far back as October 1958 while the anti-dictatorship struggle was still going on, Castro's revolutionary force in Sierra Maestra had carried out Statute No 3 of the Land Reform Program. Statute No 3 stipulates the free distribution of all state, requisitioned or confiscated land to landless peasants and peasants whose land holding is small.

Revolutionary veterans, martyrs' dependents, landless peasants and peasants whose land is exceedingly poor were given priority in receiving land. But Statute No. 3 did not mention the land occupied by foreign corporations nor did it propose to abolish the big plantations which help perpetuate the feudal system. To push the revolution

more thoroughly, a new and more thorough land reform law was promulgated on 17 May, 1959. The most outstanding features of the new land reform law as compared with Statute No 3 are the abolition of big plantations, abolition of feudalist exploitation and abolition of the right to land ownership by alien corporations.

Article I of the land law stipulates that each person or a legal person can own a maximum of 30 caballerias of land. Any land in excess of this amount is subject to requisition. Article 25 stipulates that although plantations are limited to 30 caballerias, they are subject to requisition if they are leased or temporarily cultivated by tenant farmers. Articles 12 and 15 explicitly forbids alins and alien corporations to own land in Cuba.

In May 1959, a National Land Reform Committee was established as an executive agency. The land law states that the Committee must exercise its duties in conjunction with the revolutionary armed forces. The Chairman of the National Land Reform Committee is Fidel Castro and the director of Committee is Antonio Nunez Jimenez, one of the leaders of the armed forces.

To facilitate the work of land reform, the law divides the whole country into several agricultural development regions each of which has its own fund, technical personnel and mechanical equipment. All responsible leaders of the Cuban Government and ranking generals are now in the countryside engaged in land reform work. Many revolutionary veterans, police, workers and students also go to the countryside to take part in land reform work and rural construction.

The implementation of the land reform law will result in the redistribution of 250,000 caballerias of farmland and requisition of 4,423 plantations. The total value of requisitioned land is estimated at 100 million pesos, and the beneficiaries will be two million peasants.

The Cuban government is still pushing the land reform program. According to incomplete statistics, of the 70,000 caballerias of land requisitioned in Camaguey Province, 22,000 caballerias originally belonged to American monopoly corporations. Meanwhile the Cuba Government instructed the National Land Reform Committee

to use public funds to promote multiple crops and set up animal husbandry cooperatives, loan cooperatives, consumers' cooperatives, material cooperatives and farming implement cooperatives.

To a certain extent, the big plantations are eliminated under the Cuban land reform law, and the wishes of the peasants are satisfied. An example has been set for other Latin American countries where land distribution constitutes a problem.

At a land-reform debating meeting held in the capital of Cuba, 17 Latin American countries were represented. Now the people of Latin American countries are using "Support Cuban Land Reform, and Safeguard Cuban Revolution" as their slogan for action.

IV.

In economic measures, aside from promulgating the land reform law and confiscating the property of Batista elements, the Cuban Government also adopted measures for the protection and development of domestic industry and restriction of foreign capital.

In restoring and developing the sugar industry, the provisional government first of all restored communication facilities destroyed by the war, quickly readjusted the relationship between the employers and the workers and raised the wage of sugar refinery workers by 12 percent. The government took over 11 big sugar refineries destroyed during the war, thus ensuring the normal operation of the sugar industry.

The sugar production in 1959 was 5,980,000 tons, exceeding the expected amount for the year by 180,000 tons and surpassing the 1958 output by 380,000 tons. In one year's time Cuba sold 500,000 tons of sugar to the Soviet Union. This transaction partially solved the marketing problem of Cuban sugar and relieved Cuba from depending on the United States as her sole sugar customer.

Following the victory of the Cuban revolution, the capitalist politicians in the West had predicted that Cuba would soon find all her gold and foreign exchange exhausted. To prevent the flight of foreign exchange, the Cuban Government ruled in January 1959 that all exporters must surrender all their foreign exchange earned to the agencies of "Currency Stabilization Fund" for an equivalent amount of Pesos. (During the Batista regime, exporters were required to surrender only 30 percent of their foreign exchange earned.)

As a result, Cuba's foreign exchange reserve was increased by US \$5,000,000 within four months. In November, the Cuban Government promulgated another law ordering all Cubans with American dollar income to change their dollars into pesos at the National Bank of Cuba. In view of the fact that the Batista elements had absconded with many big-denomination banknotes, the government issued a new banknote and set a time limit for the redemption of old banknotes with denominations from 500 to 1,000 pesos.

Such big-denomination banknotes are redeemed only those who are found not associated with Batista. After a series of financial stabilization measures were put into effect, the value of peso has been kept at par with that of the American dollar.

In encouraging national industry, Premier Castro proposed in early 1949 to build a fleet of merchant marine and to start food industry, light industry and copper refining industry with national capital. He announced in July that the Cuban Government would formulate an industrialization plan and issue government bonds.

Taxes on industry with the exception of sugar industry, mining industry, fishery and animal husbandry enterprises were slashed by 25 percent. Interests on loans to industrial and agricultural enterprises were lowered from six to two percent. While tax on luxurious goods and luxurious services were increased, 197 items of luxurious goods were not allowed to import without license.

The new government also adopted many measures to improve people's living standard, such as reducing rent and telephone charge by 50 percent, cutting down electri-

city price by 30 percent, increasing agricultural loans and raising workers' wages. In the past, rent alone took 30 percent of workers' income.

As to the attitude toward foreign capital, Castro declared his intention "not to expropriate investments beneficial to the development of Cuban economy," but "to review the concessions made by the Batista regime" and "to abrogate excessive concessions to foreign corporations."

Restricting the profit of foreign corporations, the new tax law imposes a 25-percent tax on dividends, and 10 percent on profits remitted by foreign corporations to their home countries. The new government twice ordered American-owned telephone and powered companies to lower their rates. As a result of the second order, the total profit of American companies was cut down by 15 million pesos.

With the intensification of the Cuban revolution, the new government took a more stern attitude toward foreign capital. In October 1959 the Cuban cabinet passed a mining law and a petroleum law, both of which are measures of great political and economic significance.

The mining law stipulates that if idle mines controlled by foreign capital fail to revive operation within a time limit after government notification, such mines shall be considered as having surrendered their franchise and such mines should be turned over to the Cuban government. A tax of US \$10 to US \$20 is imposed on mines in operation for each hectare of land. All mineral exports are subject to a levy of 25 percent.

The petroleum Law stipulates that all oil fields leased to foreign companies are considered as public property and social wealth. Toward the end of November, the new government promulgated a law providing that all oil companies are under obligation to turn over 60 percent of their profit to the Cuban government, and that the State has the prerogative to purchase a part or all of the oil products from oil companies in Cuba at prevailing international market prices. (At present there are 35 foreign oil companies in Cuba.)

However, the foreign capitalists, especially American monopoly capitalists, are still firmly in control of vital sections of Cuba's productive enterprises, and still enjoying many special privileges. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, American investments in public utilities and non-sugar manufacturing industries far exceed those in sugar industry.

Direct American investments on land constitutes but a small part of total American investment in Cuba. Therefore, if Cuba fails to nationalize all foreign capital-controlled resources and industrial enterprises including utilities and banks, or fail to free herself entirely from the bondage of American monopoly economy, her political independence cannot be stabilized.

V

After the victory of the Cuban revolution, the United States has been using all devices to intervene and sabotage Cuban revolution. The Cuban people and government exert their utmost to fight American imperialism. Upon this fight hinges the success or failure of the Cuban revolution.

It takes only 15 minutes to fly from Havana to Florida. Even in such an unfavorable geographical position, Cuba did not soften her attitude toward the United States. Immediately after the victory of the revolution, the Cuban government expelled the U. S. military mission. Premier Castro declared that the United States used to occupy a predominating position in Cuba, but now "the Cuban people want to eliminate all the evil consequences of colonialism and build their country with their own effort."

The Cuban government took retaliatory measures against the United States for her criminal intervention in Cuba's land reform. In June 1959, when the United States requested the Cuban government to "hear the opinion of American investors" and "to exchange opinion with U. S. government on the effect of land reform," Premier Castro made it known that he was not going to change a single punctuation mark in Cuba's land reform law. "Even the

heaven falls down, Cuba's land reform has to be carried on," he added.

Immediately afterwards, the Cuban Government decided to take over the land owned by American corporations one year ahead of time. In November, the United States asked for cash compensation for American-owned property to be requisitioned under the land reform law, and threatened to cut down Cuba's sugar import quota if the Cuban Government failed to do so. Carrying on the land reform even with greater speed, the Cuban Government refuted America's unreasonable demand and continued to requisition or take over American plantations.

No sooner had the United States-instigated Matos counter-revolution was nipped in the bud, a few Cuban reactionaries in exile in the United States air-raided Havana at the instigation of American imperialists, and thus aroused the enmity of the Cuban people and government toward the United States.

Premier Castro described American policy as "openly arming Cuban war criminals in exile and at the same time starting an economic aggression as part of an intrigue to overthrow the Cuban government." He declared that "Cuba is not going to retreat one inch in the face of the attack and threat of foreign monopoly capitalist bloc and its agents."

On 26 October, a mammoth parade was held in Havana in protest against American provocation. In response to the call of the Cuban government, the Cuban people started a cash donation campaign for buying airplanes and arms. The Cuban newspapers strongly supported the government's position against United States intervention.

Cuba took resolute action in suppressing and attacking all kinds of U. S.-organized restoration activities. For instance, during the foreign ministers conference of 21 Latin-American countries, the United States used underground Batista elements in Cuba and the supporters of the dictatorial regime in Dominican Republic to launch coordinated armed attacks against the new government from within and without. The government immediately put down the internal rebellion before it thwarted the military aggression from outside.

Cuba repeatedly condemned the United States for using the "Organization of American States" as an instrument of intervention. Castro solemnly pointed out that "Cuba will never permit anybody to undermine its sovereignty and dignity, and no country or organization has the right to intervene in Cuban affairs." Labelling the Pan American Foreign Ministers Conference held in Chile in August as "a part of anti-Cuban movement," he suggested that the conference should discuss economic problems of the Americans to oppose United States intervention. During the different meetings of the "organization of American States," the Cuban delegate put up a struggle in defense of national sovereignty and independence.

In short, the United States has been employing all military, political and economic means in an attempt to bring about the downfall of the revolutionary government in Cuba or to compell the latter to make concessions, but the unerving struggle launched by the Cuban people and government has frustrated all American schemes. The new aggressive intrigues on the part of the United States can only expose its forocious face which will only enable the Cuban people to know their deadly enemy better and to resist American aggression with more resolute determination in defense of the fruits of revolution.

The Cuban revolution is a good example of national democratic revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Through people's armed struggle, the revolution first established its bases in rural areas, then surrounded cities by revolutionary forces in villages, and finally seized cities and political power. After coming into power, the revolutionaries pushed the revolution further and dealt severe blows to imperialist and feudal forces.

By no means accidental, the outstanding achievements of the Cuban revolution is the inevitable result of the accumulation of revolutionary forces and a long-term struggle. The reasons why the Cuban revolution has been persecuted with comparative intensity can be enumerated as follows:

First, the Cuban worker-peasant movement has a long history. A people with rich revolutionary heritage, the Cubans had fought the Spanish colonialists heroically in a ten-year war by the end of the 19th Century, resulting

in the death of 200,000 Cubans. Judging by the fact that the total population of Cuba at that time was only about 1,500,000, the fierceness of the battle can be imagined.

The Cuban Communist Party was established in 1925 and was renamed People's Socialist Party in 1944. Since then, the Cuban worker-peasant movement has been under the leadership and influence of the Cuban Communist Party. In 1953, the Cuban Communist Party led a guerrilla warfare and called a general strike, forcing dictator-Geraldo Machado to step down.

During Batista's dictatorial rule from 1952 to 1958, the Cuban Communist Party still preserved its force and the basic-level cells of trade union organizations were kept intact despite the bloody suppression. As soon as Castro's guerrilla warfare was started, the Cuban Communist Party mobilized its party members, workers and peasants to take part in the uprising and organized the peasants to support the revolutionary forces by all means.

Even after the victory of the revolution, the Cuban Communist Party continued to mobilize the workers and peasants to support the revolutionary measures of Castro's government. Therefore, the strong Communist leadership in Cuba's peasant-worker movement and the promotion of the correct "united front" policy are important factors that account for the incessant progress of the Cuban revolution.

Second, the present revolutionary regime is dominated by progressive elements of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois classes. The "July 26 Movement" is Cuba's political party in power, but it is a party without strict organization. About 90 percent of its total membership consist of peasants, rural workers, industrial workers, and college students with different shades of political inclinations. The hardcore of this party's leadership is made of intellectuals from petty bourgeois class who are full of sense of justice, patriotic and ready to accept revolutionary ideology.

At the inception of the "July 26 Movement," its anti-imperialist and anti-feudalist characteristic was by no mean clear. In fact, such a characteristic was only made gradually evident in the course of the development of the revolution by such political platforms as land reform,

abolition of big plantations, establishment of a fleet of merchant marine, development of national industry, improvement of people's standard of living, restoration and maintenance of democratic order, etc. Although the rightists still possess considerable influence in the party and the government after the victory of the revolution, the revolution continued to forge ahead and overcome the resistance of imperialists and conservative elements mainly because the principal leaders are radicals.

Third, it is worth mentioning here that the Cuban army is now a modern army, no longer made of mercenaries. The old reactionary army under the Batista regime has been purged several times, and the revolutionary forces have been made the backbone of the new army.

Richly imbued with revolutionary spirit, and working hand in glove with the people on revolutionary programs such as land reform, the revolution army commands of people's confidence and support, thus constituting a strong guarantee to preserve the achievements of the revolution.

Of course, we should not lose sight of the negative side of the political activities on the part of a few Cuban government leaders, such as entertaining illusions toward the United States and restricting the activity of the Cuban Communist Party. However, the sharp contradiction between the Cuban people and American imperialists has rendered the negative activities of these government leaders impotent at the present time.

The Cuban national democratic revolution had won a great victory last year, but many obstacles are expected in the course of future development. We are confident that the Cuban people, who have a rich and glorious tradition of revolution, can definitely overcome the intrigues and sabotage of American imperialists and rightists at home, and continue to push their national democratic movement forward.

SEEING AMERICA THROUGH THE 14TH
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

[This is a full translation of an article written by Chang Yi appearing in Shih-chieh Chih-shih, Peiping, No 1, 5 January 1960, pages 20-22.]

The relative strength of the two camps of the world has undergone a drastic change as the East wind is getting stronger and stronger and the West wind is getting weaker and weaker day by day. The measures taken by the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union for the preservation of world peace, are enthusiastically welcomed by all peace-loving countries and peoples the world over.

The aggressive and war policies of the United States are being resisted everywhere. Under such circumstances, the U. S. has no alternative but to do some empty talk about peace or even change some of her policies, but actually the influential group in the United States has no intention to give up arms expansion or preparations for war. Instead, it obstructs the relaxation of international situation. Such schemes of the United States were fully exposed during the 14th General Assembly of the United Nations held between 15 September to 13 December 1959.

Brutal Intervention In Domestic Affairs of Socialist
Countries

In line with her schemes of creating tension everywhere in the world, the United States intended to arouse to a climax the sentiments against China and other socialist countries on the occasion of the 14th U. N. General Assembly. In discussing the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations, U. S. representative Walter S. Robertson, former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs and an avowed enemy of our country, let off a barrage of verbal blasts and launched a mad, libellous

and vituperate attack against our country. But today as the prestige of our country has reached an unprecedented height and as America's aggressive policy toward China has invited the opposition of an increasing number of countries, America's behavior like this is extremely unpopular. Even the British paper Observer said that Robertson's unreasonableness had made many of America's allies feel embarrassed.

Under the pressure of the United States, the General Assembly finally passed the U. S. resolution to postpone the discussion of the problem of Chinese representation for another year. The hoarse noise made by Robertson did not win a single vote more than in 1958. On the contrary the number of opposition votes was increased by one.

The so-called "Tibetan problem" was a major subject with which the United States had tried to fan anti-Chinese and anti-Communist sentiments and wage "cold war" in the 14th U.N. General Assembly. The illegal discussion of the so-called "Tibetan Problem" at the General Assembly was entirely a result of U. S. manipulation. In a statement issued on 23 October protesting the intervention in China's internal affairs by the U.S.-controlled General Assembly, our Government pointed out: "Tibet is a part of Chinese territory.

The suppression of counterrevolutionary rebellion and the implementation of democratic reforms in Tibet are matters of Chinese domestic affairs which the United States or any country or any international organization has no right to interfere." In violation of the U.N. Charter which forbids member states to interfere in the domestic affairs of other countries, the ignoble scheme of the United States to compel the General Assembly to discuss the so-called "Tibetan Problem" was severely condemned by the Soviet delegate and the delegate of other Socialist countries.

The Soviet delegate Kuznetsov revealed that the motive behind America's action to introduce the so-called "Tibetan problem" was to start a sinister smearing campaign against the great Chinese people and government, to pollute the peaceful atmosphere and to obstruct the relaxation of world tension.

Many Afro-Asian countries expressed their resentment against the American attitude. The delegate from Nepal Upadhyaya said that U.N. discussion of "Tibetan problem" could only endanger the improvement of international relations, adding that when Tibet was engaged in social reform, to ask for U.N. action in Tibet at that time was tantamount to asking for the maintenance of an undesirable social status quo in that area.

Because of its unpopularity, the U.S.-directed ugly show of so-called "Tibetan problem" did not have a smooth sailing in the United Nations. According to U.S. Senator Cooper and disclosures in the American press, as a measure to alienate China's relations with Afro-Asian countries and to step up the "cold war," the United States had originally intended to ask Afro-Asian countries, mostly Buddhist countries, or one country each from the five continents of the world to initiate the Tibetan proposal.

None of these countries fell for America's trick. Not until half a month after the opening of the 14th General Assembly did Ireland and the Federation of Malaya reluctantly agreed with the United States to introduce the Tibetan proposal. During the first two-days of illegal discussion, the U.S. delegate made repeated violent attacks against our country.

As nobody supported America's charges, the proceedings in the Assembly hall went on quietly. Through a great effort of maneuvering, the U.S. compelled the General Assembly to adopt the illegal resolution. When the resolution was put to vote, even such Western nations as France, Belgium and the Union of South Africa abstained from voting.

It was not a surprise that even the Washington Post and Times-Herald had to admit that "due to the large number of abstentions, this illegal resolution can hardly be regarded as a convincing statement."

The U.S. also used the Hungarian problem, Korean problem and the election of non-permanent members to the Security Council as issues to wage "cold war" against socialist states in the General Assembly.

First, the U.S. instigated a New Zealander Leslie Munro, the so-called "Special U.N. Representative on the Question of Hungary," to try to put on the General Assembly agenda again the so-called "Hungarian Problem," a topic which had been used by the U.S. to smear the socialist states every year since 1956.

When this attempt failed, the U.S. Government itself forced the General Assembly to include the problem in the agenda, and finally compelled the General Assembly to adopt an illegal resolution insinuating the Soviet Union for her alleged intervention in the domestic affairs of Hungary.

On the Korean problem, the U.S. also dictated the General Assembly to pass an illegal resolution obstructing the peaceful unification of Korea. Moreover, the U.S. made a great effort to help Turkey get elected to the Security Council as a non-permanent member, a seat which should be filled in 1960 by a East European country. Despite America's pressure, Poland was elected a non-permanent member of the Security Council for 1960.

Ugly Performance on Disarmament Problem

In his address before a plenary session of the 14th U.N. General Assembly on 18 September appealing for an end to "cold war" and the strengthening of world peace, Comrade Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of Soviet Council of Ministers, made a proposal for a total and complete disarmament. The main point he made was that all countries should carry out a complete and thorough disarmament program in three stages within four years, destroy all nuclear weapons and guided missiles, and disperse all armed troops.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Government suggested that if the Western nations were unwilling to accept a total and complete disarmament program, agreements should be made on the banning of nuclear weapons, the establishment of an atom-free zone in Middle Europe, the withdrawal of foreign troops from Europe, the elimination of foreign military bases, the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between NATO nations and Warsaw pact nations, and the prevention

of sudden attack. Due to its great significance to the promotion of universal disarmament and preservation of world peace, the Soviet proposal was enthusiastically welcomed by all the peoples of the world.

Refusing to come to an agreement on any disarmament issue, the U.S. made every effort to distort and attack the Soviet proposal in an attempt to play down its value. Popular and irresistible as the Soviet proposal was, the U.S. could not but vote with other nations in favor of placing the Soviet proposal on the agenda of the General Assembly as the foremost item.

While the Soviet proposal was under discussion, the U.S. joined the Soviet Union in making a procedural motion referring the disarmament proposal of the Soviet Union and that of Britain to the ten-nation disarmament committee for deliberation. The U.S. did this not only because she had no other alternative but also because she wanted to cover up her hostile intentions by peaceful gestures.

While these gestures were being made in the U.N., U.S. Secretary of State Christian Herter and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Henry Cabot Lodge disclosed that the U.S. favored the establishment of an "international police force" to prevent the violation of disarmament agreements, thus betraying fully America's true intentions.

Obstruct the Just Demand of Colonial Peoples

During the 14th General Assembly, the United States, Britain, France and other veteran colonial powers joined hands in obstructing all measures to the benefit of colonial peoples. By so doing, the U.S. made herself the worst enemy of the suppressed peoples of the world.

The U.S. openly helped France obstruct the discussion of the Algerian question in the United Nations. Well before the opening of the General Assembly, Eisenhower, while visiting France, had agreed with de Gaulle to destroy the independence movement of the Algerian people and prevent the 14th U.N. General Assembly from discussing the Algerian question. Shortly afterwards, France proposed

a so-called "de Gaulle plan." Due to the resolute demand of the Afro-Asian countries and the active support of socialist states, the General Assembly finally put the Algerian problem on the agenda despite the opposition of France and the United States.

Having failed to prevent the discussion of the Algerian question, the U.S. went on to obstruct the General Assembly from reaching any resolution. U.S. representative Henry Cabot Lodge read a statement from Christian Herter urging the U.N. not to take any measure which would endanger the "prospect of peace" in Algeria, and asking all nations to exercise the same kind of restraint and patience as the U.S. did to France--the butcher of the Algerian people.

Meanwhile, in the Political Committee of the General Assembly, the United States voted with France against the resolution sponsored by 21 Afro-Asian nations calling for negotiation between France and Algeria with the ultimate objective of reaching a cease-fire and an agreement for Algerian self-determination. Although this resolution was adopted by the Political Committee, it had never been voted upon in the Assembly.

America's fanatic action against the anti-colonial struggle of the Algerian people aroused the resentment of many countries. The Minister of Propaganda of the Algerian Provisional Government Ah-chi-teh called Henry Cabot Lodge "an agent of the French Government."

The U.S. also connived against measures that would help the U.N. trust territories gain their independence. She voted against the resolution sponsored by 14 Afro-Asian and Latin-American nations urging Britain and Belgium to fix a date for the independence of Tanganyika (now under British trusteeship) and Ruanda-Urundi (now under Belgian trusteeship). Nevertheless, this resolution was passed by the Assembly.

With the support of socialist states, the Afro-Asian and Latin-American countries made it possible for the General Assembly to adopt the following resolutions: (1) the end of U.N. trusteeship for Togoland and Somaliland in 1960; (2) the independence of Western Samoa in 1961; ;and (3) condemnation of the Union of South Africa

for its racial discrimination policy and its annexation of Southwestern Africa.

We can see clearly that the U.S. has not at all abandoned her policies of aggression, expansion, and war-provocation. On the contrary, she is scheming to use all available opportunities to wage "cold war". Although the 14th U.N. General Assembly passed some ignominious resolutions under the pressure of the U.S., the general situation showed that the U.S. was strong outside and weak inside, isolated, and losing her initiative.

America's intrigue of waging "cold war" was strongly opposed not only by the Soviet Union and other Socialist states but also by Afro-Asian and Latin American countries. Even some of America's close allies were worried by her naked "cold war" tactics. All these facts show that the American imperialists can not stop the march of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, the vigorous development of the anti-colonialism movement, and the progress of efforts for world peace.

WHAT IS EISENHOWER PEDDLING?

[The following is a complete translation of an article written by Wang Fan appearing in Shih-chieh Chih-shih, Peiping, No 1, 5 January 1960, pages 23-24.]

President Eisenhower of the United States set out on 3 December 1959 for a 20-days whirl-wind visit to eleven countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Wherever he went, he talked about "freedom, justice and peace" and "peace and friendship in freedom," describing the country he represented as "non-aggressive" and harboring no ambition toward other country's territory. Fantastic propaganda was made by propaganda agencies of the United States and other imperialist countries during Eisenhower's tour.

However, it is just as hard to change the true nature of a dierce wolf as to change a devil into an angel. Behind Eisenhower's belabored sweet words, one could hear the noise of cold war in disharmony with such words as "peace" and "friendship." Thus Eisenhower gave people the impression of an ugly devil holding out an olive branch. He could not blame anybody for this because it was he himself and the capitalist press that divulged his secret motives.

Now let us see what was Eisenhower peddling during his travels?

Strengthen Aggressive Alliance and Maintain "Position of Strength"

Before Eisenhower set out for his trip, the New York Times in an editorial on 29 November, entitled "The President's Mission--Cold War as Usual," frankly said: "The basic objective of his trip is to rally the manpower and material resources of America's allies and to win the support of neutral and uncommitted nations because very soon the West will hold a summit conference with the

Soviet Union." This newspaper had in many subsequent editorials openly advocated "the position of strength" in dealing with the socialist camp.

For instance, on 3 December, the Times said: "One of the President's objectives must be the strengthening of the defense and solidarity of the free world." On 7 December, the Times wrote: "The President is now at the initial stage of a mission which is like the landing on Normandy except that it is done in peaceful words."

It should be pointed out that such war-like views were not unique of the New York Times. Almost all capitalist newspapers in the United States took the same view in their publicity about Eisenhower's "peaceful mission." The New York Herald-Tribune said on 11 December: "Although we hope for an improvement in the atmosphere of East-West relations, we must bear in mind that the basic causes of cold war have not yet been removed. We cannot reduce our strength just on the basis of international atmosphere."

Were these press comments in contradiction to Eisenhower's personal viewpoint? No. The American press told exactly the purpose of Eisenhower's trip. Let us see what was this busy American President agitating during his world tour.

Rome: "According to what President Eisenhower told Italian leaders--the U.S. policy will continue to be based upon NATO and the role which this organization must play." (Agence France Presse, 5 December)

Ankara: "President Eisenhower repeatedly assured Turkey that the West must keep strong without relaxation. He said the West must maintain a position of strength." (UPI, 8 December)

Karachi: "President Eisenhower and President Mohammed Ayub Khan of Pakistan made an informal survey of the cold war situation in this area, with special attention to the persistent Communist threat from the north." (UPI, 7 December)

Teheran: "Eisenhower told members of the Iranian Parliament that before the Soviet Union agrees on a workable world peace program, the free world cannot abandon such a

defensive alliance as the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) in the Middle East." (AP, 14 December)

Madrid: "Eisenhower and Generalissimo Franco talked about America's need of continuing to maintain strategic airbases in Spain, and the probable greater role Spain is going to play in the Western military alliance." (UPI, 22 December)

Even in the Indian Parliament, Eisenhower did not give up the opportunity to make inciting speeches. The Agence France Presse reported: "The Indian Parliament reacted most unfavorably when President Eisenhower stressed that weakness in armament often invites aggression, subversion and foreign-instigated revolution."

These are but a few of the remarks Eisenhower made during his world-wide tour. Who can find any trace of peaceful intentions in his talks? Can the noise he made about strengthening military alliance prove that the U.S. has changed its aggressive policy?

Attempt to Win Over Neutral States and Stir Up Enmity with China

To maintain America's "position of strength" through the strengthening of aggressive alliance was but a part of the scheme behind Eisenhower's world-wide tour. His chief mission, or rather his greater scheme, was "to win for the West the sympathy of the people who are non-committal in the cold war." (See New York Times 29 November) In other words, the U.S. wanted to drag the neutral nations into the cold war.

An editorial of the New York Times on 10 December said incitingly that India's neutral policy and friendly attitude toward China had only won her bad returns. The paper then offered economic aid to India and asked her to align with the West. On the same day, UPI correspondent Hansley expressed the apprehension that India might have mistaken Eisenhower's peaceful smokescreen for a real desire for "peaceful coexistence," stressing that "basically, the impact of the entire event shall unite the two

nations together," The renowned American capitalist political commentator Walter Lippmann, in his columns in the New York Herald Tribune on 19 and 20, described Eisenhower's covert activity as a "bold adventure," saying that "Eisenhower is seeking a basis of understanding with a big nation which is uncommitted in the cold war."

Turning to India, Lippmann said: "The U.S. is a very congenial friend." Continuing, he wrote: "India no longer needs to choose her stand in the cold war because the U.S. is now seeking a rapprochement with the Soviet Union." Now, India could be America's close friend without joining the rank of Soviet Russia's enemies, he added.

Eisenhower's effort at "winning new friends" and peddling false peace in India could not but arouse the envy of London. Most of the British capitalist newspapers close to the government such as the Daily Mirror, Daily Telegraph and Daily Express considered Eisenhower's activity in India as "unsuccessful." The Observer said mildly: "To spend more money is not always the best way to solve problems. To a great extent, it depends upon how the money is spent and whether the aid is suitable to the political and social conditions of the recipient country." The Daily Telegraph pointed out that Eisenhower's agitation for military alliance had not received any enthusiastic response in India. The paper candidly expressed aversion to America's intrigue of "striving for new objectives."

Some of India's newspapers laid bare Eisenhower's maneuvers. The newspaper Solidarity in Urdu language said in an editorial on 14 December: "India does not want the kind of U.S. aid which will change her complexion. India has always opposed military treaties and regarded them as the greatest threat to world peace. During Eisenhower's visit, India will reiterate its current policy, and declare her resolution to carry out this policy." The Solidarity continued that "the U.S. only offers aid to those countries which agree with her policy and spends money unsparingly to defeat those countries which disagree with her policy." The New India Times declared on 10 December: "The U.S. policy runs entirely in contrast to India's policy which opposes military alliance and considers armament expansion as a threat to world peace."

As a leader of military alliance, the U.S. stresses armament expansion before a disarmament agreement can be reached with the Soviet Union." Concerning U.S. "aid" this newspaper continued: "What can we expect to get from Eisenhower? Some economic assistance, maybe. But before we can get such assistance, what is said and heard in Washington can only be endured by those countries which have no self-respect."

Peace Intention Is Put To Acid Test; Covert Aims Are Hard to Relize

What were the results of Eisenhower's 20-day tour?

Eisenhower bragged about his achievements in his Christmas Eve Message, while the New York Times summarized that his visits had "eased international tension," erased other peoples' bad impression of the United States, and provided the West with "better conditions" to take the initiative in the campaign for peace. Such deceptive propaganda cannot even be believed by the Americans themselves, not to mention the victims of the cold war.

Even before Eisenhower left Washington, AP news analyst Roberts had predicted that his trip could not bring about any good results. After asking a series of question, Roberts said: "To his slogan of 'peace and friendship,' the President has inserted the phrase 'in freedom.' In many of the places he is goint to visit, President Eisenhower may find his views unacceptable to local people."

Describing Eisenhower's dilemma in Italy, the New York Post said: "He dares not talk freely about the prospect of world peace, fearing that his words might be advantageous to the current Communist propaganda policy. Nor can he take a pessimistic view toward world peace for, by doing so, he will give the Communists a reason of attack. If he should take an ambiguous attitude, he would be accused of avoiding, or sitting on the fence toward, the only issue which by itself has a great significance."

The British press almost always gave Bronx cheers to Eisenhower's trip, predicting that "it cannot lead to any

surprising results." (See Scotsman of Edinburgh.) In an editorial on 21 December, the Daily Telegraph ridiculed Eisenhower's two-faced tactics, depicting him as "a new performer with serious predicaments." "He is a recognized leader of the NATO as well as an enthusiastic guardian of Asia without assuming any obligation," the Scotsman said.

It is interesting to look at the newspaper comments while Eisenhower was visiting in Morocco. For example, the "Hsin Pao" ["New Paper"] maintained that Eisenhower's visit "is but a travel and it cannot yield any results." Continuing, it declared: "The Moroccan people know how to act and what road to follow to liberate themselves from colonialism." L'Avant-Garde of Casablanca commented: "We must know how to talk with Eisenhower; in other words, we cannot show him the friendship of undeveloped countries until these countries are completely liberated."

Finally, if we wish to hear the opinion of the African people who are currently engaged in a heroic struggle for freedom, let us listen to what Ah-chi-teh, Minister of Propaganda of the Algerian Provisional Government, had to say about Eisenhower's visit. He said: "In our opinion, as long as the U.S. is voting on the side of the colonial powers in the United Nations, peddling America's concept of freedom in Asia and North Africa is but a waste of time."

This publication was prepared under contract to the
UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
a federal government organization established
to service the translation and research needs
of the various government departments.