

## China's role

The unity of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia in reply to the puppet axis forged by the United States in Indochina is one of the most exemplary performances of revolutionary solidarity of our day.

The powerful support extended the liberation forces of Indochina by the People's Republic of China is likewise exemplary.

By plotting the overthrow of head of state Norodom Sihanouk and then invading Cambodia, the Nixon regime has helped to create the objective conditions for a total U.S. defeat in all Southeast Asia, a circumstance of great consequence.

Mao Tsetung's speech last month (Guardian, May 30) calling on the people of the world to "unite and defeat the United States aggressors," the backing given by People's China for the National United Front of Cambodia and the Indochinese summit meeting and the mass demonstrations this month throughout China by hundreds of millions of people are extremely significant indications of just how badly Washington miscalculated its Cambodian adventure and the entire policy of "Asians fighting Asians."

People's China, against whom Washington's Asian policies are primarily directed in the long run, is entirely correct in its militant support of the Indochinese liberators, its call for unity to defeat the U.S. and in the important role it is playing in Southeast Asia today. In statements May 24, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam conveyed their appreciation of China's solidarity. The DRV expressed its "most heartfelt thanks" for Mao Tsetung's statement while the PRG was "infinitely overjoyed" by the statement and other indications of China's support.

In this context it is particularly difficult to pass without comment the sharp polemic against China's actions in Indochina which were published last week in the Soviet foreign affairs weekly New Times—an obviously official statement of the USSR.

In essence, the Soviet Union has chosen this time to charge China with seeking to "dominate" the peoples of Southeast Asia, of "meddling" in Cambodian affairs and thus contributing to the attempted overthrow of Sihanouk and of leading the people of Asia into tragedy.

"The Peking leaders, pressing their adventurist tactics on some segments of the Communist and national liberation movements in Southeast Asia, are trying to use them as tools for asserting Chinese domination in Asian countries and to condemn them to defeat and destruction," the Soviets declared in an article entitled "Asia and the Peking Khans."

Recognizing the economic and military support given the Vietnamese people by the Soviet Union throughout these years of U.S. aggression, the Soviet attack on China at this time and for the reasons stated must be sternly criticized and the thinking behind it repudiated.

Such innuendoes about People's China only serve the cause of U.S. imperialism—regardless of the motives—especially since one of Washington's favorite myths about Indochina is that popular liberation struggles must be defeated because of Chinese territorial ambitions.

The aggressor in Asia is the U.S., not China. Any reversal of this equation by any socialist country undermines the Asian liberation struggle.

Indeed, People's China is now and has always asserted an influence in Asia. This is to be welcomed, not condemned. In Asia, the revolutionary solidarity of 700 million Chinese people is decisive. There is absolutely no proof or even circumstantial evidence People's China is seeking to "dominate" the liberation movements of Asia, especially in Southeast Asia, in the manner implied by the Soviets. Were this true there could be no doubt the liberation movements would reject such attempts.

China understands that as long as imperialist aggression continues in Asia there can be no peace and no compromise. This relatively obvious fact has apparently eluded the Soviet Union as it seeks to obtrude the ideological struggle with China into the practical realm of Southeast Asia politics.

China is a strong nation which the Soviet Union has accused of trying to dominate small nations. Were this true it is hardly likely the leading spokesman for the government of China could comfortably declare—as did Mao Tsetung May 20—that "A weak nation can defeat a strong, a small nation can defeat a big nation. The people of a small country can certainly defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history."