

## Fighting Talk On Indo-china: Which Side Are Sihanouk and the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" On?

(October, 1970)

A top official of the Sirik Matak - US imperialist lackey government in Cambodia has said that the Khmer Rouge could have overthrown the government in April. Why didn't they? It is high time for some *plain fighting talk on Indo-China!*

Today in Indo-China, there are two main protagonists fighting a life and death struggle. US imperialism, the main enemy of mankind, and the (white) people of the US imperialist oppressor nation (the so-called "great American people"), are fighting might and main to suppress the rising struggles of the oppressed toiling masses of Indo-China. The heroic people of Cambodia, south Vietnam and Laos are fighting wars for national liberation.

The burning question for the peoples of Indo-China today is how to defeat US imperialism and win national liberation.

But US imperialism and the "great American people" on the one hand, and the heroic Indo-Chinese masses on the other, are not the only significant forces involved in the war for Indo-China; they are not the only forces attempting to establish the character of the war and thus determine its outcome.

Within each of the oppressed nations of Indo-China there is a class struggle being waged between the national bourgeoisie and the proletariat for leadership of the *peasant masses* in the war of national liberation. This "class struggle" is precisely to determine the scope, the limits of the national struggle being waged by the entire peoples of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam!

For this reason, US imperialism has a vital interest in the outcome of the class struggle within these oppressed nations; and for this reason, US imperialism sends the US New Left and the Russian and Chinese revisionists to strengthen the national bourgeoisie and attempt to force the proletarian vanguard of Indo-

China to follow national bourgeois leadership — leadership of compromise which leads to capitulation, to surrender of the oppressed masses to US imperialism and the "great American people."

*What is at stake?*

Far and away the most important stake in Indo-China is the liberty of the millions of Indo-Chinese people. However, led, corrupted and coerced by US imperialism, too few of the other significant protagonists in the war have the interests of the millions of oppressed Indo-Chinese toilers at heart.

By examining the stake of each of the main protagonists in the war for Indo-China, we will show that the masses of Indo-China (the proletariat, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie, and even a section of the national bourgeoisie) can best serve their own interests by struggling *on behalf* of the proletarian vanguard of their national struggles for liberation from US imperialist tyranny and *in opposition* to Russian and Chinese revisionism and the US New Left as well as their own national bourgeoisie, all of whom are attempting to establish the national bourgeoisie as the head of the national liberation movements.\*

\* \* \*

### (1) US Imperialism and the so-called "Great American People":

*The US imperialist oppressor nation* is waging an imperialist war against the peoples of Indo-China. The US imperialist ruling class (which is made up of 30 billionaire families), the main enemy of the peoples of the world, has mobilized (white) US imperialist society, its imperialist army and its New Left in order to protect

---

\* Because of the success of US imperialism and international revisionism in setting back the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle since (and largely through) the Paris negotiations and because the Cambodian masses have risen up with such strength, within the past year the focal struggle in the world has shifted from south Vietnam to Cambodia where *south Vietnamese* puppet troops are now the main armed force of the US imperialist-led counterrevolution!

Today, the rising Arabian people, with the Palestinian Arabs and Palestinian organizations such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine in the vanguard, threaten to drive US imperialism and the Israeli white settlers out of Arabia. Because, on the one hand, the Arabian masses are rising up so strongly, and on the other hand, because US imperialism needs the strategically important oil of the Arab people, needs the free access to both Africa and Asia which Arabia links together, and needs the labor of the 80 million Arab people — because of all this, and because US imperialism in collusion with Russian and Chinese revisionism has been able to keep Sihanouk and north Vietnamese (DRV) revisionists in control of the Indo-Chinese

(over)

and expand US imperialist control of the people and natural resources of south Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, to protect and increase the super-profits which it reaps from the labor of the oppressed peoples of Indo-China, and the rest of Asia, Africa, Arabia, Latin America and Afro-America. US imperialism has bribed and brutalized the entire US (white) population to support in one way or another the suppression of the Cambodian, Laotian and south Vietnamese wars of national liberation, trained its imperialist citizen-army of occupation for crushing the Indo-Chinese people's wars, and unleashed the New Left detachment of its privileged petty bourgeoisie to create a pretense of democracy, justice and humanity (none of which exist in parasitic US imperialist society today) in order to "disarm" the heroic peoples of Indo-China.\*

The war policy which US imperialism and the white people of the US imperialist oppressor nation are pursuing in Indo-China and in Arabia is the inevitable product of the economic nature of US imperialism.

Lenin taught that imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism, the stage of capitalism marked by the domination and merging of huge industrial monopolies and financial oligarchies. He taught that imperialism is characterized by the *export of finance capital* and by a desperate search by the imperialists for new areas to conquer with their armies, for *new workers* to control and *super-exploit* with their capital.

---

liberation movement, — Arabia, and Palestine in particular, is now in the process of becoming the focal struggle in the world.

What dramatizes this fact is that precisely at this time when the Arabian masses are threatening to overthrow and soundly defeat the vacillating rulers of several Arab countries, and are paving the way for the full armed mobilization of the Arab masses for "people's war" against the state of Israel — precisely at this moment when US imperialism has its imperialist army on a global military alert, making full preparation for massive US troop invasion of Arabia — the Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG), (the vacillating leadership which took over from the National Liberation Front (NLF) in south Vietnam after the NLF went to Paris) has offered the US a cease fire if the US will only "promise" to withdraw US troops from Vietnam by July 1971! The PRG is willing to cooperate fully with the military strategic material and manpower deployment needs of US imperialism!!

Thus this article not only represents a direct support to the proletarian vanguard forces in Indo-China, but is also written in support of Arab liberation. [Time Magazine, 9/28/70, Our emphasis — SWG]  
[This footnote originally appeared in body — RoL]

\*At a cocktail party last week, Attorney General John Mitchell is reported to have admitted, *There is "no such thing as the New Left.* This country is going so far right you are not even going to recognize it." [Time Magazine, 9/28/70, Our Emphasis — SWG]

All the activities and policies of the US government are formulated and carried out in the interests of the US imperialist class. The US imperialist class controls the US government, legal system, propaganda machine, the major US banks and financial institutions, all the large US industrial and agricultural enterprises and the military machine (the army, the national guard, and the various police forces). The United States government is a dictatorship of the US imperialist class.

The driving force of the imperialist system is the *profit motive*. Today imperialism's greatest profits come from the *super-exploitation of the industrial working class of the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa, Arabia, Latin America and Afro-America* and the peasantry of the oppressed nations are the main source of new industrial workers for future exploitation.

Super-exploitation of the toiling masses of the oppressed nations is the main area of profits for the 30 billionaire US imperialist families, a fact which revisionist and New Left economists have tried to bury.

The nature of imperialism is to expand or die, to wage ceaseless war on the oppressed nations in order to reap greater and greater super-profits from the labor of the oppressed peoples or be swallowed up by those international cartels which do.

US imperialism's need to *expand* or be swallowed up by its competitors is now so urgent that US giant corporations could not wait for peace in Vietnam to begin to develop industry to super-exploit the south Vietnamese workers. According to V. Perlo\* between 1960 and 1965, US imperialism invested \$100 million in south Vietnam. And the process is accelerating; Standard Oil, Caltex and Shell Oil alone were setting up a \$19 million refinery in 1965. [See *The Vietnam Profiteers*, 1966, p. 15]

Construction contracts approaching \$1 billion (by 1966) were turned over to RMK-BRJ, a US consortium. The consortium employs 41,800 Vietnamese workers at 14 cents an hour for a 60 hour week. The payroll comes to \$1.5 million per month, for which the Vietnamese produce \$30 million of construction. [See p. 19-20, op. cit.] "One of the construction projects. . . uses the forced labor of prisoners at a notorious former French prison camp for independence fighters. . ." [op. cit., p. 21]

US imperialist citizen-soldiers in south Vietnam have forced many Vietnamese peasants off their land into concentration camps

---

\* CPUSA revisionist New Left economist Victor Perlo documents the US imperialists' insatiable drive for super-profits in an attempt to bury its *real* significance for the oppressed peoples.

("strategic hamlets") in order to get slave labor for such huge US imperialist projects as the Camranh Bay complex where no previous stable proletariat was immediately available.\*

In the last year as the heroic south Vietnamese masses have suffered increasing setbacks and defeats, two US imperialist auto companies as well as increasing numbers of US imperialist banks, insurance companies, and rubber and mining companies have been established on south Vietnamese soil. US imperialism has been increasing its super-exploitation and oppression of the south Vietnamese masses!

Thus, the real war profiteers in south Vietnam and all of Indo-China today are the 30 billionaire US imperialist families. These same families control *both* the war industry\*\* in the US — the huge producers of guns, helicopters, and other military equipment being used against the oppressed masses of Indo-China — and, more importantly, they control those huge US companies which are *super-exploiting* the south Vietnamese workers (workers who are paid a maximum wage of \$1.40 per day), and they are attempting to retain and expand their control of all the toiling masses of Indo-China for future super-profits.

US imperialist war policy in Indo-China serves the interests of these 30 billionaire families. US (white) citizen-soldiers are carrying out the bestial *policy of selective mass murder of Indo-Chinese political vanguard forces* in the fascist tradition of Nazi Germany so that the US imperialist class can continue to reap tremendous super-profits from the Indo-Chinese people.\*\*\* It is in order to ad-

---

\* "There is a huge project at Camranh Bay, where there was no city, and other major projects are at formerly little populated areas. Where does the labor come from? None of the reports tell. Is it because there is something to hide? *I believe many of the workers are recruited from the hundreds of thousands of civilians driven from their homes by US bombings, and herded into barbed wire enclosed concentration camp 'security hamlets' by the United States.* If so, the United States is using the same forced labor methods the Nazis did in occupied countries during World War II." [op. cit., p. 21]

\*\* International revisionism and the New Left spread the lie that it is *only* the producers of military equipment who profit off the war in Indo-China in order to make it seem as if the US (white) working class is the main source of US imperialism's profits instead of the proletariat of the oppressed nations, and to make it seem that the oppressed nations must rely on the "great American people" instead of on the broad shoulders of their own workers and poor peasants to liberate their nations from US imperialist domination.

\*\*\* This past week, in Amman, Jordan, US imperialist-directed Jordanian lackey troops murdered over 20,000 Palestinian Arabs, (a concentrated community of the political vanguard of Arabia), in an attempt to decapitate the rising Arab national liberation movement in order to perpetuate US imperialist domination of Arabia.

vance US imperialism's drive for super-profits that US citizen-soldiers committed mass murder on the infants, children, women and aged men of Songmy, a defenseless village (whose able-bodied men were away fighting in the People's Liberation Army) and that they are still committing bestial atrocities throughout Indo-China today!

But US imperialism's drive for super-profits *alone* does not explain why US imperialism has been able to carry out its vicious, predatory policy of selective mass murder against the heroic Indo-Chinese masses.

*The fact is that US imperialism is able to carry out its war policy in Indo-China because it has mobilized the entire white US oppressor nation to wage its imperialist war against the Indo-Chinese people in the interests of US imperialism.* The fact is that the entire US oppressor nation is carrying out US imperialist policy in Indo-China because the *privileged* existence of the *entire* US oppressor nation is dependent on the continued super-exploitation of the Indo-Chinese people and of the people of all the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa, Arabia, Latin America and Afro-America! The fact is that without the *direct* participation of the "great American people" in US imperialist policy — and especially the activities of the white US citizen-soldiers and the white New Left peace movement — US imperialism could not be carrying out the bestial policy of selective mass murder in Indo-China today.

It is these *facts* which US imperialism, international revisionism and the New Left peace movement are trying to hide from the heroic Indo-Chinese people.

All of the revisionist and New Left theoreticians "recognize" the existence of the US imperialist class and pay lip service to the idea that US imperialism is fighting in Indo-China out of economic necessity. However, *all* these opportunists bury the real teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the historical development of imperialism. All of these so-called "revolutionaries" bury the real nature of the imperialist war being waged by the *US imperialist oppressor nation* against the heroic wars of national liberation being waged by the peoples of Indo-China.

On the one side, these revisionist "theoreticians" and "experts" bury US imperialism's super-exploitation of the Indo-Chinese toilers and the *national* oppression of the entire Cambodian, Laotian, and (south) Vietnamese people; they bury the source of organized strength of the Indo-Chinese peoples' struggles. On the other side, these opportunists bury the real nature of the enemy of the Indo-Chinese people, both the real nature of profit-mad US imperialism, *and more importantly* the real nature of the decadent, parasitic US imperialist *society*, of the "great American people"!

And it is precisely the knowledge of these facts which the Indo-Chinese masses must possess and put into practice in the form of ruthless armed struggle against US occupation troops (as well as lackey troops) in order to liberate their nations from US imperialist domination.

As we stated several months ago:

“S.W.G. has the extremely important task of warning the oppressed peoples about the extreme decadent, parasitic, bestial nature of the ‘great American people’ – the task of warning the Indo-Chinese masses (and the Arabian masses in the near future) to destroy US occupation troops as their main strategic military objective – S.W.G. has the task of helping to lay the conditions in which the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa, Arabia and Latin America will co-ordinate their national liberation struggles with the brutally oppressed Afro-American and Indo-Hispano nations (which encompass the entire US South) *in opposition to US whites!!* – of helping to rally all the oppressed peoples around the fighting cry – *Remember Songmy!*” [SWG Bulletin No.4, “Two Letters *Against* the ‘Cultural Revolution’!!!”, 7/18/70, p. 12] \*

Of the two main protagonists in the world, the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples (led by their own working classes) are so powerful vis-a-vis the US imperialists, that US imperialism, in order to survive and continue to thrive at the expense of the intensified suffering of the oppressed peoples, must bring into play its agents within the revolutionary movement. This includes not only the US New Left but the powerful revisionist leaderships of formerly socialist countries as well as representatives of the privileged classes in the oppressed nations. Because US imperialism stands for everything that is rotten and decadent in the world, while the oppressed peoples stand for what is new and rising and blossoming and good in the world, US imperialism’s

---

\* SWG’s position that the main strategic military objective of the Indochinese peoples should be the destruction of US occupation troops was in conformity with fundamental military strategy, e.g. Mao’s writings on peoples war. SWG slightly overemphasized the extent to which Afro-American and Indo-Hispano people including those in the US army were already in active struggle against US imperialism, though this reaction is understandable in light of the way the oppressed Indo-Hispano and Afro-American nations were buried by the revisionist dominated international communist movement. Finally, while on the surface the SWG position seems “anti-white,” the fact is that if 20,000 US troops had been killed in 1965 as they landed on Vietnamese soil and the war ended, then not only would the Vietnamese and other Indochinese people have saved themselves much suffering but also 55,000 US troops who died over the long drawn-out war would not have died fighting on behalf of their own US imperialist masters, and the struggle for the liberation of the peoples of both Indochina and the USA would have been greatly advanced. – *Ray O. Light*

appeal to its agents is an appeal to their selfish, private interests. By understanding the terms under which these various opportunist forces “sell their souls” to US imperialism, the peoples will understand how to politically defeat opportunism and militarily defeat US imperialism!

## (2) Russian Revisionism:

Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956, the Russian leadership has carried out consistent revisionist betrayal of the oppressed peoples as the price for its peaceful co-existence “deal” with US imperialism. In April 1968, in our (*Youth for Stalin*) document “The October Revolution vs. the ‘Cultural Revolution,’ ” we said the following:

“In 1956 at the 20th Congress CPSU, Khrushchev slandered Stalin. . . . In slandering Stalin, the great Marxist-Leninist theoretician on the *national question*, Khrushchev negated the national liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples (which had become the main contradiction) and thus negated *proletarian internationalism*. He denied the responsibility of the Marxist-Leninists of the world to support in every way the struggles of the oppressed nations against US imperialism. *He denied the necessity for proletarian leadership of united front (national liberation front) movements in the oppressed nations – the only leadership capable of achieving a thorough national democratic revolution, that leads to socialism.* . . . [emphasis added – SWG]

“What is the essence of the Khrushchev line put forward at the 20th Congress CPSU?

“Khrushchev’s line was in essence a *deal* which he, as the representative of the privileged intelligentsia, the government bureaucrats – the Russian national bourgeoisie – was making with US imperialism at the expense of the Soviet people *and the oppressed peoples of the world* [emphasis added – SWG]. For their part, Khrushchev and his ilk would abandon the struggle against world capitalism headed by US imperialism. They would lead the Soviet Party down the revisionist path and they would use the great influence of the CPSU(B) plus military and economic pressures to mislead the world Marxist-Leninist movement into capitulation to US imperialism.

“For its part of the deal, US imperialism would allow the Russian national bourgeoisie and its Khrushchevite representatives to carry out peaceful national construction (capitalist restoration). In other words, US imperialism would allow Khrushchev and the Russian capitalists to expand and develop exploitation of the Soviet workers with temporary immunity from US imperialist efforts to capture the Soviet market.” [p. 33-34]

In 1960, Khrushchev and the Russian revisionist leadership led in the writing and signing by the entire international Marxist-Leninist movement of the 81 Party Statement. In the same document quoted above, we said:

“According to the 81 Party Statement, US imperialism is not the main threat to the world’s peoples; rather the main danger is ‘war.’ Wars of national liberation are thus to be prevented lest they interfere with the national construction of the socialist countries. The 81 Party Statement calls for ‘peaceful co-existence’ with US imperialism — in reality — capitulation to US imperialist expansion and exploitation.” [p.35]

“Today the Soviet Union is not merely a partner in the crimes against the oppressed peoples by US imperialism; it is becoming a rival imperialist country. An important reason for the Soviet revisionists’ sham support to the Arab people is their desire to gain a foothold in the area for exploitation of the Arab people and of their oil and other resources.”\* [p. 34]

Now two years later, we must point out that the aim of the Russian revisionist leadership in Indo-China is still (as it is in Arabia) to aid US imperialism in the suppression of national liberation struggles of the Indo-Chinese people while competing with its US imperialist partner-rival for the “spoils.”

Thus Russian revisionism is both a partner and a rival of US imperialism. But its main aspect is as a *partner* of US imperialism. It is no wonder then that, in line with its 81 Party Statement, the Russian revisionist leadership supports the most right-wing national bourgeois leadership in Laos and Cambodia today, and especially supports the revisionist DRV leadership and supports the PRG leadership (which it played a big role in creating, to replace the more militant anti-imperialist NLF of south Vietnam); it is no wonder that Russian revisionism has called for the reconvening of Geneva Treaty talks, etc., etc., and that in the May Day celebration in Moscow, as the Cambodian masses faced the new massive invasion of the US imperialist army, the Russian revisionists did not even mention the Cambodian people! Right after US imperialism made its Songmy revelation, the Russian revisionists responded by *warmly* co-operating with US imperialism in its Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT Talks) at Helsinki!

---

\* Our observation has been confirmed throughout the period since the terrible defeat suffered by the Arab people in the June War in 1967; for since that time, Russian revisionism has gained all kinds of oil rights, guarantees, deals, etc. from Arab countries, especially from Egypt, and even from Syria and Iraq.

Russian revisionism represents the openly capitulationist position in the midst of the Indo-Chinese people’s struggle. When the focal struggle was in south Vietnam, the Russian revisionists, through the DRV leadership, played a criminal and critical role in “cutting the guts” out of the heroic south Vietnamese liberation movement organized in the NLF under the leadership of the People’s Revolutionary Party (the party of the south Vietnamese proletariat). Today its main role is to give legitimacy and a “militant” face to the Chinese (“Cultural Revolution”) revisionists’ political line and policy and to Sihanouk’s leadership. Thus while China immediately recognized Sihanouk’s National United Front of Kampuchea, Russian revisionism has remained silent on Cambodia, and continues to push the DRV revisionists (whose battle front is the Paris Peace Talks) as the primary leadership of the Indo-Chinese liberation movement.

### (3) DRV Revisionism:

“Socialist” north Vietnam is — like most of the rest of the “socialist” camp today — ruled *not* by the proletariat (even in an alliance with the poor peasantry) but by its national capitalist class. The long-range objective of this class is to develop capitalism in north Vietnam. The representatives of the national bourgeois class of north Vietnam cannot openly advocate a return to capitalism in “socialist” north Vietnam. They operate in the name of Marxism, of socialism — they are modern revisionists.

The capitalist class of the DRV cannot “freely” pursue its class objective of developing capitalism in north Vietnam as long as US imperialism occupies the southern half of the Vietnamese nation. The national bourgeois class would like to be free of the threat of US imperialist intervention, but the dynamics of the class struggle between the national bourgeoisie and proletariat within north Vietnam make the national bourgeois class *incapable* of mobilizing the masses of Vietnam and of other oppressed nations into a national liberation movement powerful enough to drive US imperialism out of Vietnam.

The national bourgeois class cannot mobilize the Vietnamese masses in the north around the question of liberation of the south, because this self-less internationalist approach to socialist construction is the strongest basis for the struggle *against* the development of capitalism in “socialist” north Vietnam. Further, the national bourgeois class cannot mobilize international support for the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle: On the one hand, to ally with the national bourgeoisie of the other oppressed nations is to ally with their prospective *competitors*, and on the other hand, to ally with the proletariat of the other oppressed na-

tions (the only class which can mobilize effective support for Vietnamese national liberation) is to strengthen the Vietnamese proletariat in the struggle for leadership of "socialist" north Vietnam.

This also holds true for the north Vietnamese national bourgeoisie's inability to mobilize support from fraternal socialist countries: For the national bourgeoisie of the DRV to encourage the socialist countries to carry out socialist construction for the purpose of supporting Vietnamese national liberation is to encourage the development of proletarian internationalism as the guiding policy of the socialist countries. By thus helping lay the basis for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the other socialist countries, the national bourgeoisie of north Vietnam would be strengthening the struggle of the north Vietnamese proletariat for leadership of north Vietnam.

The inability of the north Vietnamese national bourgeoisie to mobilize the Vietnamese masses and the people of the world and their consequent awe of US imperialism inspired these revisionists, under tremendous pressure from Russian (and now Chinese) revisionism, to make a *deal* with US imperialism — a deal whereby US imperialism does not interfere directly with peaceful development of capitalism in the north while the national bourgeoisie in the north leads the masses of their half country to abandon solidarity and support of their beleaguered brothers and sisters in the south and tries to facilitate the *surrender of the heroic south Vietnamese to US imperialist occupation*.

US imperialism has used a combination of force and bribery to get the revisionist DRV national bourgeois leadership to use its influence on the revolutionary south Vietnamese leadership and masses to capitulate to US imperialism, while the modern revisionists (first Russian and now Chinese as well) rendered invaluable aid to this part of US imperialism's war effort in south Vietnam by actively supporting DRV "leadership" of the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle.

The DRV leadership played an important role in the success of the treacherous negotiations strategy adopted by US imperialism in March 1968 which so weakened the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle that US imperialism is now able to use south Vietnam as a base for its brutal suppression of the rising Laotian and Cambodian masses.

The revolutionary upsurge of the oppressed masses of Laos and Cambodia is a *threat* to the dominance of the national bourgeois class in the DRV, for great successes in the Cambodian and Laotian armed struggles against US imperialism will be a tremendous encouragement to the oppressed masses of south Vietnam who are suffer-

ing terrible defeats at the hands of US imperialism while pursuing a negotiations strategy. When the masses in south Vietnam again rise up, they will be a tremendous support to the proletarian forces in north Vietnam demanding all-out proletarian internationalist support for the armed struggle against predatory US imperialism in the south. Thus the north Vietnamese national bourgeois leadership has a *stake* in helping US imperialism and international revisionism stifle the flames of revolution in Indo-China.

When US imperialism made its Songmy revelation, the Lao Dong Party (the Workers Party of north Vietnam) responded by having frank, friendly discussions with Cyrus Eaton, a so-called "enlightened" US imperialist! Recently north Vietnamese revisionists have actively encouraged the leadership of the Laotian and Cambodian national liberation movements to follow the same path as the south Vietnamese PRG leadership — i.e., to reject the all-out mobilization of the oppressed masses of their nations for armed struggle against the US imperialist occupation army in Indo-China in alliance with the other national liberation movements of Indo-China (and the rest of Asia, Africa, Arabia, Latin America and Afro-America); and to follow instead a path of half-hearted struggle for negotiations with predatory US imperialism in "alliance" with the so-called "great American people" — the path of making a deal with US imperialism at the expense of the masses of Indo-China! This is the message that Premier Pham Van Dong brought to the meeting with Sihanouk and the Pathet Lao leadership held in China in late April.

#### (4) Chinese Revisionism:

In April 1968, we pointed out:

"Because China is the red base area of world revolution [and because one quarter of mankind live and labor in China — *SWG*], US imperialism urgently seeks to make a deal with the national bourgeoisie of China. At present, the Chinese national bourgeoisie is, through the 'Cultural Revolution,' achieving and consolidating power in the Chinese Party and state. If this is accomplished, a deal between US imperialism and the Chinese national bourgeoisie will be established and US imperialism will be able for a long time to come to continue its high living at the expense of the oppressed peoples.

"To pave the way for this deal, the Chinese national bourgeoisie will mislead the oppressed peoples and all the anti-imperialist peoples by carrying out the essence of Soviet revisionist policies for betrayal of national liberation struggles and for appeasement of the US imperialist beast. In order to achieve the economic domination of their class, to carry out wide-spread exploitation of the Chinese working

class and poor peasantry, the Chinese national bourgeoisie will lull their own people into a false sense of security concerning the danger of US imperialism and concerning the importance of their international solidarity with the oppressed peoples and all anti-imperialist peoples....

"On August 12, 1966, the foreign policy statement of the 'Cultural Revolution' was delivered: in this statement the 'Cultural Revolution' leaders made it clear that China could and would build national 'communism' regardless of what happened to the rest of the world."  
["The October Revolution vs. the 'Cultural Revolution' " *Youth for Stalin* (now *SWG*), p. 45]

We also pointed out that "... a deal between US imperialism and the Chinese national bourgeoisie would be a far more terrible blow to the oppressed peoples and to the world anti-imperialist struggle than the US-Soviet Alliance!" [op. cit., p. 60]

Now, two years later, we must warn the oppressed peoples that the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" has consolidated its power within China — the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC) signified that the Chinese national bourgeoisie is firmly entrenched in state power. The Chinese national bourgeoisie is now in the process of consolidating its "deal" with US imperialism at the expense of the peoples of Indo-China!

Immediately following US imperialism's open invasion of south Vietnam and its first bombing attacks on north Vietnam in early 1965, the CPC encouraged the DRV to unite with the south Vietnamese NLF for the purpose of completing the Vietnamese national democratic revolution. The positive forces in the CPC tried at this time to mobilize the world's people for all-out support to south Vietnam and pledged to give the NLF whatever supplies and troops they requested from China:

"The Chinese people resolutely respond to the recent statement and appeal of the south Vietnamese National Front for Liberation and will give the south Vietnamese people all necessary material assistance including weapons and all other war materials. *We are also prepared to send our personnel to fight alongside the south Vietnamese people whenever they deem it necessary.*" [Chou En-lai's Speech at Tirana Mass Meeting, March 29, 1965. Our Emphasis — *SWG*]

For a full year after the so-called "Cultural Revolution" began in 1966, there was virtually no mention of the struggle of the heroic south Vietnamese people against US imperialism from the Chinese leadership. When the "Cultural Revolution" leadership finally felt strong enough to present its bourgeois nationalist "China first" line (in opposition to its previous proletarian internationalist line) on

Vietnam, the "Cultural Revolution" mentioned inevitable victories without discussing the need to *prepare* for possible setbacks; it mentioned the "paper tiger" side of US imperialism without ever mentioning its "real tiger" side; it has mentioned Chinese "support" to Vietnamese national liberation without mentioning Chinese troops; and it has mentioned "people's war" without ever mentioning the need for Vietnamese proletarian Marxist-Leninist leadership.

The Chinese revisionists have never mentioned, let alone given support to, the south Vietnamese proletariat and its People's Revolutionary Party which in reality has led the historic military victories of the NLF. Furthermore, as we pointed out in *SWG* Bulletin No. 4:

"... in Nov. 1968, precisely at the time when the NLF arrived in Paris to negotiate with (to surrender to) US imperialism, the 'Cultural Revolution' issued through Chou En-lai a statement of 5 Principles for Peaceful Coexistence between China and US imperialism encouraging the south Vietnamese leadership to make a deal with US imperialism as part of the 'Cultural Revolution' deal with the imperialist beasts."  
["Two Letters *Against* the 'Cultural Revolution'!!" p.4, footnote 1]

This "Cultural Revolution" overture to US imperialism was a signal that the Chinese revisionist leadership was ready, willing, and able to support the most vacillating bourgeois leadership of the national liberation movements as its part of the deal with US imperialism — and this signal itself resulted in the serious weakening of ("pulling the rug out from under") the People's Revolutionary Party and other vanguard fighters in the south Vietnamese NLF. The "Cultural Revolution's" peaceful coexistence offer was a strategic blow to the revolutionary side of the NLF and played a large role in the eventual replacement of the NLF by an even "broader" coalition Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) in June 1969, with the national bourgeoisie now in firm control.

It is no accident that, within hours after his US imperialist-engineered "ouster," Prince Sihanouk was "assured of Chinese support by his old friend Chou En-lai who met him at the airport"\* *in opposition to the Khmer Rouge against whom Sihanouk had been fighting for three years!*

In Dec. 1935, in his great Marxist-Leninist document "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism,"\*\* Mao Tse-tung said:

---

\* [Wilfred Burchett, "United Against the Common Foe," *Daily World*, 7/18/70, Our Emphasis — *SWG*]

\*\* This document was the theoretical basis for the re-establishment of a united front with the Chinese national bourgeoisie for the Chinese national liberation struggle against Japanese imperialism.

"Over the past nine years the national bourgeoisie has deserted its ally, the working class, and made friends with the landlord and comprador classes, but has it gained anything? Nothing, except the bankruptcy or semi-bankruptcy of its industrial and commercial enterprises. Hence we believe that in the present situation the attitude of the national bourgeoisie can change. What will be the extent of the change? The general characteristic of the national bourgeoisie is to vacillate. But at a certain stage of the struggle, one section (the left-wing) may join in, while another section may vacillate towards neutrality. . . .

"Is it correct to object to our view on the ground that China's national bourgeoisie is politically and economically flabby, and to argue that it cannot possibly change its attitude in spite of the new circumstances? I think not. If weakness is the reason for its inability to change its attitude, why did the national bourgeoisie behave differently in 1924-27 when it did not merely vacillate towards the revolution but actually joined it? Can one say that the weakness of the national bourgeoisie is a new disease, and not one that accompanies it from the very womb? Can one say that the national bourgeoisie is weak today, but was not weak in 1924-27? One of the chief political and economic characteristics of a semi-colonial country is the weakness of its national bourgeoisie. That is exactly why the imperialists dare to bully them, and it follows that one of their characteristics is dislike of imperialism. Of course, so far from denying it, we fully recognize that it is the very weakness of the national bourgeoisie that may make it easy for the imperialists, landlords and compradors to entice them with the bait of some temporary advantage; hence their lack of revolutionary thoroughness. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that in the present circumstances there is no difference between the national bourgeoisie and the landlord and comprador classes. . . .

"Comrades, so much for the positive side of the question. Now let me take up the negative side, namely, the fact that certain elements among the national bourgeoisie are often past masters at deceiving the people. Why? Because apart from the genuine supporters of the people's revolutionary cause, this class includes many who temporarily appear as revolutionaries or semi-revolutionaries, and who thus acquire a deceptive status which makes it difficult for the people to see through their lack of revolutionary thoroughness and their false trappings. This increases the responsibility devolving on the Communist Party to criticize its allies, unmask the fake revolutionaries, and gain the leadership. . . ."  
["On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," Dec. 1935, *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. I, p. 156-8]

Ever since the beginning of the "Cultural Revolution," the Chinese revisionist leadership, in violation of Mao's revolutionary teachings (before the "Cultural Revolution"), have supported national bourgeois leadership, at the expense of proletarian leadership (and

at the expense of victorious liberation) throughout the oppressed nations!

Cambodia is the most recent and most flagrant example of this "Cultural Revolution" perfidy!

From the beginning of the Paris Peace Talks until today, the "Cultural Revolution" representatives of the Chinese national bourgeoisie have told the Vietnamese leadership in both north and south, and more recently the Pathet Lao and Sihanouk leadership in Laos and Cambodia as well, to fight on in "protracted" war (by which the "Cultural Revolution" means long, drawn out war). While taking this seemingly militant stand, the Chinese revisionist leadership provides no theoretical perspective for winning victory in the Indo-Chinese war of liberation and offers no practical aid which can help to make victory possible — in particular, no troops! In order to encourage these forces to continue the war, the "Cultural Revolution" promises them that victory is "inevitable" (because they have the strong support of the "great American people," what a lie!).

The "Cultural Revolution" leadership hopes by doing this to use the heroic and long suffering peoples of Indo-China as a *buffer* between US imperialism and the (bourgeois) "national construction"-oriented Chinese revisionists who are preparing not *for* war (against aggressive, expansionist US imperialism) but "*against* war"!

Nor is the "Cultural Revolution's" "prepare *against* war" concept the only tip-off of the "Cultural Revolution's" *real* basis for telling the Indo-Chinese masses to continue *their* struggle against US imperialism, while the Chinese masses are kept busy building Chinese (bourgeois) "national construction."

The establishment of the negotiations in Paris was a major triumph for Russian revisionism and a Russian trump card in their dealings with their US imperialist partner. The negotiations were a giant step toward the final division of north from south Vietnam, with a northern zone under Russian imperialist domination and a southern zone under US imperialist domination. Because the anti-Russian struggle of the CPC since the "Cultural Revolution" has been in essence a struggle between rival capitalist groupings, the CPC, with the advent of the "Cultural Revolution," abandoned all effective struggle against Russian revisionist influence on north Vietnam, and this helped lay the basis for the Paris Peace Talks.

However, the "Cultural Revolution" spokesmen of the Chinese national bourgeoisie had hoped that the heroic Vietnamese people could be kept busy fighting US imperialism for sufficient time to allow the Chinese national bourgeoisie to consolidate capitalist economy in China on a large scale before revealing the real international essence of the "Cultural Revolution." The imminence of a Vietnam-

ese settlement from which the Chinese national bourgeoisie would be excluded and further, a settlement which would include a beachhead for eventual joint US-Russian expansion into China, forced the Chinese national bourgeoisie to reveal their renegade features in the Chou En-lai peaceful coexistence statement referred to above! This statement and overture was a powerful support to US imperialism in its attempt to bring the heroic south Vietnamese masses to their knees at the Paris Peace Talks!

Again, when US imperialism made its Songmy revelation, instead of making China available as a staging area for an international military mobilization in support of the south Vietnamese people under the rallying cry "Remember Songmy," the "Cultural Revolution" leaders resumed the Warsaw Talks with the barbaric butchers of Songmy!!!

It is no wonder then that the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" leadership has thrown its great weight and prestige behind Sihanouk who addressed the "great American people," the butchers of Songmy, in the following manner: "Allow me to appeal to the wisdom of the American people and their Congress. . ." ["From Peking: Sihanouk Talks to Americans," *Look Magazine*, 10/20/70, p. 107]

In this interview with the editor of the US imperialist *Look Magazine*, Sihanouk states that "the principal groups of adherents" "in the United National Front of Cambodia" "met in congress in April in Peking" where they "clearly defined our foreign policy in its political program." He said: "The *United States will once more become our friend when it has stopped intruding in our affairs* [!] and defending, or helping defend, by force of arms, the perfidious regime of Lon Nol." [ibid., p. 105-6, Our Emphasis — SWG]

Prince Sihanouk points out that "Prime Minister Chou En-lai himself *has insisted on the respect of the People's Republic of China for the non-Communist regime of Cambodia as established by the Royal Constitution of 1947.*" [ibid., p. 106, Our Emphasis — SWG] The "Cultural Revolution" leadership of China has thrown its weight behind Sihanouk's kind of deal with US imperialism in place of Lon Nol's! (*Both* are in opposition to the interests of the Cambodian masses, represented by the Khmers Rouges!)

The Khmers Rouges' armed struggle against Sihanouk, Lon Nol, and the oppressive Sihanouk regime developed largely from 1967 on. Because the "Cultural Revolution" has been in power in China throughout this period, the Khmers Rouges have never been supported by the Chinese leadership. Never, that is, until now! *Now* the Chinese revisionists support the *coalition* of the "Sihanoukists" and the Khmers Rouges. And within the new coalition of the "Sihanoukists" with the "Red Khmers," the Chinese revisionists not surprisingly throw their weight behind the "Sihanoukists"!!

It is no wonder, then, that the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" leadership, after sponsoring Sihanouk, also sponsored the Summit Conference of Indo-Chinese "leadership" which, according to Wilfred Burchett\* "resulted in an agreement" concretized in "*a wise and moderate document* which affirms that the fundamental position of the three peoples have not been modified because of the extension of the war." [!] [ibid., Our Emphasis — SWG]

In SWG Bulletin No. 4 entitled "Two Letters *Against* the 'Cultural Revolution'!!", we pointed out that: "Today in 1970, when US imperialism has openly invaded all of Indo-China to suppress the rising revolutionary Indo-Chinese masses, some level of coordination (at least of the three nations of Indo-China) cannot be prevented by US imperialism." [pg. v.] We immediately went on to *warn* the Indo-Chinese people: "But in coordination with Chinese revisionism, US imperialism may be able to keep the Indo-Chinese leadership, especially Sihanouk and the north Vietnamese revisionists, pursuing a capitulationist, compromising, vacillating path." This is precisely what occurred at the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" sponsored Summit Conference!

The following statement (exactly as Burchett quoted it) appears in the agreement reached at the Summit Conference *sponsored by Peking*.

"The Cambodian, Lao and South Vietnamese parties affirm that their combat objectives are independence, peace, neutrality, the prohibition of the presence of all foreign troops or military bases on their soil, non-participation in any military alliance, prohibition of the use of their territories by any foreign country for the purpose of aggression against other countries. . . . The people of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam fully respect these legitimate aspirations and unreservedly support the struggle for these lofty objectives."

To make sure that US imperialism does not miss the point, Burchett sums up his sinister article with the following: "In other words, *despite the greatly changed situation, neutrality remains*, with the implications for an autonomous South Vietnam as a partner in a neutral zone together with Laos and Cambodia." [op. cit., Our Emphasis — SWG]

In the face of the butchers of Songmy, the Indo-Chinese "leadership" under Chinese revisionist sponsorship aims for "neutrality"! Is it "neutrality" between bestial US imperialism on the one hand, and on the other, the long-suffering Indo-Chinese masses, which these "leaders" seek? In the words of the old Appalachian miner's

---

\* Australian-born Burchett is an extremely important fifth column intelligence gatherer for US imperialism.

song, "There are no *neutrals* there!" Such misleaders and their "Cultural Revolution" sponsor must be politically exposed and destroyed by the Indo-Chinese people as a prerequisite for genuine fighting coordination of the Indo-Chinese liberation movements and for fighting international military and political support for their struggles.

As we stated in *SWG Bulletin No. 4*:\*

"Today the oppressed toiling masses of Indo-China, of Afro-America, of Arabia and throughout the rest of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are rising up and are in the process of overcoming this period of setback! However, *unless revolutionary Marxist-Leninists within the oppressed nations wage ruthless ideological struggle against the 'Cultural Revolution' while leading the armed struggle of their peoples against US imperialism and the 'great American people,' this new period of rising and advancing national liberation struggles will be aborted!* [Emphasis from *SWG Bulletin No. 4*, p. vii]

Finally, let us sum up: new-found "Cultural Revolution" "support" for the Cambodian national liberation struggle, i.e., "Cultural Revolution" support for Sihanouk *at the expense of* the Khmers Rouges and the Cambodian masses, is a large part of the answer to the question posed at the outset of this Bulletin: Why didn't the Khmers Rouges overthrow the Cambodian lackey government of Lon Nol-Sirik Matak last April when it had the opportunity?

But it is not the whole answer.

### BOURGEOIS LEADERSHIP OF THE INDO-CHINESE LIBERATION MOVEMENT

"The national bourgeoisie is a class with a dual character.

"On the one hand, it is oppressed by imperialism and fettered by feudalism and consequently is in contradiction with both of them. In this respect it constitutes one of the revolutionary forces. In the course of the Chinese revolution it has displayed a certain enthusiasm for fighting imperialism and the governments of bureaucrats and war-lords.

---

\* We must point out that the Burchett article was published the same day, July 18, 1970, as *SWG Bulletin No. 4*. *SWG Bulletin No. 4* was written without the benefit of Burchett's "inside information." Burchett's "inside information" unfortunately confirms the *SWG Bulletin No. 4*. *SWG Bulletin No. 4*, therefore, needs to be taken very seriously by Indo-Chinese Communists.

"But on the other hand, it lacks the courage to oppose imperialism and feudalism thoroughly because it is economically and politically flabby and still has economic ties with imperialism and feudalism. *This emerges very clearly when the people's revolutionary forces grow powerful.*" [Mao Tse-tung, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," Dec. 1939, *Selected Works* Vol. II, p. 320-1, Our Emphasis — *SWG*]

### (5) The Provisional Revolutionary Government of south Vietnam:

The south Vietnamese national bourgeoisie has a dual character. On the one hand, it would like its country free from US imperialist domination so that it can begin to develop national capitalism and exploit "its own" workers and peasants. However, while it strives for bourgeois "freedom," the south Vietnamese national bourgeoisie (like the national bourgeoisie of north Vietnam) fears a thoroughgoing, no holds-barred, no-compromise revolutionary struggle of the south Vietnamese *masses* against US imperialism because such a struggle would lay the basis for the elimination of all exploitation and of the national bourgeoisie as a class in the future.

Because of this, and because US imperialism will never give up its political domination and super-exploitation of the toiling masses of south Vietnam until it is driven out of south Vietnam by force of arms (or until its great super-profits or potential super-profits are more seriously threatened elsewhere), the south Vietnamese national bourgeoisie is presently *negotiating* with US imperialism in Paris for whatever petty *concessions* it can get out of the powerful US imperialist occupiers of its nation in exchange for the national bourgeoisie's aid in disarming the south Vietnamese *masses*. The south Vietnamese PRG leadership is attempting to use the still-aroused south Vietnamese masses as a *lever* with which to force US imperialism to grant concessions to the national bourgeois class!

The PRG is the main political representative of the south Vietnamese national bourgeois class. The establishment of the PRG in early June, 1969 signified that the south Vietnamese national bourgeoisie, with the powerful backing of Russian and "Cultural Revolution" revisionism and the US New Left, had consolidated its domination of the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle; it signified the complete abandonment of revolutionary armed struggle against US imperialism and US (white) citizen-soldiers in south Vietnam by the present *leadership* of the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle.

The tremendous revolutionary upsurge of the Cambodian and Laotian masses is a *threat* to the south Vietnamese national bourgeois class' leadership of the south Vietnamese struggle and its efforts

to get concessions from US imperialism at the expense of the south Vietnamese masses. For the victories achieved by the Cambodian and Laotian masses are a tremendous encouragement to the south Vietnamese masses to reject the suicidal "negotiations" strategy being pursued by their capitulationist national bourgeois leadership and to rise up strongly against US imperialism once again — this time in co-ordination with powerful national liberation struggles throughout Indo-China! (In April when the Cambodian masses (under the leadership of the Khmers Rouges) had advanced their national liberation struggle to the point of overthrowing the Cambodian government, the south Vietnamese masses were so inspired and encouraged by the advancing struggle of their Cambodian brothers and sisters that they intensified their own greatly-reduced armed struggle against US imperialism, in opposition to their capitulationist leadership, and inflicted the greatest number of casualties on US citizen-soldiers in south Vietnam in eight months.) Thus the PRG has a *stake* in helping US imperialism suffocate the revolutionary initiatives of *all* the Indo-Chinese masses!

Even prior to the formation of the PRG, by August 1967 the south Vietnamese national bourgeoisie had gained the upper hand in the struggle for leadership of the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle. This is reflected in the approach which the NLF leadership took to the Khmers Rouges which was leading the Cambodian masses in armed struggle against Sihanouk prior to his "ouster" (as well as in the NLF's adoption of a strategy of *negotiations*). Wilfred Burchett, who was the closest white man to the NLF leadership and who himself has played a criminal role in strengthening the forces of capitulation within the NLF, points out:

"In the past, the NLF of South Vietnam did not supply arms to the Khmers Rouges resistance fighters, although they had abundant stocks in the frontier areas. They did not want to do anything which might endanger Sihanouk's neutrality. They loyally respected agreements on non-interference in each other's internal affairs. *The Khmers Rouges*, once they went over to armed resistance in 1967, were *something of an embarrassment, in fact, to the NLF.*" [op. cit., Our Emphasis — SWG]

What an exposure of the bankruptcy of the political-military line of the national bourgeois-dominated NLF!!!

An important way in which the PRG, inspired and encouraged by international revisionism and the US New Left, has attempted to stifle the just anger of the south Vietnamese masses against the bestial occupiers of their nation in the *past* is to hail the white people of the US imperialist oppressor nation, the butchers of Songmy, as genuine allies of the south Vietnamese people.

*South Viet Nam in Struggle*, a journal published by the NLF Information Commission (now dominated by the PRG), has been filled with pages hailing the "revolutionary" struggles of the "great American people." Here is an example from the Sept. 2, 1969 issue:

"These past few years, the actions taken by Americans to support the South Vietnamese people's resistance to American aggression, for national salvation, have increased many times over. A 'second front' against American aggression has taken shape right in the United States. . . . *The American people are proud of our struggle and strive to step up their support to Viet Nam-drive to the same level as the battle in Viet Nam itself.*" ["Hectic Activity on 'the Second Front'" Our Emphasis — SWG]

The following quote appeared in the Nov. 1, 1969 issue and helped pave the way for US imperialism's Songmy revelation:

"The South Vietnamese warmly hail the American people's gallant endeavour as a concerted attack on the common enemy, as an inestimable contribution to the ultimate triumph of their own just cause. For their part, they will muster up all their courage and daring and push up their resistance until final victory, for the sake of their national independence, of international security and peace *and as their share in bringing an end to the American people's sufferings.*" ["American People's Sweeping Protest Tide," Our Emphasis — SWG]

The PRG told the long suffering south Vietnamese masses that their main concern should be helping to bring "an end to the American people's sufferings" at a time when the military-political needs of the south Vietnamese masses demand that the south Vietnamese liberation fighters direct their main blows at *wiping out* US citizen-troops, the butchers of Songmy, i.e. at increasing "the American people's sufferings" in south Vietnam to such an extent that US imperialism can no longer maintain its domination of the south Vietnamese masses!

Immediately following US imperialism's revelation of the bestial Songmy massacre, the PRG devoted an entire article in *South Viet Nam in Struggle* to praises of the "Awakening [US] GI's," who love Vietnamese children etc., etc. What a distorted picture of the murderers of the children of Songmy!

A few weeks later, the PRG delegates to the Paris Peace Talks offered to "hold fire", i.e., to attempt to keep the south Vietnamese masses "cool," for *six months* if US imperialism would only "agree" to withdraw all its troops *during* that time. The PRG did not even demand that US imperialism "promise" to have its own troops cease firing during that period! This was the first open offer of the PRG

to sell-out the south Vietnamese masses at the Paris Negotiations.

The PRG, with the powerful backing of international revisionism including the US New Left, has played a significant role in weakening the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle to such an extent that US imperialism is now able to use south Vietnam as a base of aggression, and south Vietnamese puppet troops as an army of aggression, against the Laotian and Cambodian masses!

Today the south Vietnamese PRG leadership is trying to suffocate the revolutionary initiatives of the Indo-Chinese people by pushing the "great American people" myth on all the masses of Indo-China. Richard Dudman, one of the US journalists who was captured by Cambodian liberation fighters in early May, described the difference in the approach of the *Cambodian masses* and the *south Vietnamese leaders* to the captured journalists:

"The Cambodian peasant's hatred for the Americans, according to Dudman, struck the journalists from the beginning. Angry stares, curses, and fist-shaking met them in some villages.

" 'Cambodian peasants hate all Americans because of the invasion and bombing and they can still try to hurt you,' one of the Vietnamese guards responsible for the journalists' safety explained to Dudman. 'We Vietnamese know that there are good Americans and bad Americans, but the Cambodians still think they are all bad.' The guards protected the journalists by explaining to villagers that they were 'good people.' " ["Cambodians Fight For Themselves!" *Muhammad Speaks*, Aug. 14, 1970]

The Cambodian masses correctly viewed all US whites as their enemies whereas the south Vietnamese PRG leaders as well as the DRV, Russian and Chinese revisionists, and the US New Left, were disarming the Cambodian people with lies about "good Americans" precisely at a time when the Cambodian masses were faced with the massive invasion of US citizen-troops!

Today the PRG, by continuing to negotiate with US imperialism and offering to make a deal with US imperialism in the face of the stepped-up US imperialist aggression in Indo-China, is encouraging the Laotian and Cambodian masses to follow the path of *negotiations* with (surrender to) predatory US imperialism which has resulted in such tremendous hardships for the south Vietnamese masses in the past. The PRG is supporting the present capitulationist Pathet Lao leadership as well as Sihanouk's treacherous leadership of the Cambodian masses. And as we pointed out above, the PRG is now willing to cooperate with US imperialism in its aggression against the Arab masses. All this in the name of the heroic south Vietnamese people!!

It is no wonder then that "On Sept. 25, 1969 the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet Nam and the Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia concluded a commercial and payment agreement, the first official accord signed by the Provisional Revolutionary Government with a foreign country." [Nguyen Van Hieu, "May Cambodia be Prosperous and the Vietnam-Cambodia Friendship Last For Ever," *South Vietnam in Struggle*, Nov. 15, 1969] — The PRG's agreement helped to strengthen the Cambodian Sihanouk-Lon Nol government in opposition to the Khmers Rouges! And it is no wonder that the President of the PRG, Mr. Huynh Tan Phat, made his very first visit abroad to Cambodia to meet with *Prince Norodom Sihanouk!*

#### (6) Sihanouk's National United Front of Kampuchea:

"During the period when the heroic south Vietnamese people were destroying the US imperialist Saigon puppet army, [Prince] Sihanouk, Cambodian Chief of State, was becoming more and more anti-US imperialist. But by the beginning of 1968 and Johnson's 'era of negotiations,' when US imperialism found new life in Indo-China because the south Vietnamese masses had been disarmed by the revisionists, Sihanouk began to play a more and more openly *pro-imperialist* role in southeast Asia in the name of 'neutrality.' Because of this, the *armed resistance* of the Cambodian masses, which developed under the impetus of the advancing Laotian national liberation struggle and the continued heroic struggle of the south Vietnamese masses, developed largely *in opposition to Sihanouk's leadership*. Based on this, the politically advanced Cambodian masses are in an especially good position to expose the limitations of national bourgeois leadership, of compromise settlements with US imperialism, of 'neutrality,' 'peaceful coexistence,' reliance on negotiations and on the 'great American people!'" [SWG Bulletin No. 4, p. ii]

For the question of what is happening in Cambodia today, we reprint in its entirety the following article entitled "A Closer Look at Cambodia's Coup: Why Did Sihanouk Choose Lon Nol to Rule in his Absence?" by Dadi Hassimtou of the Afro-Asian Liberation Press. This outstanding article not only reflects the advanced political thinking of many emerging proletarian revolutionaries in Indo-China, but further, its very publication in *Muhammad Speaks*, (run by Afro-American petty bourgeois nationalists), the official organ of the Black bourgeois-led Black Muslims, reflects the tremendously revolutionary character of the national liberation movements in general, and the Afro-American national liberation movement in particular. May the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" leaders and Prince Norodom Sihanouk read this and weep.

"Paris — The Khmer people of Cambodia have been fighting for their freedom from French and US monopolies long before the recent US invasion inflamed the internal situation in that country.

"Lon Nol, the current pro-imperialist head of state, and his merchant boss, Sirik Matak, have been principle foes of the liberation movement led by the Khmers Rouges (Red Khmers).

"Prior to his downfall, Prince Norodom Sihanouk himself had also opposed — violently at times — the Red Khmers.

"Experts on Cambodian politics find it interesting that Sihanouk appointed the CIA-connected Lon Nol to rule Cambodia when the prince and his family packed up and left for Paris — allegedly for health reasons.

"Now the same CIA-hired fascist and racist mercenaries who fought in Algeria, the Congo and Nigeria are fighting in Cambodia for \$2,500 a week.

"Why did Sihanouk — who is now hailed as a progressive liberator, even as a revolutionary — place the Lon Nol-Sirik Matak group in power?

"That question puzzles many Cambodians who, like Sihanouk himself, have known for the last ten years or more that the Lon Nol-Sirik Matak crowd directly represents French and US interests and is their arm of oppression within Cambodia.

"Leaders of the Red Khmers believe that Sihanouk, Lon Nol and other forces may have rigged the 'coup' in order to prevent the increasingly strong and popular Red Khmers from taking over Cambodian leadership through a revolutionary coup.

"This would have put Cambodia squarely beside the progressive liberation movements fighting in Laos, Viet Nam and Thailand.

"Sihanouk — never known as a real friend of popular socialist movements — had threatened both North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front forces with military attack a few months before the so-called coup, a North Vietnamese official told this reporter.

"Sihanouk has always been a royalist at heart, but he has also been smart enough to know that if he exhibited these traits openly, the people of Cambodia would identify him as an enemy along with the French and Americans.' the North Vietnamese explained.

"A Laotian revolutionary in Paris has expressed similar concern about Sihanouk's 'government in exile.'

"What is the objective effect of the formation of this government?' the Laotian asked. 'It is an attempt to prevent a truly revolutionary, anti-imperialist regime from coming to power in Cambodia. The Cambodian aristocracy does not like the idea of a united Indo-China led by peasant and workers parties. They like Cambodia as a pleasure resort and rubber supplier for the decadent Yankee and European aristocracy.

"Now they think they have two horses to ride. If Lon Nol temporarily crushes the liberation forces, all is well and good. And Sihanouk can remain in exile. He moved his wealth outside the country before he replaced himself with the reactionary Lon Nol. Apparently he did not want to struggle directly with the rightist forces.

"But if the liberation forces win as Sihanouk is betting, then a previously formed government of his choosing will be imposed again on the people. And many Khmer Rouges (Red) privately admit that such a government will exclude them — by force if necessary. But despite his faults, Sihanouk is far better for Cambodia's progress than the Lon Nol-Matak clique is.'

"This delicate situation is complicated because the Cambodian peasantry has always been courted by Sihanouk and much of it tends to think along traditionalist lines. It still pays obeisance to the notions of monarchy.

"But many peasants have been politically educated by Vietnamese guerrillas who came from peasant families but who now are revolutionaries. This erosion of his influence is what many progressives always saw as the reason Sihanouk gave the North Vietnamese and NLF such trouble. And this is also why Lon Nol committed mass murder against Vietnamese Cambodians.

"But the Cambodian workers in the rubber fields, on the other hand, have been forced to understand the full nature of their brutal oppression much earlier than the peasants. It is they who give strong support to the Red Khmers and who protected NLF guerrillas from US, Saigon and now Cambodian mercenaries.

"The possibility exists that Sihanouk has seen the error of his ways and that he actually believes some of the revolutionary language he has been using in Peking.

"It is too hard to say now but it is the Cambodian people who will ultimately be his judges regardless of the forces who recognize his government in exile right now." [Muhammad Speaks, 8/7/70, Our Emphasis — SWG]

## PROLETARIAN LEADERSHIP AND THE INDO-CHINESE PEOPLES' FREEDOM

*The Proletarian Revolutionaries of Indo-China must fight in opposition to (1) US imperialism and the so-called "Great American People," (2) Russian Revisionism, (3) DRV Revisionism, (4) Chinese Revisionism, (5) the Provisional Revolutionary Government of south Vietnam, and (6) Sihanouk's National United Front of Kampuchea in order to lead the oppressed Indo-Chinese masses to victorious liberation!*

The toiling masses of Indo-China have indicated by years of heroic anti-imperialist struggle that they would rather die on their feet than live on their knees. The oppressed toiling masses are once again rising up in mighty wars of national liberation in Indo-China, in Arabia, in Latin America and in Afro-America, after experiencing a period of setback during the past few years. The masses of Indo-Chinese people have been in the *forefront* of this new period of *advance* for the national liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples all over the world.

The masses of people in Indo-China will no longer tolerate US imperialist political domination and economic enslavement. They will not settle for phony *negotiated* "coalition governments" set up under the aegis of US imperialism to mask its brutal domination of the peoples. The revolutionary masses of Indo-China will carry on their struggle until there is no room left on Indo-Chinese soil for US imperialism in any form, under any guise.

In Laos, Cambodia, south Vietnam and north Vietnam, the only class capable of providing the perspective for victory, the only class capable of leading the oppressed masses of their nations to the fulfillment of their desire for freedom, for national liberation, is the working class. Only the proletarian class is capable of fully understanding the objective economic nature of US imperialist presence in Indo-China — of understanding that US imperialism is not in Indo-China because of isolated errors or evil human nature but is driven by its need to intensify and expand its super-exploitation of the working class of the oppressed nations and to intensify its economic domination of each of these *entire* nations. Only the proletarian class in the nations of Indo-China is capable (through their Parties) of mobilizing the people of these nations to drive US imperialism out of Indo-China. Let the Indo-Chinese proletarian vanguard raise the cry throughout the world — *Remember Songmy!!*

As Mao pointed out while leading the struggle for Chinese national liberation:

"The chief enemies in China's revolutionary war are imperialism and the feudal forces. Although the Chinese bourgeoisie may take part in the revolutionary war at certain historical junctures, yet its selfishness and lack of political and economic independence render it both unwilling and unable to lead China's revolutionary war on to the road of complete victory. The masses of China's peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie wish to take an active part in the revolutionary war and to carry it to complete victory. They are the main forces in the revolutionary war, but being small-scale producers they are limited in their political outlook (and some of the unemployed masses have anarchist views), so that they are unable to give correct leadership in the war.

Therefore, in an era when the proletariat has already appeared on the political stage, the responsibility for leading China's revolutionary war inevitably falls on the shoulders of the Chinese Communist Party. *In such an era, any revolutionary war will definitely end in defeat if it lacks, or runs counter to, the leadership of the proletariat and the Communist Party.* Of all the social strata and political groupings in semi-colonial China, the proletariat and the Communist Party are the ones most free from narrow-mindedness and selfishness, are politically the most far-sighted, the best organized and the readiest to learn with an open mind from the experience of the vanguard class, the proletariat, and its political party *throughout the world* and to make use of this experience in their own cause. Hence only the proletariat and the Communist Party can lead the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie, can overcome the narrow-mindedness of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie, the destructiveness of the unemployed masses, and also (provided the Communist Party does not err in its policy) the vacillation and lack of thoroughness of the bourgeoisie — and can lead the revolution and the war on to the road of victory."

[Mao Tse-tung, "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War," Dec. 1936, *Selected Military Writings*, p. 87-8; *Selected Works*, Vol. 1. p. 191-2, Our Emphasis — SWG]

The second part of the answer to the question: Why didn't the Khmers Rouges achieve victory in Cambodia last April (essentially the same question should be asked about the Pathet Lao in Laos) is that the Cambodian proletarian vanguard has not yet waged a sufficiently sharp struggle against the Cambodian bourgeois class represented by Sihanouk (propped up by international revisionism) to win *leadership* of the Cambodian national liberation struggle.

Thus the proletarian vanguard of Indo-China must struggle against international revisionism, especially Chinese revisionism, and against Sihanouk and the "Sihanoukists" for leadership of the Cambodian national liberation movement.

There is no doubt that significant forces in the Khmers Rouges are beginning to wage this vital ideological struggle within the national movement and in the international movement. This is why President Nixon made his Oct. 7th speech a double-edged blade aimed at the hearts and minds of the Indo-Chinese leadership and masses. One the one hand, Nixon rejected the openly capitulationist ceasefire offer made by the PRG, because Nixon cannot move his troops out of Indo-China by June 30, 1971 as the PRG asked. In fact, he can never pull all US imperialist troops out of Indo-China as long as US imperialist investments need to be "safeguarded" from the people. On the other hand, Nixon talked "reasonable" ("ceasefire in place" etc.), in order to support the international revisionist and Indo-Chinese national bourgeois claims

that the "great American people" (through elections) are forcing the US imperialist government to pull out. According to this treacherous line, the Indo-Chinese masses do not need to wage armed struggle against the US imperialist citizen-soldiers. If he can keep the Indo-Chinese masses thus "contained" under bourgeois leadership, Nixon can begin to shift the main US imperialist armed forces to Arabia!

*In opposition to the present "Cultural Revolution" leadership in China, and in opposition to bourgeois national leadership of the Indo-Chinese liberation movements, all Marxist-Leninists and national liberation fighters and especially Indo-Chinese proletarian revolutionaries must:*

*(1) put the thoughts of Mao Tse-tung which led to victorious Chinese national liberation in 1949 into practice in Indo-China!*

*(2) fight for genuine military and political coordination of the Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian national liberation struggles!*

*(3) establish fighting unity of the heroic anti-US imperialist peoples of Indo-China, Afro-America, and Arabia!*

**REMEMBER SONGMY!**

**October 10, 1970**

**Stalinist Workers Group for Afro-American National Liberation and  
a New Communist International**