

# SUPPORT EXPRESSED FOR CHINA'S VIETNAM ACTION

China's 17-day military action against Vietnam which came to an end early this month has been the topic of widespread discussion and debate within the left movement and among political activists of different types. Understanding the real facts of the situation, Marxist-Leninists and many progressive people have spoken out in support of China's limited counter-attack to deter Soviet-backed Vietnamese aggression.

Unity newspaper, for example, which is published by the League of Revolutionary Struggle (M-L), declared in its March 9 issue that "China's actions serve the international proletariat." Vietnam's aggression against Kampuchea and its provocations on the Chinese border, says Unity, "serve the interests of the Soviet imperialists' design to dominate the whole world."

In contrast to Vietnam's aggression, Unity notes that "it cannot be said that China's strike against Vietnam serves the interests of imperialism. China's actions were necessary to defend her sovereignty. When words failed, then action became necessary. To say that China should not have 'resorted to violence' is an idealistic view which only appeases the Soviets' and Vietnamese authorities' violence."

China's action against Vietnam is also supported in the March 7 issue of the San Francisco Journal, with a signed article by the Chinese Progressive Association.

"For decades Vietnam and China were good neighbors," says the article. "During Vietnam's revolutionary war against U.S. imperialism, China... supported the just war to expel the imperialists and establish an independent Vietnam."

But the situation has changed since those days. The article goes on to observe, "Today Vietnam's anti-China campaigns to expel Chinese, attacking into China's territory, and outright invasion of Kampuchea are clear acts of aggression and expansionism which cannot be supported."

The commentary goes on to stress, "Vietnam's main backer is the Soviet Union. Soviet intentions are to instigate more aggressive activities and expand further into Southeast Asia... The decision by China to stand up to the Vietnamese and their Soviet supporters

is certainly in the interest of the people of Asia and people internationally."

A new pamphlet published by the U.S.-China Peoples Friendship Association of New York called "China and Indochina," also addresses the question of China's strike against Vietnam in an article by Hugh Deane.

Deane analyzes a number of past cases where China has been forced to counter-attack its enemies, including the 1962 operation against the Soviet-backed Indian expansionists, and China's support for the Korean people in fighting U.S. imperialism in the 1950s.

Adding the recent Chinese response to Vietnamese expansionism to this history, Deane concludes, "China preaches constantly that appeasement brings aggression and leads to defeat. It believes not only in the generality that aggression must be resisted; it believes that timely use of force, limited and controlled, can deter aggression."

Noted China scholar William Hinton also spoke out in defense of China's actions at a Feb. 23 Rutgers University forum sponsored by the People's Independent Coalition in New Jersey. Putting the situation in Indochina in light of the whole international situation and the threat of a new world war, Hinton said that Vietnamese-Soviet expansionism was reminiscent of the fascist aggression in Spain and elsewhere prior to World War II.

Hinton noted that "In order to stop the (Vietnamese) border incursions and to bring the issue of Kampuchea to a head, China has adopted a tactic of limited blow."

Answering those who fraudulently charge that China's current leadership is carrying out a policy Chairman Mao would not have supported, Hinton explained that the "limited blow" tactic had often been employed under Mao's leadership in the history of the Chinese revolution. "The tactic of limited blow is essentially a political attack which defines the limits of what the people's forces will tolerate and then having made the point, (the people's forces can) pull back," Hinton said.