

The Struggle for National Independence and Socialism in Kampuchea

Samir Amin

I would like to discuss the reasons why the struggle for independence of Kampuchea and the struggle for independence of Afghanistan constitute the primary objectives on the world scale of the closely connected struggles for peace and for socialism. In the first part I will deal with the stages and the problems of the Kampuchean Revolution. In the second I will consider the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea and its consequences on the local, regional, and world level. In the third part I will discuss the insertion of the Kampuchea question in the world situation.

1. I would like to address a few points concerning the development of the Kampuchean revolution. First, I will discuss the reason for the success of the popular and anti-imperialist revolution, led by the Communist Party and the Patriotic Front from 1970 to 1975; second, I will examine the reasons why this very success is itself the origin of the difficulties of the period 1975-78 which followed victory.

The victory of the popular and anti-imperialist revolution in Kampuchea constitutes one of the major successes of the struggle for socialism in our era. Whatever the case may be, history will judge and will certainly give due honor to the Communist Party of Kampuchea for having defined and put into practice a revolutionary strategy adapted to the conditions of its country which permitted the liberation of Kampuchea. This adequate revolutionary strategy adapted to the conditions of the country was not self-evident.

The objective social, historical, and political conditions of Kampuchea are, as always, specific and, in any case, they were and are different from the social, historical, and political conditions of other countries, such as China or Vietnam. It will doubtless be known,

*This article first appeared in the October 1981 issue of *Ikwezi* (published in England).*

however, that these objective conditions of Kampuchea may, up to a certain point, share common characteristics with the situation in other countries of the region, such as Thailand or Burma.

Nevertheless, in this group of countries Kampuchea alone has succeeded in carrying out by itself, under the leadership of the Communist Party, a popular, anti-imperialist revolution, opening up the road to socialism. Even though authentic socialist forces in the other countries have for dozens of years carried out a struggle for socialism, they did not obtain victory.

SELF-RELIANCE BASIS OF KHMER VICTORY

The victory of the Patriotic Front in Kampuchea is in no way due to the proximity of Vietnam. This proximity did not allow the same success for the other countries of the region. Moreover, during their long, glorious liberation war against imperialism, the government and the Communist Party of Vietnam have not advised or aided the Kampuchean people and their Communist Party to define this just revolutionary line. On the contrary, they have constantly prescribed collaboration with the previous regime and tried to avoid the fact that the Kampuchean Communist Party carried out on its own and for its own people a fight for socialism.

The strategy of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, the position taken by it, the distance it maintained from the previous regime, and thereafter the glorious and decisive struggle undertaken against the dictatorship of Lon Nol are the origins of this victory. Let us remember, in passing, that the Lon Nol regime was recognized and supported by the Soviet Union. The main reason for victory has been the capacity of the Kampuchean Communist Party to define a political line able to unify the totality of the peasantry against the specific mercantile and bureaucratic forms of exploitation suffered by the Kampuchean people through the specific forms of its integration in the capitalist world system. The Kampuchean Communist Party managed under these circumstances to define a strategy, under conditions different from those of China or Vietnam. The latter is characterized on the one hand by an advanced, centralized and bureaucratic feudal state, and on the other by a higher level of industrial development.

The Khmer Patriotic Front and the Communist Party have consequently succeeded in defining the correct forms of a popular anti-imperialist revolution in a country where the proletariat was almost non-existent, where the bourgeoisie was very weak, and where the principal source of the transmission of capitalist-imperialist exploitation and domination was a small bureaucratic bourgeoisie and a mercantile, comprador-style class.

LESSONS OF KAMPUCHEAN REVOLUTION

The victorious experience of the Khmers constitutes an entirely new and essential lesson. As already mentioned, this is a lesson different from those which can be drawn from the experience of the victorious struggles of the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples under the leadership of their Communist Parties. It is a lesson that is essential and valid, if adapted to other conditions, which as far as the countries of South Asia are concerned, are closer to those of Kampuchea. The lesson is also valid beyond this. For example, I have long thought of the predominant conditions in numerous regions on the African continent. This region is often equally characterized by an absence of sharp social differentiation in the countryside and by the predominance of mercantile and bureaucratic forms of global peasant exploitation by the imperialist system through a transmission belt represented mainly by the state and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie.

On this subject I wrote, just after the victory of the Khmer people, an article entitled "The Lesson of Cambodia." And I continue to believe that the Communist Party of Kampuchea has the honor of having defined an efficient strategy of anti-imperialist struggle on its own, not just putting into practice a strategy copied from that of China or Vietnam, but one adapted to the Khmers' own conditions. This constitutes a lesson of very great importance for other regions in South Asia and Africa.

But this success has been the origin of the tragic difficulties which the country has had to confront after the victory in 1975, as well as the well-known excesses and shortcomings which have appeared during this period. In fact, what it was all about was the success of a principally peasant revolution, a revolution carried out by the totality of the peasant population under conditions where the main form of contradiction did not exist between the differentiated peasantry. Naturally the main struggle was not fought by certain classes against the others, but by the whole peasantry against the forms of imperialist and capitalist exploitation.

This fact (i.e., the peasant character of the revolution in Kampuchea), resulted in absolutely fundamental problems, which could be formulated in the following manner: How to reconcile in our modern era the development of a peasant revolution with three demands: a) the abolition of classes, since the peasant revolution inscribes itself in the socialist world revolution; b) the necessity of developing the productive forces, since this peasant revolution takes place in a very backward country, practically without industry and with extremely low agricultural productivity; and c) the necessity of reconciling the development of the peasant with the need to con-

struct a modern state compatible with the demands of the contemporary world. This is a fundamental problem which does not only concern the Kampuchean revolution. Since all the socialist revolutions have taken place until now in relatively backward countries within the capitalist world system, it is the fundamental problem for all the socialist revolutions of our era, be they Russian, Chinese, or Vietnamese. Kampuchea thus does not escape the problems posed for every socialist revolution of our time, which so far have all contained a more or less important and fundamental peasant dimension and which have all been confronted with this problem of conciliating the demands of the peasant revolution and its realization with the necessity to construct a modern state and develop productive forces from a perspective of abolishing classes. This problem, which concerns relations between the peasantry and the state, industry, and city, is the fundamental problem of socialist construction in our time.

THE PEASANTRY AND SOCIALIST REVOLUTION AND THE ROOTS OF REVISIONISM IN THE U.S.S.R.

The manner in which this problem has been approached here or there, for better or for worse, has everywhere been decisive for the ultimate evolution and fate of the socialist revolution and its development. I will here take three examples—the example of the U.S.S.R., that of China, and that of Vietnam—in order to show that equally in these countries socialist forces have met with the same problem of the relationship between a peasant revolution and the demands for socialist development.

In the U.S.S.R., the revolution of 1917 would not have been victorious without the ingenious capacity of Lenin to combine the demands and goals of the Bolshevik Party with the general popular peasant demand for land and peace. During the entire period of the twenties, a worker-peasant alliance continued to exist, though taking the form characterized by the New Economic Policy (NEP) under the socialist political regime of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, as we all know, from 1930 on, collectivization—particularly in the form in which it was imposed, associated as it was with the extraction of an enormous surplus from the peasantry, said to benefit socialist primitive accumulation—has been the origin of a progressive degradation of the nature of the social system and constitutes the main source, the origin, the roots, of revisionism. Dating from this period the U.S.S.R. has gradually lost its socialist character and become a social-imperialist country. The exploitation of peasant and worker masses by a new exploiting class created a pow-

er with a new class content. This fundamental problem has thus been badly solved in the U.S.S.R. and that is the reason why this country has lost its socialist character.

So far this question has been solved correctly in China by collectivization supported by the poor peasantry and unassociated with the extraction of surplus in the form of tribute.

The worker-peasant alliance has been reinforced further from 1958 on with the introduction of the communist system and the three levels (workteams, brigades, and commune) based on equal relations of trade between city and countryside. That is the reason why so far China preserves a marked socialist character. China thus so far has managed to solve this problem of the relationships between the peasant revolution and the perspective of constructing a modern state, of developing productive forces, and of abolishing classes in a correct manner.

How is it in Vietnam? During the first phase, i.e., until the end of the fifties, Vietnam also effectively succeeded in solving during the anti-imperialist struggle the question of the relationship between the peasant revolution and the perspective of development, modernization, and national independence. Unfortunately, from the end of the fifties, a bureaucratic deviation in the liberated part of Vietnam, North Vietnam, has progressively led the Communist Party of Vietnam to adopt positions and practices of a bureaucratic type of relationship between the peasantry and the state. Progressively a system of almost unpaid tributes has been imposed on the peasantry. It is known for example that at present in Vietnam one kilogram of rice is bought from the peasants in the form of compulsory deliveries at 1/3 the price at which it is sold in the city. Thus there is a bureaucratic extraction of a considerable surplus enforced on the peasantry. These measures are the origin of economic, social, ideological, and political problems in Vietnam. They are the origin of its deviation and, as I will try to demonstrate, of its expansionism and its attitude on the question of Kampuchea.

THE STRATEGY OF THE KAMPUCHEAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Kampuchea, beginning with the victory of 1975, has been faced with the same problems: reconciling the demands of a victorious peasant revolution with those of modernization, construction of a national state, and development of the productive forces in the perspective of abolishing classes. But it has had to face this problematic under the most dramatic circumstances.

First, the national conditions are those of a small country, practically without industries, practically without a proletariat, moreover with a Communist Party and a liberation army which—thanks to

their correct strategy—had developed very rapidly, within a period of less than 10 years; practically speaking, within about 5 years. During this short period this political organization did not have the time to accumulate experience, very unlike the Chinese Communist Party, which started its struggle in the mid-twenties and continued all over the country for about 30 years before achieving victory. The same goes for the Vietnamese Communist Party, which has carried out a very long liberation war over a period of about 30 years. The speed with which the Patriotic Front successfully developed its strategy, the speed with which the Communist Party and the liberation army developed, thus constituted unfavorable and difficult conditions, since there had been no opportunity to accumulate an experience as rich as that of China or Vietnam.

International conditions were also extremely unfavorable. For five years the American imperialists and their stooge Lon Nol had carried out a war of extermination against the people of Kampuchea. It was their strategy, through heavy bombings of the countryside, to bring about a massive immigration of the population to Phnom Penh, to keep and feed this refugee population in refugee camps in order to recruit from among them an army in the service of the imperialists with the ultimate motive of “cambodianizing” the war, just as they attempted to “vietnamize” the war in Vietnam.

PEASANT EXCESSES AND ORCHESTRATED CAMPAIGN AGAINST KAMPUCHEA

When, under these conditions, the People’s Liberation Army and the Communist Party achieved victory in 1975, they were consequently faced with an evident and immediate danger, which can be described in the following terms: either they maintained Phnom Penh with its population and accepted an immediate and generalized famine in this artificially swollen city; or, in order to avoid famine in Phnom Penh, they would have to tap the peasants in an authoritarian manner, making Phnom Penh a greedy, artificial town living from the exploitation of the entire peasantry. Obviously the second solution was impossible since the revolution had been carried out by the peasants themselves. Under these circumstances the regime of Democratic Kampuchea had no other alternative but to evacuate Phnom Penh as rapidly as possible to avoid famine and to avoid exploitation of the peasantry by this artificial city.

The operation could not be carried out in a reasonably normal manner, because the government of Democratic Kampuchea could count on no short-term external aid at the time of the country’s liberation. The only country which might have been able to grant such aid, the neighboring country of Vietnam, was itself faced with

enormous difficulties and would probably not wish to come to the aid of the people of Kampuchea. It is under such conditions that the peasant and anti-imperialist revolution of Kampuchea progressively skidded into a fight of the countryside against the city. The excesses, which cannot be denied, are familiar from the long history of peasant revolts. They are of the same nature and represent the same character. I am not going to go into the details; let me simply point out that through extremely well-orchestrated propaganda, the Vietnamese government has succeeded, in alliance with reactionaries from the whole world, in using this deviation as an argument to condemn the peasant revolution. All reactionaries in all countries and at all times have always used the excesses of the peasant revolution. These are the circumstances which preceded the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea.

CONSEQUENCES OF VIETNAM'S INVASION

2. Why did this invasion of Kampuchea by Vietnam take place? And what are the consequences of this invasion for the struggle for socialism in Kampuchea as well as in Vietnam itself?

Two explanations come to mind as to the reasons that may have brought Vietnam to invade Kampuchea. The first explanation is based on so-called "Vietnamese nationalism": the historic ambitions of Vietnam to control the entire Indochinese peninsula. There is the fact that, even prior to French colonization, Vietnam progressively expanded to the detriment of Kampuchea and Laos. One might also refer to more recent manifestations of expansionism on the part of Vietnam. From the very creation in the thirties of the Communist Party of Indochina, the Vietnamese element, which dominated the party, nursed and put forward the project for the liberation of the entire Indochinese peninsula and the formation of an Indochinese Federation. It is known today that a great number of Kampuchean communists resisted this project, which, because of the situation, would have given predominance to the Vietnamese all over the peninsula. One might, in this connection, recall what I mentioned before, that is, the Vietnamese position toward the Communist Party of Kampuchea. The Vietnamese Communist Party advised and urged the Communist Party of Kampuchea to support neutrality and not engage in a fight for socialism on its own.

But in my view this explanation is not entirely acceptable. Vietnam is not the only country in the world which has an expansionist past. All peoples have known in the course of their history periods of expansion and nationalism. Nor is the Vietnamese Communist Party unique in having advised moderation and neutrality to the Communist Party of Kampuchea.

In fact, socialist revolution so far has not been a world revolution, made all over the world at the same time, but a revolution which develops in stages at the weakest links of the world imperialist system. There are, at each moment of the development of this socialist revolution, more advanced and less advanced zones. It is in a certain sense not unreasonable that the vanguard of the most advanced regions, those who consequently see the possibility of victory to be within reach, try to subordinate the strategy of their neighbors, of their allies, to the demands deemed by the vanguard—rightfully up to a certain point—to take priority in support of their own revolution. But it is for the others (that is, for communists who fight in less advanced regions) to resist these attempts to be made appendices to the revolution in the more advanced regions, and to formulate their own proper strategy corresponding to their specific conditions, in order to transform their less advanced regions into more advanced regions.

PROBLEM OF THE SOVIET UNION

I will give examples of problems between the vanguards of more advanced regions on the one hand and the vanguards of the less advanced regions on the other. It is well-known that the U.S.S.R. was for a long time the only socialist country, and it is true that the U.S.S.R. was for a long time a besieged fortress. Imperialists and capitalists of all the countries in the world cherished the plan to isolate and defeat the Russian revolution. It is not unreasonable that under such circumstances the responsible vanguard of this besieged fortress should have tried to subordinate the strategy of its allies the world over to its own protection. The Popular Fronts in Europe, for example, on the advice of the Third International, adopted strategies of supporting the besieged Soviet fortress and not the development of the socialist revolution in their own country.

It is known that China, the second example, made its revolution almost against the advice of the Soviet Union. At a moment and for a long period, the Soviet Communist Party recommended that China's Communist Party make an alliance with the Kuomintang in the twenties, during the anti-Japanese war and after it. It is to the honor of the Chinese Communist Party and of Mao Zedong that they refused to make China's socialist forces an appendix of the Soviet Union and defined a correct strategy corresponding to China's proper conditions, fighting for the revolution in China until victory. Vietnam made its revolution under conditions where it found itself in opposition to the progressive and socialist forces in the world. It is necessary to recall that the French Communist Party (which, after all, was responsible in the French empire) condemned the Vietnam-

ese revolution when Haiphong was being bombed by the French imperialist forces in 1945. At that time, the French Communist Party was represented in the French government itself. It is the same case with Kampuchea. Kampuchea equally made its revolution not with the support of Vietnam but against the Vietnamese will to utilize Kampuchea as a neutral base in the struggle for its own liberation.

REASONS FOR VIETNAM'S DEGENERATION

The insufficiencies of explaining the invasion of Kampuchea by simply referring to Vietnamese nationalism leads us to proceed to the second type of explanation. This is that the contemporary expansion of Vietnam into Kampuchea is the result of the blind alley in which the leadership of the Vietnamese Communist Party has placed itself in the past few years.

First of all, as I have already mentioned, this is expressed in the relationship between countryside and city, as well as in the relationship between the peasantry and the state. From the end of the fifties, the Vietnamese Communist Party leadership engaged in unilateral tapping of surplus from the peasants, thereby alienating the support of the peasantry, which had after all constituted the principal force of the Vietnamese revolution. This became the beginning of a revisionist degradation in Vietnam. It had immediate and disastrous economic consequences. The economic situation in Vietnam is completely disastrous as far as food production is concerned.

After the liberation of the South in 1975, the leadership of Vietnam placed itself once more in a blind alley. The southern part of Vietnam had suffered 30 years of American neocolonialism and, for this reason, the society and the economy of the region were very different from those predominant in the North at the time of liberation. The reunification of Vietnam thus demanded a subtle policy of maintaining, as much as possible, a certain openness toward the exterior. No doubt the conditions for such a political choice were not the most favorable. But the unfavorable conditions, the Western hostility (particularly that of the United States toward Vietnam) reinforced the tendency toward a flight forward into the southern region. What solution has the bureaucratic leadership of the Vietnamese Communist Party found to these problems? It has found a solution in external expansionism with the long-term goal of truly colonizing Kampuchea to utilize this country's productive capacity and produce, with the aid of Vietnamese colonizers, the rice which Vietnam can produce on its own territory only with great difficulty because of the negative social conditions that the Vietnamese Communist Party has itself created.

What then are the consequences of this invasion? First it should be recalled that Vietnam was able to use the opportunity offered by the weaknesses of the Kampuchean Revolution to invade the country. And the consequences are entirely visible: the establishment of the puppet regime of Heng Samrin. All the observers most favorable to the Vietnamese and unfavorable to Democratic Kampuchea are forced to recognize that the Samrin regime couldn't last 24 hours without the presence of 200,000 Vietnamese troops. Under these unfortunate circumstances, the chances for a straightening up of the socialist revolution in Kampuchea and its proper development are cancelled by the presence of the Vietnamese and of the Samrin puppet government. Once more, foreign military presence makes the struggle for national liberation in Kampuchea the highest priority.

FALSE ARGUMENTS AGAINST KAMPUCHEA

We can now proceed to examine the arguments that are generally offered by the Vietnamese themselves or by their friends to justify the invasion of Kampuchea. There are three main arguments: the humanitarian argument, the argument about exporting the socialist revolution, and the argument concerning national security.

The humanitarian argument is in the final analysis the argument offered by all the colonialists of all times. The barbarity and backwardness of the country they are colonizing have always been given as the reasons for their interventions. But one ought to ask: who has been the cause of the most evil to the people of Kampuchea in its contemporary history? Isn't it first of all the American imperialists and Lon Nol? Isn't it today the Vietnamese army and their project of colonizing Kampuchea?

The second series of arguments concerns the question of exporting the socialist revolution. This sort of argument is foreign to Marxism, but unfortunately it is not foreign to the realities of contemporary developments. Every authentic revolution based on national popular support has been forced sooner or later to take its distance from the Big Brother. It is enough to recall the cases of Yugoslavia in 1948, of Albania, or China, the countries that made their own proper revolutions, taking their distance from the Soviet model. In other cases, where revolution was exported, people are bound to reject Soviet domination or face the dramatic consequences of colonialism. The first and oldest case is that of Mongolia, a country in which the heavy Soviet military presence reveals submission to Soviet interests. In all the countries of Eastern Europe (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Romania), the trend is resistance to Soviet domination; liberation is a precondition

for further progress of socialism. Romania has already taken its distance from the U.S.S.R. East Germany in 1953, Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968 and presently Poland are or have been in a state of revolt against Soviet domination. The latest example to date is Afghanistan, where the Russians claim to be exporting revolution and where the Afghan people are forced to fight a war of national resistance. Stalin, who in his time was a better Marxist than his successors, once said that when the Afghan Emir carried out a struggle for his country's independence against the British government led by the Labor Party, then the forces of progress were on the side of the feudal Afghan Emir and not on the side of English "Socialists." One might apply this analysis to the present situation and say that in the struggle between the Soviet army, the so-called exporter of socialism in Afghanistan, and the Afghan resistance fighters, be they Muslims or so-called backward, the forces of progress and liberation are on the side of the Afghan people and not on the side of the Soviet army.

Finally, the third argument concerns security. Kampuchea is said to have "threatened" Vietnam. One might, however, have some doubts about this claim. How could Kampuchea—which the Vietnamese army has proved it is capable of beating and occupying within a number of days—really be a threat to Vietnam? The same goes for the Soviet Union in Afghanistan: that Afghanistan should have threatened the U.S.S.R.! If one accepts this kind of argument, that certain countries have the right to invade others to assure their own security, then we are accepting the law of the jungle as international rule, or we accept that "Real-politik a la Bismarck" is taking the place of proletarian internationalism. On the contrary, the necessity to respect absolutely the autonomy of nations should be insisted upon. And of course not only nations' right to self-determination but the rights of nations and of them alone to carry out their social revolutions brought about by the maturation of internal class struggles, because the nation is a social reality and will remain a historic social reality for a very long time.

THE PRESENT WORLD SITUATION

3. I will now attempt to insert the Kampuchean question into the framework of the world situation. On that level I would like to make three observations: firstly, recalling the main characteristics of the world situation; secondly, examining the motivations and forms of Soviet expansionism; and finally, looking at the consequences of Vietnam's actions in the region and on a world scale.

The present world situation is the result of the progressive emergence of two superpowers, two hegemonies which are still the

only two powers capable of intervention on a world scale and, as a consequence, capable of either dividing or fighting over world domination. First, the United States, after a period of about 30 years competition with Germany over succession to British hegemony, emerged after 1945 as the hegemonic power in the world capitalist system. Then the U.S.S.R., which until the end of the fifties was relatively isolated, has since the beginning of the sixties climbed to the rank of superpower by gradually obtaining equality of military power with the United States. What are the consequences of this progressive emergence of two superpowers? First of all, it has resulted in reducing the people's autonomy and, as a consequence, blocking the progress of socialism. This is the reason why all socialist revolutions are in the final analysis made against the Soviet Union. I could mention the examples of Yugoslavia, of Albania, of China, and even of Vietnam and Cuba. On the other hand, this emergence has led to a double monolithism. Something was particularly evident during the Cold War period: the monolithism of the capitalist system under the American leadership and McCarthyism and the monolithism of the Soviet system under Stalin's leadership. This double monolithism, by practically reducing to zero the real autonomy of the peoples, made every step in class struggle and every new socialist revolution more difficult.

But the present world situation is no longer characterized in the same way as during the Cold War, or the quarter of a century after World War II, by two superpowers each dominating in an absolute manner their own zone of influence, their own system of political and ideological alliances. Today, the situation is characterized by their decline. These two superpowers find it more and more difficult to assert themselves and make themselves accepted in their respective camps. In the Western camp, Japan and Europe have now reached a level of development and economic autonomy which now puts them in an entirely different position in relation to the United States, compared to the situation just after the Second World War. The defeat of the U.S., first in Korea in 1950-53, then in Vietnam and Kampuchea in 1975, has created more favorable conditions for national liberation in Asia and Africa. In the ex-socialist camp we have seen the separation of China from the Soviet Union after 1960 and a degradation of Soviet domination in Eastern Europe. This decline of the two superpowers, their more and more disputable capacity to assert their point of view within their sphere of influence, is significantly increasing the danger of war. The danger of war is much more serious when superpowers are on the decline, because as

a result of this decline they feel potentially more threatened by their adversary. It is this decline which is consequently the origin of Soviet expansionism.

Why should the Soviet Union be expansionist when it is faced with constant political and economic problems? It is expansionist precisely because it is faced with these difficulties, just as I said before about Vietnam, which has chosen expansionism because of the difficulties it has itself created. If some people hesitate to qualify the Soviet Union as expansionist it is because for romantic reasons they continue to consider this country socialist or, if not socialist, then at least "half socialist," and that socialism is in contradiction with all forms of expansionism.

However, if one examines objectively the attitude of the U.S.S.R. toward China, it is hard not to see the realities of this systematic expansionist policy. Its objective is to avoid at any price and by any means the emergence of China as a modern industrial and military power.

THE SOVIET THREAT TO CHINA

I say China, under whatever system, for the Soviet Union has adopted the strategic objective of opposing all Chinese efforts of modernization and development, regardless of whether China be capitalist, revisionist like the U.S.S.R. or authentically socialist. In all cases the emergence of China as an autonomous power would be seen from Moscow as representing an eventual adversary. Consequently the main Soviet strategy is to try by all means to dismember China.

Why is this the case and what is the proof of this expansionism? Some facts: The U.S.S.R. is no longer the second industrial power in the world; for the last few years the second world industrial power has been Japan. The Soviet Union is now only the third industrial power. If China was to emerge as an autonomous power, the Soviet Union would probably again lose one rank in the world standing of economic development. If Europe and Japan succeeded in emancipating themselves to an even greater degree than today from their present partial submission to the United States, the result would be the moving from a bipolar constellation of powers to a multipolar world. The U.S.S.R. presently competes only with the United States and, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, multipolarism would put an end to double hegemonism in the world, and thereby reveal the economic weakness of the U.S.S.R. The bipolar world of today is not based on economic equality between the two superpowers but rests on a military parity in spite of the economic and social weakness of the Soviet Union.

If the emergence of China, together with that of Europe and Japan, managed to put an end to the present military bipolarization of the world, the Soviet Union would be confronted with its own internal economic, social, ideological, and political difficulties and the problem of nationalities.

What is the proof of this Soviet expansionism toward China and of this strategic objective of disintegrating the Chinese state? I believe that there are many indicators that this is the case, not all of them recent. I would like to refer to four examples only. Firstly, during the period 1945-49, when the Chinese Communist Party was engaged in the struggle against the Kuomintang toward final victory, the Soviets chose to support the Chinese nationalists, including militarily, against the Chinese communists. Moscow wanted to bargain this assistance to the Kuomintang against the taking-over of the regions of Sinkiang and Manchuria. Allow me to remind you that in 1948, shortly before the victory of the Chinese revolution, the Soviets attempted to set up a puppet republic in Sinkiang and that all the cleverness of the Chinese Communist Party was necessary to defuse the situation and recover Sinkiang.

Second example: during the first five-year plan, it is known that the Soviets attempted to separate the industrial economy of Manchuria from that of the rest of the country and that they had found allies and friends in this project. The fall of Kao Kang was directly connected to this episode. Remember also that the U.S.S.R. was among the very few who recognized the puppet State of Manchukuo in 1932.

SOVIET UNION WANTS TO DISMEMBER CHINA

Third example: Victor Louis, a Soviet journalist who is a well-known KGB agent, in a recently published book has written quite clearly that the principal objective of Soviet political strategy is the dismembering of China. In other words, to take China back to the situation of the 19th century, when the country was the victim of imperialist schemes of division. Those who have doubts about this Soviet goal should read this book. They would also discover the Hitlerian racist language of Soviet ideologists.

Finally, the fourth example: the invasion of Afghanistan. This is not an unimportant matter. The Afghanistan invasion has, among other motives, the objective of preventing the degradation of "big Russian" domination of Turkestan. I say Turkestan, because the division of Turkestan into the four artificial republics of Kazakh, Kirgiz, Turkmen, and Uzbek corresponds to an artificial division of four peoples with the same Turk language and a cultural affinity which in the past constituted one nation, the Turk nation of Turkes-

tan. When the Chinese speak of the “new tsars” and Soviet expansionism, of the Soviet strategy of encirclement of China, and of Soviet opposition to the modernization and reinforcement of China, this is not empty talk. They are speaking of a reality, a very strong reality which must be kept in mind.

What then are the consequences of the positions taken by the present Vietnamese leadership? By getting bogged down in the occupation of Kampuchea and Laos, Vietnam becomes progressively an instrument of the Soviet strategy of encircling China. Willingly or unwillingly, by fighting against the Kampuchean people Vietnam falls into an increasing dependence on the Soviet Union. Soviet materiel, weapons, oil, etc., are necessary for the Vietnamese war effort. Through this dependency Vietnam becomes more and more an instrument of Soviet policy. This is the reason why the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea is an absolute precondition for the struggle for socialism, not only for socialism in Kampuchea, but for socialism in Vietnam. There will not be any socialist progress in Vietnam as long as Hanoi has not withdrawn its troops from Kampuchea and until the leadership has refused to become an instrument of Soviet policy in its designs on China.

4. In conclusion, I would like to answer very briefly the question: What is to be done in the actual situation? I would propose the strengthening of nonalignment as the primary task, the main strategic objective of our time. By nonalignment of course I mean nonalignment toward the two superpowers, the United States and the U.S.S.R. Real nonalignment is the only method of increasing the space for the autonomy of the peoples, and thereby is an absolutely necessary condition for the development of the forces of socialism. At present, non-alignment is a preference of Third World countries. However, because of their economic weaknesses, they are often forced to be aligned. But real nonalignment, if it could be reinforced by consistent support of Japan, Europe, and China, would be an essential and worthwhile task. Through such a development it would be possible to spare the peoples of the world the tragic dilemma which we are confronted by: Chile or Afghanistan and Kampuchea.