

[XS: PC /

rough translation: letter to the editor, published in Rouge, no. 552, Jan. 17, 1978. letter is [redacted] signed Nikita and Sandor

The Rouge articles on the Vietnam-Cambodia conflict are basically identical to those published in L'Humanité. with a bit more care [redacted] in style, the author adopts Hanoi's theses as his own (and as the paper's [Rouge's])

Rouge no. 546 -- without any care [redacted] this time -- published the interview with a Vietnamese militant who defends the official positions of the CPV, and ran it under the headline, "Genuinely fraternal relations between Vietnam and Cambodia are possible." The person interviewed took it on himself to cite [redacted] Vietnam - Laos relations as a model.

[redacted]
Given the lack of sufficient information, why this unilateral support? The explanations ^{offered by} [redacted] P.R. [Pierre Rousset] and Hanoi only amount to citing exacerbated Khmer nationalism. It is detestable, of course, but that of the Vietnamese Communists is no better.

It is possible that a few tens of thousands of 'fanatic' Khmer guerillas fell upon the hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese regulars; but it is also possible that Hanoi decided to make ^a [redacted] major show of force to pressure its neighbor.

It is likewise conceivable that the Vietnamese political bureau is dreaming of a Vietnam-Cambodia collaboration similar to that between Laos and Vietnam -- just as the Soviets dream of a generalized [redacted] Soviet-Bulgaria collaboration.

#

rough translation

reply by Pierre Rousset to Nikita and Sandor letter, Rouge, no. 552

"The explanations by P.R. and Hanoi..." -- frankly, ██████ to read your letter one would think that I went ██████ looking for the facts for my article at the embassy! "Basically" (which is an even graver charge ██████ than "seemingly"), the ^{articles} might be ██████ "identical" to those of L'Huma[nite] -- I don't think I ██████ wrote like a "subtle" Stalinist, and the editors of L'Huma -- just like the members of the Vietnamese embassy -- would be the first to be surprised by this assertion.

At bottom, you are content to put an equal sign between the protagonists in the conflict. But we have to answer two questions of a different order. How was such a conflict possible? Here, the response is very general, going back to the history of the world working class movement and to the bureaucratic characters of the two regimes. Why ^{did} such a conflict ██████ ^{take place? It is, after all,} not such a common ^{occurrence,} ██████ even among bureaucratic regimes. ██████ I do not think that the responsibilities here are symmetric. Because the political orientations -- particularly on nationalism -- are not simply six of one and ^a half-dozen of the other, contrary to what you ██████ imply.

This is clearly worthy of debate. But the accusations that seems most serious to me is that of "unilateral support." Formally, of course, it seems normal to me to let a Vietnamese militant speak in our columns, ^{under} the same conditions that we open our columns to ██████ a lot of other currents. A criticism of his positions does not have to appear in the same issue. If we

2...

had obtained an interview with a Cambodian, he would have received the same treatment. All of this was spelled out in the introduction to the interview. And if, in general, the Vietnamese positions were better presented in our columns, this is because the quality, frequency and regularity of the documents that we received from them were ^{much} better. It wasn't by an insidious political choice.

Let us be clear, finally, that my analyses are my responsibility ^{and do} alone, ^{not} necessarily ~~commit~~ the LCR! But in a daily paper that has to respond to the latest events, this is inevitable.