

sudden acceptance augurs to realize China's goal of forging an Asian anti-Soviet cordon around the Soviet Far East.

There has not been any sign of lessening anti-Sovietism in China, since the last October purge of four leading Maoists, but it has in fact increased in intensity.

The chief obstacle to direct China-U.S. military ties as desired by Schlesinger-Carter circles here is the sticky question of Taiwan. So far, the Administration, especially Carter's National Security Affairs Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, has operated on the belief that China could be offered some empty verbal formula that would come short of the abrogation of the U.S. defense treaty with Taipei as demanded by China. An interview given the *Washington Post's* Hong Kong correspondent by a top Chinese official and published April 29 expressed in clearest terms yet that China cannot accept any compromises on this question. Few observers doubt that if this matter can be resolved, Chinese-U.S. relations would become quite close, an eventuality that would subsume the current Japanese overtures.

Storm in Japan

Fukuda's moves have not failed to raise a storm in Japan. The faction fight within the Japanese government bureaucracy was so great that Fukuda felt unable to go through normal Foreign Ministry channels to make his China bid. According to a leak to the daily *Yomiuri's* Minoru Hirano, Hogen, a private citizen, albeit with close links to one faction of the Foreign Ministry, was chosen by Fukuda to prevent the mission being blocked by opposition within the Foreign Ministry.

Business circles regard intransigence on the question of fishing rights as a direct response to Fukuda's provocative moves toward China.

Since April 1, Japanese fishermen have been barred

from traditional fishing waters inside the USSR's new territorial limit because the Soviets have decided to link the question of even an interim fishing agreement to Japanese territorial concessions on northern islands occupied by the USSR after World War II.

The May *Yomiuri* reported that Shigeo Nagano, president of the Japan Chamber of Commerce and Industry, said recently: "Fishery is one thing and economic cooperation is another. Should a deadlock of the fishery talks affect the two countries' economic cooperation, the bilateral relations would be jeopardized root and branch."

At stake is the entire prospect for Japanese multi-billion dollar investment and development of Soviet Siberia, desperately desired by many major business leaders in Japan.

Another business leader, Toshiwo Doko, president of the Federation of Economic Organizations, the leading business group in Japan, was quoted in the *Yomiuri* article as holding the view that the only way to resolve the outstanding Japan-Soviet dispute about possession of the four Northern Islands taken by the Soviet Union in 1945 — an issue used repeatedly by anti-Soviet circles in Japan to block closer cooperation with Moscow — was to join hands with the Soviet Union to develop the Tyumen oil fields. His point is that provocation of the Soviet Union is counterproductive if Japan ever wants the islands returned. It is only in the context of close economic collaboration and a dropping of the formal issue that Moscow might someday give up its claim.

Nonetheless, for the moment, Fukuda is achieving his objective of wrecking Soviet relations and realizing his China caper. The business and political opponents of Fukuda have not been able to muster the clarity on the issues, nor the decisive alternate policy options, to make Fukuda's moves inoperative.

Vietnam Negotiations: U.S. Stalls For Concessions

VIETNAM

The first round of talks between Vietnam and the United States on normalization of relations between the two nations were concluded in Paris this week. The U.S. delegation, led by Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke, announced that the U.S. would not block a Vietnamese bid to enter the United Nations, while the Vietnamese delegation, led by Deputy Foreign Minister Phan Hien, promised to intensify efforts to provide information on U.S. servicemen still listed as missing in action in Vietnam.

Though acclaimed in much of the U.S. press as the dawning of a new period of friendly relations between the two countries, it was evident that "little progress" was actually made, in the words of the *Washington Post*. Central to this failure was the Vietnamese refusal to separate the question of U.S. responsibilities to "heal the

wounds of war" — i.e., supply reconstruction aid — from the broader political questions of normalization. The Administration's balking on the question of aid underscores that its initiative is no more than a ploy to force political concessions that the Vietnamese are neither willing nor prepared to make.

On May 3, the first day of the negotiations the Vietnamese Communist Party daily *Nham Dan* declared that U.S. aid for reconstruction was "an undeniable obligation" rooted not only in the 1973 Paris accords but in "international law, morality and human conscience." It charged that the U.S. refused to "abandon erroneous policy" in refusing to give economic aid. In a press conference following the talks Pham Hien said the U.S. had promised \$3.25 billion in reconstruction assistance and an additional billion or one and a half billion in "concessional aid."

The Vietnamese demand for aid defines the basis on which they seek relations with the U.S., that is in terms of broad and mutually beneficial economic cooperation. This was strongly implied when Pham Hien, at the press

conference shunned the term "war reparations" when it was used in a question by a French journalist. Hien said, "We never use the words 'war reparations.'" It is well known that many industrialists throughout the U.S. are eager to get involved in Vietnam especially before it is fully dominated by the Europeans and Japanese whose involvement is growing rapidly.

The U.S. refusal to lift even the trade embargo until after the establishment of relations, and its refusal to even discuss the question of aid are clear answers to the Vietnamese demands. The Vietnamese have made clear that the trade embargo must be lifted immediately.

The Administration's "no aid" position was backed by former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Speaking before the American Chamber of Commerce luncheon in Washington, D.C. last Tuesday he said, "It is absolutely absurd for the Vietnamese to say they have a right to U.S. economic aid." His remarks cost the Chamber \$5,000 although it is said that Kissinger wanted \$7,500 for the appearance.

The present talks, which are to resume in two weeks, parallel those going on with Cuba in which the Carter Ad-

ministration is seeking concessions by President Castro in return for normalization. Such concessions include a general retreat from the Cuban political and diplomatic initiatives made in Africa and Latin America. While Carter talks peace in Paris, he is busily trying to break up any regional detente from coalescing between the Communist states of Indochina and non-communist states of Southeast Asia including Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, Philippines and Burma. The primary vehicle for this is the U.S. backed military junta in Thailand where anti-Vietnamese provocations continue. For the last week Vietnamese refugees have been arrested through the North Eastern region of Thailand; an act that has drawn sharp attacks from the Vietnamese in the past. Also there are ongoing border provocations and subversive activities by the CIA-linked Thai military and police units aimed at Vietnam-allied Laos.

The Paris talks take place exactly two years after the U.S. defeat of April 1975 and nine years to the week of the initial Paris peace talks under the Johnson Administration. The top negotiators at that time were none other than Averell Harriman, a top Carter foreign policy advisor and Cyrus Vance, Carter's Secretary of State.

Vietnam Calls Aid From U.S. 'Undeniable Obligation'

Excerpts from Nhan Dan :

"The U.S. contribution to healing the wounds of war and to post war reconstruction in Vietnam is an undeniable obligation." It is not only rooted in the 1973 Paris agreement but in "international law, morality and human conscience...Vietnam made clear to the U.S. Presidential Commission last March that we are ready to look forward to the future, but it is impossible to completely separate the future from the past because the past has left a number of questions which if not satisfactorily solved will create obstacles to the normalization of relations between the two countries.

"We will give the U.S. information about the Americans missing in action and will satisfactorily settle the question concerning the remains of those known to have died in the war. Results obtained in

the process of investigation and research will be communicated to the U.S. as soon as possible.

"Vietnam has told the U.S. side that it is prepared to create favorable conditions for an American contribution to postwar construction in Vietnam...The U.S. side, however has not given any indication that it will abandon its erroneous policy. On the contrary it has spread slanders against the Vietnamese government's correct policy and does not say anything about its obligation and responsibility for helping to heal the wounds of war and reconstruct Vietnam, This is not right and is not in line with the professed desire of the U.S. to open a new dialogue, a new era in the relations between the two countries. To make the current dialogue successful, the attitude of the U.S. must suit realities and U.S. statements."