

10/21/72

PS

FILE / SUBJ.
DATE / SUB-CAT.
10/72

PRGRSV REPRESENTATIVE SCORES U.S. 'DIPLOMATIC TRICKS'

London MORNING STAR in English 21 Oct 72 p 2 L

[Statement given to MORNING STAR diplomatic correspondent by PRGRSV representative Nguyen Minh Phuong]

[Excerpts] Nixon's policy of Vietnamisation in tatters after only four years, the U.S. President has now re-Americanised the war.

He has fielded a massive air and naval force. He has organized, trained and equipped a puppet army of some million men, hoping this puppet force could replace the U.S. ground troops. A huge quantity of bombs and shells has been flung against the people of South Vietnam in a desperate attempt to defeat their struggle. In Quang Tri Province alone, the northernmost province of South Vietnam, the amount of bombs dropped in the past two months is equivalent to seven atomic bombs of the Hiroshima type. Meanwhile, Nixon has been waging a diplomatic campaign of manoeuvres and tricks, trying to pretend that there has been real progress at the Vietnam Paris talks.

He has boasted about his good will for peace, and made quick propaganda over his claim that U.S. involvement in Vietnam was coming to an end, covering up the real acts of war in the hope of misleading public opinion in the world and at home in a bid to win the elections.

The fact is that, as far as a settlement is concerned, the U.S. position is still very far from our own.

This is clear from the fact that the U.S. still refuses to put an end to the war of aggression and end its support of the Thieu regime in Saigon. Instead the U.S. war has been intensified day by day with the massive participation of the U.S. Air Force and Navy.

Of late, B-52 bombers have been used in carpet bombing raids against areas only 20 miles from Saigon and on areas along the South Vietnam-Cambodia border.

Another thing is that the U.S. is still rejecting our proposals, the proposals of the Provisional Revolutionary Government, for a peaceful solution to the war.

As we reiterated in our statement of September 12, all this lays bare the U.S. plan to maintain U.S. involvement in Vietnam and impose a U.S. neo-colonialist solution on South Vietnam.

In our proposals we made it clear that there are two basic problems at issue:

First, as far as the military aspect of the issue is concerned, we are demanding an end to the U.S. policy of Vietnamisation, an end to U.S. aggression, to the mining and the bombing, directed against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

The U.S. must end all its commitments to the Saigon regime and end its policy of using that regime as a tool against the people of South Vietnam.

All U.S. troops, advisers, personnel of all kinds, all equipment and foreign mercenaries must be withdrawn. What has been happening recently is that U.S. forces withdrawn from South Vietnam have simply been transferred to Thailand.

Secondly, there is the political aspect of the struggle. On this we proceed from the simple reality that there are in South Vietnam two administrations and two armies.

Following from our desire to put national interests above all else, we propose the formation of a provisional government of national concord made up of three sections--the Provisional Revolutionary Government, the Saigon administration and the other political forces in the country.

This provisional government would be given the work of organizing general elections.

So far, the U.S. has not responded to our proposals. The U.S. is still trying to deny the existence of the PRG, still trying to eliminate it.

Nixon does speak of Thieu resigning, but only to say he would be replaced by his senate chairman. He does speak of general elections, but these would be held in the framework of the present regime--one of coercion and repression.

Elections held at gunpoint and under U.S. bombs are no elections. They could only be a repetition of the elections held in October last year when Thieu was the only candidate, was the organiser of the elections and the one who controlled them.

In such conditions democracy would be impossible. But then the real intention behind all Nixon's claims is to maintain the Saigon regime as a tool of the U.S. against the people of South Vietnam.

We have fought for many years, we have recorded great successes and we are now in a winning position. We could very well just not take the Saigon administration into account.

Our policy, however, is one of national concord and we have reserved for it an equal position in the provisional government we are proposing. That is something that proves our good will, something that shows our determination to settle the problem in a spirit of national agreement.

The response of the U.S. has been a series of manoeuvres culminating in the sending of high officials, and finally Kissinger, to Saigon. Over recent days Thieu has convened his National Security Council and in his speeches he has even threatened that if anyone dared to speak up for the idea of a government of national concord he would not live for five minutes.

It was Thieu who said that, but the thoughts of those of the U.S. Thieu is nothing more than a spokesman for the U.S. reflecting the obstinacy and warlike nature of the Nixon administration.

If we have fought for dozens of years it is not to end up by accepting the yoke of U.S. neo-colonialism. We have fought for genuine independence and freedom and that is our consistent aim.

While we maintain our struggle on the battlefield we have also persisted in our struggle to find a peaceful solution and therefore we have remained at Paris.

If the U.S. really respects the fundamental national rights of the people of Vietnam and the right of the people of South Vietnam to self determination, if it would positively respond to our proposals, then peace could come overnight.

Otherwise if the U.S. stubbornly continues its war of aggression, and maintains the Thieu regime in Saigon, then our people are determined to continue their struggle until we drive out all the aggressors, overthrow the Thieu regime and achieve independence, peace and neutrality for South Vietnam.

10/21/72