

Tokyo
7/9/71

file subj.
date sub-cat.
7/71

NGUYEN THI BINH ELABORATES ON PRG PEACE TERMS

Tokyo JOAK-TV in Japanese 2330 GMT 9 Jul 71 T

[Text] According to NHK's Paris bureau, Foreign Minister Nguyen Thi Binh, head of the PRGRSV delegation to the Paris talks, on 9 July granted an interview to NHK correspondent Hagino at the PRGRSV mission in the Paris suburbs concerning the seven-point proposal for a peaceful settlement. In this interview she said: "The U.S. Government should publish a timetable for U.S. military withdrawal, and no preliminary talks can be held to decide on such a timetable." Her statements at this interview were as follows:

U.S. military withdrawal is the prerogative to a fair political settlement in South Vietnam. The withdrawal of the U.S. military forces should include bases, weapons, materiel, and also military advisers. The continued presence of foreign forces in South Vietnam is impermissible, even if under the name of maintaining public security until the South Vietnam situation settles down. As long as U.S. military forces remain in South Vietnam, and a government such as the current Saigon regime is allowed to control elections, the South Vietnamese people have no way to express their opinions freely.

Chief U.S. delegate Bruce said at the 8 July session: "The problem of South Vietnam should be discussed by the South Vietnamese people, especially between the PRGRSV and the current government." However, since the Saigon regime was created by the United States, the problem of South Vietnam becomes a matter between our side and the United States. The U.S. Government should publish a timetable for military withdrawal, and no preliminary talks can be held to decide on such a timetable. Even after the completion of U.S. military withdrawal according to President Nixon's timetable, the war between the liberation forces and the Saigon regime forces will continue, and a cease-fire with the Saigon regime can only be achieved when a government is formed with the people's approval.

RADIO DECRIES LACK OF 'SERIOUS' U.S. RESPONSE TO PRG PLAN

Liberation Radio [Clandestine] in Vietnamese to South Vietnam 1400 GMT 10 Jul 71 S

[Station commentary: "Confusion, Stubbornness, and Cheating"]

[Text] The Vietnamese people, the American people, and the world people are waiting for Nixon's answer to the seven-point peace proposal set forth by the PRGRSV at the 119th session of the Paris conference, held on 1 July. However, at the 120th session

held on 8 July, the U.S. representative still avoided the basic problems. To appease U.S. and world public opinion and to cover up Nixon's stubbornness, the U.S. side proposed a so-called closed-door meeting, or a high-level meeting in order to avoid propoganda, and so forth. The U.S. representative also ordered his tail, Pham Dang Lam, to pose 15 questions aimed at covering up Nixon's stubborn clinging to puppet Nguyen Van Thieu.

Everyone knows that the PRGRSV and DRV delegations often pointed out that the main problem is not a closed-door or a high-level meeting. In the past, as at present, the main problem has always been the content of the meeting, that is, that the Americans must answer the basic questions: Is the United States willing to end the aggressive war and withdraw all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam in 1971? Does Nixon want U.S. militarymen captured while perpetrating crimes in Vietnam to be allowed to return to the United States, the sooner the better? Does Nixon want to respect the South Vietnamese people's right to self-determination and stop supporting the present warlike Saigon administration headed by Nguyen Van Thieu? Does Nixon agree to let the South Vietnamese people in all walks of life form a new administration that approves peace, independence, neutrality and democracy?

If Nixon has good will, he should immediately answer these basic questions. Questions of open meetings or closed-door meetings, high-level or low-level, are but a matter of form. They constitute an attempt on the part of the United States to avoid answering the basic problems. This trick only further exposes Nixon's stubborn refusal to talk seriously. This attitude, moreover, reflects Nixon's isolation and confusion, faced with the PRGRSV's proposal concerning its just cause, and faced with the public opinion at home, in political circles and in the world.

Indeed, if the U.S. troops are forced to withdraw from South Vietnam, Nixon will have to tacitly admit that the Americans are the aggressors and that they must thus end this aggression. Can he deny this aggression? The Pentagon's secret documents, now known throughout the world, clearly prove the aggressive designs of the U.S. administrations for the past 30 years, which the most cunning U.S. warmongers and Nixon cannot deny. However, if he does not withdraw all U.S. troops from South Vietnam, how can he prove to the American people he is really concerned over the U.S. militarymen captured in Vietnam, whom he has thus far used as a talisman to fool the American people and to cover up his intention to occupy Vietnam for a long time.

If he ends the U.S. aggression, withdraws all U.S. troops from South Vietnam, and stops supporting the present warlike administration in Saigon headed by Nguyen Van Thieu, how can Nixon effectively carry out the U.S. neocolonialism?

The so-called Vietnamization plan was bitterly doomed on the Route 9-southern Laos battlefield, as well as in northeastern Cambodia, and is being basically defeated in South Vietnam. It can no longer be used as an effective medicine for this prolonged, aggressive-war illness. If the Americans do not end their aggression, they will sooner or later be defeated by the stalwart, unsubmitive Vietnamese people who are being supported by progressive mankind including the American people.

If the U.S. aggression is not ended, the United States will suffer successive difficulties and an economic recession, and will be unable to solve problems of poverty and unemployment for 10 million American people. As for the U.S. troops in South Vietnam, they are growing ever more tired of this dirty war. Among the U.S. forces, discipline leaves much to be desired, drug addiction is spreading, troop morale is plummeting, and the antiwar movement and the movement to demand their repatriation are spreading in the various divisions of the U.S. expeditionary forces. The American people and U.S. political circles are becoming ever more awakened and are firmly opposing Nixon's cruel aggressive war.

Nixon now finds himself in a state of great confusion. However, he remains very stubborn. The fact that Kissinger, Nixon's adviser, has come to Saigon to assure the present Saigon administration, that is the Thieu clique, of Nixon's support, according to UPI on 5 July, sufficiently explains why the U.S. delegation to the Paris conference has deliberately tried to avoid answering the basic problems mentioned in the seven-point PRGRSV statement, and why the U.S. dog wags its tail. It is obvious that Nixon and his representative at the Paris conference cannot divert the attention of anyone, nor can they cover up their own extreme confusion. Of course, this beating about the bush cannot appease U.S. and world public opinion.

Regarding warlike U.S. aggressors, our people never have had any illusions about them. From its winning posture, our government has set forth the seven-point initiative following the 10-point overall solution and other points of clarification, which have always been based on an eagerness to secure peace and the legitimate aspirations of our people--that is, peace in independence and freedom--and on the aspirations for peace of the American and world people.

Our people want to solve the South Vietnam problem in a fine, honorable and reasonable manner, reflecting their eagerness for peace and national concord. Apart from this, they have no other problems. Nixon still relies on U.S. military strength [words indistinct] our people who have [words indistinct] determination and experiences, will smash all schemes of prolonging the war of the warlike clique in the White House and the Pentagon. They will certainly sustain bitter defeats if they continue to show themselves stubborn.

U.S. Leaders' Stubbornness

Liberation Radio [Clandestine] in Vietnamese to South Vietnam 1400 GMT 9 Jul 71 S

[Station commentary: "The Best Method and Time for the Americans"]

[Text:] Last week, world opinion warmly welcomed the PRGRSV's new statement on peace at the Paris conference. Especially in the United States, from the masses to political circles, many people voiced their support for this statement, saying that this was encouraging news, a good opportunity for the United States to withdraw from the Vietnam quagmire. They also demanded that the Nixon administration seize this opportunity. On 3 July.

Ziegler, the White House's spokesman, first admitted that the PRGRSV's new initiative contained encouraging factors. However, he later said that some of its points were unacceptable. On 4 July, Taylor, military adviser to Nixon, said that there was nothing new in the seven-point statement. On the same day, U.S. Vice President Agnew stated that the United States would continue to back the puppet lackey Nguyen Van Thieu. On 5 July, after arriving in Saigon, Kissinger, Nixon's adviser on security affairs, stated that the United States would not withdraw its troops hurriedly and that the PRGRSV seven-point statement was unacceptable. According to some sources, Kissinger assured Thieu of Nixon's continued support.

On 7 July, it was Nixon's turn to speak his views. To placate public opinion, he stated that he would end U.S. involvement in Vietnam and that there remains only the problem of methods and time. However, he added that no matter what might happen in Paris, the United States would pursue its Vietnamization plan. Nixon said nothing about the PRGRSV's new peace initiative.

On 8 July, at the 120th session of the Paris conference, U.S. delegation head Bruce stated that the new initiative was unacceptable, although it contained a number of new points, that the United States was studying it, and so forth. To deceive public opinion, Bruce proposed that restricted meetings be held. He made no concrete proposals. Faced with this situation, Minister Nguyen Thi Binh said that the U.S. representative had not responded to her seven-point statement and Minister Xuan Thuy commented that the Nixon administration was trying to convince public opinion that the United States was paying great attention to the negotiations. In fact, the Nixon administration did not want to peacefully solve the Vietnam problem on the basis of respecting the fundamental national rights of the Vietnamese people. Indeed, Nixon has continued his war of aggression, refusing to peacefully solve the Vietnam problem. However, to deceive public opinion he stated that he was concerned about the negotiations, about ending U.S. aggression in Vietnam. Thus, in his deceitful statement, Nixon was unable to cover up his stubbornness and embarrassment. This stubbornness and this embarrassment led to a two-faced policy: He stated on the one hand that there were new factors and, on the other hand, that the new initiative was unacceptable.

Through the statements by Ziegler, Taylor, Agnew, Kissinger, Nixon, and Bruce, public opinion has clearly seen the Nixon administration's efforts to buy time and evade its responsibility. Public opinion also realizes that the Nixon administration does not want to end its aggression and that it is using the time factor as an excuse for its refusal. Nixon does not want to end the war. It is not true that he cannot end the war. The best method and time for ending U.S. involvement in Vietnam is the methods and time proposed by the seven-point statement made by the PRGRSV on 1 July.

U.S. Withdrawal Requirement

Liberation Radio [Clandestine] in Vietnamese to South Vietnam 1300 GMT 10 Jul 71 S

[Station commentary: "The Way In and the Way Out"]

[Text] The total withdrawal of U.S. troops is not only a demand of the American people but also the objective of the struggle for peace of our compatriots of all walks of life. It is inconceivable that a thief who sneaks into a house and is beaten and wounded does not know how to get out of the house.

A Vietnamese woman has shown this thief how to get out--Mrs Nguyen Thi Binh, head of the PRGRSV delegation to the Paris conference. In her seven-point peace initiative, Mrs Nguyen Thi Binh advanced the following proposals for U.S. troop withdrawal: If the U.S. administration sets forth a deadline for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops and troops of other countries of the U.S. camp from South Vietnam in 1971, the concerned parties can agree on the procedures of this withdrawal and on the release of all captured militarymen and civilians, including U.S. pilots captured in North Vietnam. These two tasks will begin on the same day and be completed on the same day.

Progressive public opinion worldwide--including that of exiled Vietnamese living abroad--has warmly welcomed this new peace initiative. They say that this is the key for all negotiations. For the first time, Mrs Binh used words that can be understood by the Americans. A large segment of the U.S. public opinion has paid attention to these words. Many U.S. congressmen, newspapers, and news agencies have asserted that this was encouraging news. They demand that the Nixon administration properly respond to this important, positive proposal, which all the world's people are paying attention to and which may achieve a breakthrough at the Paris conference.

What has the Nixon administration said and done? Although it has refrained from talking about "old wine in a new bottle," as the head of the U.S. delegation Bruce once did, it has maintained that the new proposal contains nothing new. Indeed, there is nothing new in it. The Americans have committed aggression and should withdraw their troops. What is new is that the Americans have stubbornly beaten about the bush. The Americans have argued that to accept the "communists' proposal" is to surrender unconditionally, yet the Americans have not surrendered to anyone. They will withdraw their troops only when the "Republic of Vietnam forces" are "strong enough" to replace the U.S. troops. They have put the "Republic of Vietnam forces" on trial by sending them to Laos and Cambodia, to the high plateau areas, to the swamps of Dac Lo, or to the U Minh areas--remote battlefields where U.S. troops dared not to go when their numerical strength was at its peak and when they enjoyed maximum support.

In these U.S. military adventures, many puppet generals, officers, and soldiers were killed. Many people, realizing this state of affairs, protested. Some generals protested against the U.S. adviser system, but they were immediately cashiered by Thieu. Many people have come to understand the meaning of "Vietnamization." "Vietnamization" means changing the skin color of the bodies of the dead troops. Is "Vietnamization" a reality or an illusion? When the "Vietnamization" program is completed, millions of Vietnamese youths may be killed. If they survive they will be maimed. But the "Vietnamization" plan can never be completed because it is Nixon's plan.

Nixon has pretended to be a humanitarian, concerned about the fate of captured U.S. pilots. He raised the problem of U.S. POW's to excite public opinion in the United States and exert pressure on the PRG and DRV delegations. Nixon has continued to threaten that U.S. troops would stay in Vietnam as long as Americans were detained in North Vietnam. He has feigned concern for the latter's fate. But people know that as long as U.S. troops remain in Vietnam, U.S. POW's will be detained. This was the trap set by Nixon himself. He has now caught himself in the trap.

On 3 July, the French paper L'HUMANITE wrote: "The POW issue has now become a trap for Nixon. His intention to use the POW's as a tool for his policy has backfired, just like an inexperienced sorcerer's tricks." Inherently malicious as he is, though, Nixon will resort to many other moves to avoid a troop withdrawal.

The PRG statement points out that the withdrawal of all U.S. troops and the release of all POW's, including U.S. pilots captured in North Vietnam, will be discussed and completed on the same day. Very embarrassed, the Nixon administration has admitted that the seven-point plan contains positive factors. However, it later said that this plan is unacceptable.

In Saigon, Thieu is afraid he will lose face because of the Pentagon's classified report, and that he will be unable to win votes if his lackey face is bared. While Thieu is bewildered, Kissinger, security adviser to Nixon, has assured Thieu that Nixon will continue to support Thieu although the U.S. Government has been strongly pressured to withdraw all U.S. troops. Like a drowning man clutching at straws, Thieu seized on the following statement of his U.S. masters: "The other side's proposal is unacceptable." Actually, he can say nothing else, because he has been entrusted by his U.S. masters with the task of carrying out the Vietnamization program. The words "freedom, independence, legal and constitutional" cannot cover up the presence of the remaining 255,000 U.S. troops.

On 21 June, Jean Lacouture wrote an article in the French paper NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR ridiculing the U.S.-puppet elections as follows:

"The elections are 'so free' that only military officers can be candidates. Balloting will take place under the supervision of a 1.5 million-man military and police force and of hundreds of thousands of foreign troops." For this reason, our compatriots' aspirations cannot be attained through words, but rather through acts. This means cooperation among the people in the struggle to demand that the United States withdraw all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam, stop supporting the present bellicose Saigon administration headed by Nguyen Van Thieu, and put an end to all of its maneuvers and election tricks.

The United States found a way into the war, now it must find a way out.