

IV. 12 Jul 71

L 12

SOUTH VIETNAM

VNA
7/9/71

FILE SUBJ
DATE SUB-CAT

DUONG DINH THAO HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE AFTER 120TH SESSION

Paris VNA in Vietnamese to VNA Hanoi 0855 GMT 9 Jul 71 B--FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

["Memorandum of Duong Dinh Thao's press conference after 120th session"]

[Text] Opening his press conference, Duong Dinh Thao stated: In her statement today, Minister Nguyen Thi Binh elaborated on the seven-point peace proposal of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, emphasizing two main points, namely, the question of the withdrawal of U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the American camp from South Vietnam and the question of the administration in South Vietnam. After delivering her statement, Minister Nguyen Thi Binh made the following additional remarks:

Our seven-point proposal and our prepared statement of today have clearly answered the questions raised earlier by the U.S. delegate. However, the U.S. delegate's statement shows that the Americans have not responded to our good-will proposals and have not responded to the public's expectations. If the U.S. Government really wants to negotiate seriously to end the war in Vietnam, let the U.S. delegate answer the following questions.

1--Do you agree that the seven points advanced by us constitute a basis for negotiation to settle the South Vietnam problem or not?

2--Among these seven points, with which ones do you agree, and with which ones do you disagree? Which ones do you consider to be positive and which ones unacceptable?

3--Are you ready to advance immediately a deadline for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the American camp from South Vietnam in 1971, so that captured U.S. militarymen may soon return to their families in 1971?

4--Is the U.S. Government ready to end its support for the present rotten, warlike ruling clique in Saigon headed by Nguyen Van Thieu?

Let the U.S. delegate answer the questions raised above. The most important issue is the content, particularly of the answer by the U.S. delegate to the question as to when the United States will withdraw all its troops as raised in our seven points. When we know this answer, we will discuss the format of the meeting.

Next, Duong Dinh Thao made these remarks: As predicted by several news agencies, the U.S. delegate today did not reply to our new peace proposals. Not only that, he even raised the question of holding restricted meetings to replace the present plenary sessions. This is a perfidious trick of his. Minister Nguyen Thi Binh asked the U.S. delegate: Does the U.S. delegate intend to put forward the question of the format of the meeting to evade replying seriously to the seven points of the PRG/RSV and evade responding to the demand of public opinion in the world, including in the United States, that the U.S. Government set a deadline for a U.S. troop withdrawal in 1971?

The reason we consider the U.S. proposal a perfidious trick is that since September 1970 we have demanded that the United States set a deadline for a troop withdrawal, and increasingly more people among the U.S. public, even in the U.S. Congress, are asking that the U.S. Government set a deadline for withdrawing all U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the American camp from South Vietnam.

Many senators and congressmen have raised their voices in protest against the Vietnam war, but others do not, for it is their uncertainty to realize our mistake and lack of regard for the rights of other nations. We hope you will bring our nation together, instead of trying to divide it. We hope you will act as a conscious man, to bring peace, now, instead of continuing your reckless policy.

Sincerely [recording ends]

That was a recorded message to U.S. President Nixon, from a group of captured U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam.

RADIO CITES KY'S, MINH'S CONDEMNATION OF THIEU

Liberation Radio [Clandestine] in Vietnamese to South Vietnam 1400 GMT 7 Jul 71 S

[Text] Since the beginning of June, Saigon public opinion and members of the National Assembly have not ceased strongly protesting and denouncing the antidemocratic nature of the so-called electoral law with its Article 10, clause 7, which Thieu had tried by every means possible to bribe and force the Saigon puppet National Assembly to pass.

In an interview with an AFP correspondent in Saigon, Gen Duong Van Minh publicly condemned Nguyen Van Thieu for attempting to organize a rigged election. Duong Van Minh denounced Thieu for having used provincial chiefs, military commanders, the police force and the pacification and "Phoenix" groups as instruments supporting Thieu's candidacy. Duong Van Minh again condemned the so-called electoral law fabricated by Thieu.

On 5 July, after his meeting with Kissinger, the special adviser of Nixon who came to Saigon, Nguyen Cao Ky strongly criticized Thieu, demanding that he completely change the Saigon government. According to observers in Saigon, Ky's statement was a strong slap in Thieu's face, aimed at enhancing Ky's prestige in the forthcoming October election. It is obvious that the election law fabricated by Thieu to insure his success in the forthcoming election has been strongly denounced by everyone. Public opinion now clearly realizes that as long as there are the U.S. aggressors and the warlike Thieu clique, there will be no free elections in the south.

Previously, Mr Nixon stated that if he announced a deadline for a troop withdrawal, we would not settle the question of captured militarymen.

We have now said clearly: If the U.S. Government announces a deadline for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the American camp in 1971, then the beginning of the withdrawal of U.S. troops will also be the beginning of the release of the captured militarymen of the different parties and of civilians, and when the last U.S. soldier withdraws, this will also be the time when the release of the captured militarymen and civilians will be completed. The question now is for Mr Nixon to announce a deadline for a troop withdrawal in 1971.

For our part, we have repeatedly said that in order to settle the South Vietnam problem, the most important question is content and a serious attitude. We are not inflexible on the format of the meeting. Today, the U.S. delegate raised the question of holding restricted meetings with the purpose of avoiding answering the demands of the Vietnamese people, the U.S. people, and world public opinion that the United States set a deadline for a troop withdrawal.

Finally, running short of arguments, the U.S. delegate agreed to meet in plenary session, as usual, next Thursday.

Duong Dinh Thao then answered questions posed by newsmen:

Bernard Valery (New York DAILY NEWS): 1) I understand from Mme Binh's statement that the negotiations on the seven points can begin only after Mr Nixon has set a deadline for a troop withdrawal. Is that correct? 2) Is this condition (that Nixon set a deadline for a troop withdrawal) applicable to the holding of restricted meetings or closed-door meetings? That is, can there be no restricted meetings before Mr Nixon's announcement of a deadline for a troop withdrawal?

Answer: The United States is committing aggression against Vietnam. It has brought its troops to occupy our land and rigged up a puppet administration which acts as its servant. In order to bring about peace and settle the South Vietnam problem, we must settle the question of the withdrawal of U.S. troops and the question of forming an administration in Saigon that represents the interests of all strata of the South Vietnamese people.

Actually, these two questions should be discussed and settled at the same time. But to prove our goodwill, we have proposed in the process of discussions to settle the question of a U.S. troop withdrawal if a settlement can be reached on this. Our demand that Mr Nixon set a deadline for a U.S. troop withdrawal in 1971 is aimed at creating favorable conditions for moving the Paris conference forward. Mr Nixon prevents the conference from making progress when he refuses to set a date for a total troop withdrawal in 1971.

As for your second question, we have said that the format of the meeting is also important, but what matters most is the content of negotiations and a serious attitude in the negotiations. Minister Nguyen Thi Binh has repeatedly said that we are prepared to meet the U.S. delegate privately. Our attitude is consistent. But we reject Mr Bruce's proposal today to hold restricted sessions because it is only a perfidious maneuver, as I have just explained.

Mme Lenart (FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW): If my understanding is correct, Mme Binh meant that if the United States sets a deadline for a troop withdrawal by the end of this year, you will agree on the format, the framework of closed-door meetings with the U.S. delegate?

Answer: First, we must say that Mr Bruce's proposal in the present context is a perfidious maneuver which must be rejected. However, after Mr Nixon puts forth a deadline for a troop withdrawal in 1971, we will be ready to discuss all formats and modalities so that the parties may rapidly reach an agreement on the total withdrawal of U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp from South Vietnam and the release of all captured militarymen of the parties and of civilians.

We reject Mr Bruce's proposal to hold restricted sessions because we do not want him to use this maneuver to deceive public opinion and to drag out the conference. However, in the future, after Mr Nixon puts forth a date for a troop withdrawal, we will be prepared for any format of the meeting that will guarantee the implementation of these two questions.

Redmont (Westinghouse Broadcasting Corporation):

Let me make an assumption. Let us suppose that the U.S. delegate says today: I agree to point one, and all U.S. troops will withdraw in 1971. Will a cease-fire be observed immediately between the South Vietnamese People's Liberation Armed Forces and the forces of the United States and the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp? Will there be any guarantee of security for the withdrawing troops and of the release of all captured militarymen? Would it be possible to leave the remaining points--points two to seven--for later discussions?

Answer: In the PRGRSV seven-point statement, Mr Redmont's question is dealt with in great precision. If Mr Bruce announces a deadline today for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp from South Vietnam in 1971, the parties will immediately reach an agreement on the following questions: A troop withdrawal and the release of captured militarymen and civilians.

For our part, we have repeatedly said that once a date for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam in 1971 is set, the question of agreeing on the modalities does not raise any difficulty. That is why, after an agreement on the two points mentioned above is reached, a cease-fire will immediately be observed between the PLAF and the forces of the United States and the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp.

Concerning Mr Redmont's second question on whether or not the release of captured militarymen is guaranteed to take place on the same date as the troop withdrawal, I would like to reiterate that if Mr Nixon announces a deadline for a troop withdrawal, for instance, on 30 September or 31 October of this year, the release of captured militarymen will be completed on 30 September or 31 October of this year. Thus, all U.S. troops in South Vietnam at present, including those captured, will be able to celebrate this Christmas and New Year in the United States.

With regard to Mr Redmont's third question as to what about the other questions, I would like to answer that one should continue to work at settling them. If, after the questions of the withdrawal of all U.S. troops and the release of captured civilians and militarymen have been settled, the warlike rulers in Saigon headed by Nguyen Van Thieu are still in office, then the United States will have the responsibility to continue to settle this question with us because the Thieu ruling clique has been rigged up and maintained by the United States. This clique cannot exist by itself.

Villard (AFP): If Mr Nixon sets a deadline for a troop withdrawal, but among the captured militarymen are those of South Vietnam (meaning of the puppet army) and your militarymen detained by South Vietnam (the puppets), then after such a deadline is set, would you have to talk with the present Saigon administration to settle the question of these captured militarymen?

Answer: There are two different things here. Regarding the question of captured militarymen and civilians, as I said earlier, since it is the United States which is directing the Saigon administration, it must assume the responsibility for settling this. The recently revealed documents of the U.S. defense Department also say clearly that South Vietnam, that is, the puppet administration in Saigon, is but a creation of the United States. TIME magazine of 12 July also states that a large majority of the population in Saigon believes that the United States controls the Saigon administration. And when we say that the U.S. Government must assume responsibility for what takes place in South Vietnam, this is not slander directed at it.

Kalisher (CBS): When you speak of a prisoner release, specifically what prisoners will be released, North Vietnamese prisoners of war, South Vietnamese prisoners of war, prisoners in the north, or in the south, in Laos, or in Cambodia?

Answer: I have already replied several times to your question. I have said that this conference is designated the Paris conference on Vietnam. That is why the question of captured militarymen includes U.S. militarymen, puppet militarymen, and militarymen of the other foreign countries in the American camp captured in South Vietnam and U.S. pilots captured in the northern part of Vietnam. As for soldiers on our side who have been captured, they are Vietnamese militarymen who come under the South Vietnam People's Liberation Armed Forces.

A Dutch journalist: You are tying prisoner release to a U.S. troop withdrawal. Does this also imply the withdrawal of U.S. advisers in Saigon and eventually an end to aid to Saigon? That is to say, prisoners will be released only when the United States withdraws all its advisers?

Answer: I believe that you are going back to a question which has already been asked. Let Mr Nixon set a deadline for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from South Vietnam in 1971 and the parties will come to an agreement on the modalities for the withdrawal of troops and the release of captured militarymen. These two operations will begin and end in the period set by Mr Nixon, on the same date, and we will then take up another question.

The United States has set up the warmongering ruling group headed by Nguyen Van Thieu to implement its policy of Vietnamization of the war, and it must therefore abandon this ruling group. This is in the interest of the Vietnamese people and also of the American people.

Sedbon (REUTER): You demand the withdrawal of U.S. troops, the dismantling of U.S. military bases, and the withdrawal of all U.S. weapons. But what will become of the weapons which have already been transferred to the Saigon army? Who becomes the owner of these weapons?

Answer: We demand the withdrawal of U.S. troops, the dismantling of all U.S. military bases, and the withdrawal of all U.S. war equipment. So do the U.S. people and peace-loving public opinion in the world. As for the question of the armaments of the Saigon troops, this question comes under the item on Vietnamese armed forces in South Vietnam mentioned in point three of the seven-point statement.

DELEGATION DEPARTS FOR MONGOLIAN ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS

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

[Text] Accepting the invitation extended by the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and by the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, the Presidium of the NFLSV Central Committee and the PRGRSV sent an NFLSV-PRG delegation headed by Mr Nguyen Van Ngoi, member of the Presidium of the NFLSV Central Committee, to attend the 50th anniversary of the Mongolian National Day. The delegation has left for Ulan Bator.

LPA Commentary

LIBERATION PRESS AGENCY [Clandestine] in English to East Europe and the Far East
1508 GMT 10 Jul 71 B

[Commentary: "50 Years of Continuous Growth and Brilliant Victories"]

[Text] South Viet Nam July 10 GPA--Following the path of the October Revolution and under the clear-sighted leadership of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party headed by their beloved leader Suhe Bator, the Mongolian people victoriously waged the revolution in 1921 and since then have step by step brought Mongolia from the position of a backward feudal country of nomads to a socialist one endowed with developed agriculture and industry and an ever more developed culture and education.

Starting from scratch, the Mongolian people have now built up a developed industry. Many new industrial centres have been set up and the role of industry in the whole national economy has ceaselessly raised.

The success of the people's revolution eliminated feudal exploitation and opened to the Mongolian people inexhaustible possibilities to transform and develop their agriculture and meet the people's needs in food. This is an unprecedented success in agriculture in Mongolia.

The most significant success of Mongolia in the cultural field is the formation and consolidation of a system of popular education consisting of a wide network of general education schools, vocational schools and universities. Illiteracy, a legacy of the old regime, has been basically wiped out.

The aforesaid great achievements of the Mongolian people in the past 50 years constitute a brilliant manifestation of patriotism and profound love for socialism, of the persistent struggle and labour of the Mongolian people under the clear-sighted leadership of the People's Revolutionary Party, now headed by respected Chairman Yumjaagiyn Tsendenbal.

The South Vietnamese people are very proud and elated at the splendid achievements of the Mongolian people and consider these successes as their own.

On the occasion of this festival day of the Mongolian people we wish to extend to the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Great People's Hural, Government and people the warm congratulations and deep gratitude of the South Viet Nam 14 million people, National Front for Liberation and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam.