

PS

FILE	SUBJ.
DATE	SUB-CAT.

10/72

MA
10/28/72

MAINICHI (Full)

October 28, 1972

Now Is Time to End Vietnam War

DATE

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam) announced the nine-item agreement on peace in Vietnam, reached between the United States and North Vietnam at the Paris secret talks, and the United States confirmed that the contents thereof are correct. The signing of a peace agreement, with these items as the key points, has been temporarily suspended because the conflict of opinion still remains between the US and THIEU Governments.

This is making it necessary for the last negotiations to be held among Washington, Saigon and Hanoi. Some period of time will be required for these negotiations. However, we want to believe US Presidential Special Assistant KISSINGER's remark that "Peace is within our reach." We want to note, on the other hand, the point that the North Vietnamese Government said that it was for the purpose of promoting the negotiations that it positively disclosed the matters agreed upon at the secret talks. North Vietnam declared that there is no change at all in its resolve to realize peace on the basis of the nine items.

The North Vietnamese Government is pressing the US side to sign the peace agreement on the 31st, as scheduled. On the US side, there seem to be its "domestic circumstances" where it must persuade the THIEU Government, and therefore it cannot sign the agreement on the appointed date. However, on the North Vietnamese side, too, there seems to be no reason why it must stick to the 31st by all means. Is it not possible to come to an understanding on this point? The agreement on peace in Vietnam, which has been finally reached, must not be upset.

It can be said that the contents of the publicly announced agreement are within the utmost possible limit, through mutual concessions between the United States and North Vietnam. The United States promised to withdraw all its forces and military personnel within 60 days after a ceasefire. If the agreement is signed on the 31st, there will be no military Americans, including military advisers, in South Vietnam by the end of this year. The United States has completely swallowed the assertion hitherto made by the North -- withdrawal of all the US Forces.

J

We should probably evaluate that the compromise made by the North in response to this was also drastic. The North agreed on the principle of separating military from politics. On the problem of "President THIEU's retirement," which the North had been demanding till the last, it changed its entry argument to an exit argument, too. The North decided to postpone this problem until it is settled after a ceasefire, giving up the idea of making it a pre-condition for peace. Is it not that a peace proposal based on such a critical compromise is the best under the present situation?

The THIEU Government is opposed to this agreement proposal. We can understand that South Vietnamese Government leaders including President THIEU, who have been working to strengthen the Government Forces, centering on the "Vietnam-ization" policy, and calling for a military settlement persistently, feel resistance, even emotionally, to a complete change to a peace policy. In the agreement proposal, however, a way is opened for the THIEU Government to compete with the "communist forces" not on the battlefield but now in free elections under international supervision. In addition, the North has withdrawn its assertion that a three-faction coalition Government should be started immediately after a ceasefire. Instead, it proposes starting with the present situation where two forces -- the THIEU Government and the South Vietnamese Provisional Revolutionary Government - exist, and discussing future political problems between the two.

In his speech on the night of the 24th, President THIEU opposed some items of the peace proposal but appealed to the people: "I want you not to call me an obstacle to peace." He said also that "Vietnam will recover and prosper in five or ten years, and become happier." Is it not that President THIEU, although showing resistance outwardly, is inwardly thinking of the future of the Vietnamese people? Is the President not equally hoping for peace? If so, an agreement ought to be reached between the United States and the THIEU Government.

If the climax for peace this time sadly comes to naught at the final stage, no one can predict when the next chance will come. The international environment, including China and the Soviet Union, which is moving toward early peace, may recede again if this chance is lost. Outside of Vietnam, too, regular peace talks have got under way in Laos. Such a long, tragic war is rare in history. The people of Vietnam, whether in the North or in the South, must be anxiously waiting for peace. We repeat that this chance must not be missed.

RA

YOMIURI (Full)

October 28, 1972

Restoration of Peace Near at Hand in Vietnam

It has become clear that the restoration of peace is imminent in Vietnam. On the 26th, the North Vietnamese Government unilaterally published the draft of the peace agreement on which negotiations had been boiled down between the US and North Vietnam, and pressed the US side for enforcement of this agreement. As a result, the world was made aware of the fact that the protracted

peace in Vietnam has been missed several times to date, contrary to our expectation. We strongly hope, therefore, that all the parties concerned will do their best at the final stage of the negotiations on the termination of hostilities.

Judging from the statements issued by North Vietnam and KISSINGER, it can be said that the 9-point ceasefire plan, which has been agreed upon in principle between the US and North Vietnam, clearly reflects the concessions made by both sides, and is based on the principle of national autonomy. The US has been strongly insisting that military problems, such as the cessation of hostilities and release of the prisoners of war, and political problems such as the determination of the future form of the Government of South Vietnam by two parties concerned in South Vietnam, should be settled separately. The peace plan recognizes this contention of the US side, and does not call for resignation of President THIEU of South Vietnam.

According to the peace plan, an administrative machine called the "National Council of Reconciliation and Concord" is to be established by three parties on an equal footing for the purpose of holding a general election, although North Vietnam's demand for establishment of a new Government by a coalition of three parties has been dropped. The US side says this machinery is but an implementation of the idea of setting up an Election Control Committee which was included in the proposal made by the US on January 25, this year. It can still be said, however, that the provision for equality of the three parties reflects a concession made by the US side.

It is all too clear that none of the US and three other parties concerned with the complicated war in Vietnam can realize all their demands. On the 27th, the South Vietnamese Government announced that it cannot accept any political solution running counter to the wishes of the South Vietnamese people, although it will agree to end hostilities. It has taken such an attitude perhaps because it thinks that the provisions for solution of the political problems, which are contained in the peace plan, still reflect the idea of a coalition Government, though in a new form.

Special Assistant KISSINGER says that President THIEU has revealed his views on the proposal made by the communist side previously, and not on the new proposal. If there is any misunderstanding between the US and the South Vietnamese Government about such a point, the US should exert all efforts to persuade the South Vietnamese side to accept the new peace plan. US President NIXON, too, has said it is possible to remove the remaining differences in views. We feel, however, rather than fundamental differences in views exist between the US and Saigon.

Needless to say, it is the Vietnamese people who are playing the leading role in the Vietnam war, as long as this war is a struggle for national self-determination. The role and responsibility of the US in the war, however, are very great, since the US is a country outside Vietnam. The sudden announcement made by Hanoi strongly reflects the feeling of distrust toward the US which has been growing in North Vietnam for many years. We want to think, however, that North Vietnam will not beat a retreat from the point it has reached at last. The US should remove the remaining obstacles to the restoration of peace as speedily as possible according to its definite promise, so that the peoples of North and South Vietnam will be rescued from the ravages of war.

HF

US Urged to Reach Decision Quickly on Peace in Vietnam

The Vietnam war is at last about to greet the final phase. Moves for realizing peace in Vietnam have been especially busy for the last one month, with US Presidential Special Assistant KISSINGER's having held secret talks with the North Vietnamese Delegate many times and with his having held talks with the Nguyen Van THIEU Government in Saigon. As a result of North Vietnam's announcement, on the 26th, of the contents of agreements reached with the US side on nine points, and the US Government's having admitted the fact, the development of the situation as to peace has been generally completely clarified. It goes without saying that the North unilaterally disclosed the contents of the recent secret talks, because the US side hesitated to fulfill completely the contents of the agreements, because of its relationships with South Vietnam, and that for this reason, quick realization of peace in Vietnam is being delayed. This probably shows the fact that there is still distance before the war is brought to an end and peace is realized. However, we want to note the point that efforts and steps for peace, which have been made public, have come to carry definite weight, with which no power can compete now, as a great, inevitable, historic current. At the same time, we ask for the NIXON Administration's decision with courage, which will enable that Administration to realize the contents of the agreements with its actual actions quickly, without any further delay.

The contents of agreements reached between the US and North Vietnam advocate the establishment of a National Concord Council of the People, besides the suspension of the bombings against the North, a complete ceasefire and the lifting of the blockade by mines within 24 hours from the signing of an agreement, the complete withdrawal of the US Forces within 60 days, complete non-intervention by the US in domestic affairs, and the mutual release of prisoners of war, in parallel with a ceasefire. The agreement was reached, on the 8th of this month, under these conditions, on the suspension of the bombings against the North on the 18th, the signing of a peace agreement in Hanoi on the 19th, and the signing of an official agreement in Paris on the 26th. Nevertheless, these schedules were postponed to the 21st, 23rd, and 30th, respectively, having been proposed by the US side. The signing of an official agreement was further delayed to the 31st. On the 23rd, the US side proposed the return of these schedules to a clean-slate and the continuation of discussions, for the reason of "difficult circumstances in Saigon," and on the 24th, President THIEU made the speech, "declaring his opposition to peace, going over his head." Through this process, Hanoi unilaterally issued its announcement. This situation brings into the limelight the point, first, that one question, which is posing a big barrier to the early realization of peace in Vietnam at the present stage, lies with the Saigon Government side, and the point, secondly, that the US and North Vietnam mutually agreed on the complete withdrawal of the US Forces and the principle of national self-determination, while making concessions to each other. These two points are important in that they again clarified the basic nature of the Vietnam war.

We cannot deny the fact that the Vietnam war has expanded from the cold-war strategy based on the domino theory, under the successive US Governments' policy of containing China since the end of World War II. This war has not been fought because the Vietnamese Forces waged aggression against the US. We can recall the fact again that the North Vietnamese Declaration of Independence was drawn up in 1945 immediately af-

nam, even though going through turns and twists, produce results in the form of an "honorable withdrawal," this will carry great meaning. We strongly request the NIXON Administration to complete its steps, which that Administration has steadily piled up for the realization of peace, as soon as possible, without missing this precious opportunity, even though that Government's "political judgment" for the purpose of securing re-election in the Presidential election, which is approaching in the very near future, is attached to its efforts.

When a ceasefire is realized and peace comes to Vietnam, there will be awaiting the important task of establishing a new political structure and also rehabilitating the people's minds and the national land, which have been thoroughly destroyed. However, the question, to which the NIXON Administration should devote its all-out efforts, lies at the stage before that. Now is the time for the US Government to mark the first step forward toward the touchstone, which will tell whether the US will be able to demonstrate, domestically and internationally, the "spirit of 1776" on the occasion of its bicentennial anniversary of the founding of its nation.

KS

SANKEI (Full)

October 28, 1972

Vietnam Peace Immovable

The North Vietnamese Government on the 26th disclosed the contents of a nine-point agreement on the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war reached with the US. Hard on the heels of this, US Presidential Special Assistant KISSINGER stated his determination to realize peace in less than several weeks. It may be all right to believe that the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war has already become an immovable fact.

As these are the important negotiations designed to settle the Vietnam war of ten years' duration, it is inevitable that various problems will arise until immediately before the signing. However, according to the North Vietnamese Government's statement this time, it is said that the US side has postponed the signing as many as three times. This is different from the explanations made by Special Assistant KISSINGER, and it is difficult to decide as to which statements are true. However, that the North Vietnamese side pressed the US to sign an agreement on the 31st, even by resorting to exposure tactics, shows that the US side had been tardy, at the very least. It is readily imaginable that the cause thereof is attributable to South Vietnamese President THIEU. In other words, the US may have failed to persuade President THIEU as to one or another of the contents of the nine-point agreement, or President THIEU, who had approved it tentatively, may have changed his attitude at the last moment.

In reading the contents of the nine-point agreement, it is found that it is a peace plan for which both the US and North Vietnam made compromises to the utmost possible limits and which was drafted with great pains. For instance, the settlement of the Vietnam war by separating politics from military affairs is a concession on the part of the North Vietnamese side, although it is perfunctory. With regard to the treatment of President THIEU, the North Vietnamese side is also taking a flexible attitude. Although a tri-partite coalition Government, which was advocated by the North Vietnamese side, has taken the form of the "National Council of People's Reconciliation and Concord", this is tri-partite equal participation, and is a concession on the part of the US side. The US side also has withdrawn its call for

holding South Vietnamese Presidential elections and agreed to hold a general election, proposed by the North Vietnamese side. Furthermore, the US side seems to have given up a package ceasefire in Indo-China. To take up the ceasefire between Laos and Cambodia itself by the talks held between both the US and North Vietnam alone is unreasonable, as is claimed by the North Vietnamese side. However, if the ceasefire in Vietnam is realized, there will be a possibility that the ceasefire between these two countries can be attained separately.

That President THIEU shows resistance in such a manner to an agreement plan which has been reached by devoting four years to it may be likened to resistance against the current of history, and such resistance will not be advisable for President THIEU himself and all the South Vietnamese people. To lose no time in bringing peace in Vietnam is the first consideration, and we would like to believe that as is claimed by Special Assistant KISSINGER, the US will be able to reach an agreement with the Saigon Regime on a final basis.

The North Vietnamese side is calling upon the US so strongly to sign an agreement on the 31st as to be taken to mean that it is an ultimatum. However, even if the time for signing is delayed, there will not be such a thing as the North Vietnamese side cancelling this agreement. As is claimed by the North Vietnamese side, its disclosure of the contents of an agreement itself should be taken to mean that, "This is to benefit peace and will not produce any effects on negotiations." Also, it will be all right to believe that this disclosure showed the North Vietnamese side's zeal for peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war. Furthermore, it is possible to interpret that the North Vietnamese side's statement applied pressure to President THIEU, in the form of criticizing the US.

At any rate, both the US and North Vietnam should have reached the point from where they cannot retrace their steps. We hope that there is no such thing as to "plough the field and forget the seed." At the same time, we expect that the light of peace will be lit in Vietnam as soon as possible.

SO

ARTICLES

MAINICHI (Full)

October 31, 1972

US Should Accept Nine-Point Agreement on Peace in Vietnam: Kamakura Mayor MASAKI

Mayor of Kamakura Chifuyu MASAKI, who is to visit North Vietnam at the invitation of Mayor of Hanoi Tran Dzui HUN, held a press conference at "Peace and Labor Hall" in Shiba, Tokyo, on the afternoon of the 30th. He criticized the US Forces' bombing against North Vietnam, and stated that, "I demand the US accept the 'nine-point agreement' which was made public by North Vietnam, and realize peace. I want to inspect fully the destruction of cities in North Vietnam and let our country's people know the actual situation. I will convey to the Vietnamese people the actual situation of the North Vietnam-support movement in Japan."

Members of the Delegation are five persons -- Tomigusuku Village Headman Ichiro MATAYOSHI in Okinawa Prefecture, Japan Society for Protecting Children Standing Director Yuko YAMAGUCHI (atomic-bomb victim in Hiroshima), Yoyogi Hospital Doctor Masako CHIBA, and Japan-Vietnam Friendship Promotion Association National Director Kazushi SASAKI, in addition to Mayor MASAKI.

In the special news program of Fuji Television on the afternoon of October 25, Prime Minister TANAKA made the following statement on his plan for a foreign trip next year and showed his intention to visit the expanded EC nations: "Although I have not yet made the decision concretely, Britain's entry into the expanded EC on January 1 next year will have great effects upon Japan. The problem with the expanded EC is important. There are things on which we must say this and that, upon our visit."

At the same time, the Prime Minister said: "(The EC) is advocating a new International Round (for abolishing trade restrictions). Japan must promote balanced expansion of trade." The Prime Minister already accepted an invitation to visit Britain, on the occasion of British Prime Minister HEATH's visit to Japan, and his visits to the expanded EC nations are expected to be realized next January, if early, or after the close of the special Diet session following the general election at the latest.

As to his visiting Southeast Asian nations to explain our country's policy toward Southeast Asia after the normalization of Japan-China diplomatic relations, the Prime Minister said: "Each country approved the explanations by Special Envoy AICHI and others. I would like to make a round of visits to those countries as much as possible, but it must not be forceful."

With regard to the Japan-US Security Treaty, the Prime Minister said once again that it will be "firmly maintained" even after the normalization of Japan-China diplomatic relations. He also said, "(The extraordinary Diet session) is a good opportunity for discussing that the Security Treaty is necessary," and thus clarified his view that the Security Treaty problem shall be a point of dispute between the Ruling and Opposition Parties at the extraordinary Diet session.

Regarding the land problem, the Prime Minister showed a positive posture of tackling the reform of the Japanese Archipelago, clarifying the policy to tackle it with three pillars -- (1) to increase supply, (2) to take taxation measures toward land-owners who are waiting for rises in land prices, and (3) to map out a land-use plan so that speculative deals cannot be conducted. In connection with the rises in wholesale prices, the Prime Minister said, "I wish to have the recession cartels for iron and steel dissolved, in the light of the situation."

Gist of Prime Minister's Statements

The gist of Prime Minister TANAKA's statements is as follows:

1. (With regard to the normalization of Japan-China diplomatic relations and the Japan-US Security Treaty) The Security Treaty is very important. There appears such a problem as that since the Japan-China problem has been settled, there will be no need for the Security Treaty, but that is not so. The Constitution has set forth the major premise that Japan will not have military power nor will it wage war, and it is not that everything (concerning the defense of Japan) can be done by the SDF alone. There are expressions that the Security Treaty should be maintained and that it should be firmly maintained. (The expression is) rather that the Security Treaty must be firmly maintained.