

# Statements and Comments by U.S. and Communist

Special to The New York Times

PARIS, May 4—Following are the texts of a statement at the Vietnam peace talks today by William J. Porter of the United States and of his comment to the press after the session, and of a similar comment by Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh of the Communist side, as well as excerpts from Mrs. Binh's statement during the meeting. Mrs. Binh's statement was supplied in English by the Vietcong delegation; her comment to the press was translated from the French by The New York Times.

## By Mr. Porter

### AT THE CONFERENCE

Ladies and gentlemen:

When we agreed last week to your pressing demands that these plenaries be resumed, we posed then the question of whether you were prepared to discuss, as a matter of first priority, the ending of your invasion of South Vietnam and the withdrawal of your divisions back to North Vietnam. Our proposal, as you know, provided for a corresponding reduction in the level of activity undertaken against North Vietnam in response to your invasion of South Vietnam.

You have not yet replied to or commented on that important question.

Moreover, while you were demanding a return to this table to "continue the work" for peace, what have you done on the ground in South Vietnam? You continue your massive invasion in the most flagrant violation of the 1954 Geneva accords and the 1968 understandings. You have

committed additional North Vietnamese troops to the battle. You have shelled and rocketed population centers such as Quangtri, Kontum and Anloc. Your divisions are marauding and killing helpless refugees throughout South Vietnam—a process you describe as assisting the South Vietnamese people to determine their own future. After we had agreed to resume these plenaries in response to your insistence, you—with cynical duplicity—stepped up the level of your all-out military aggression.

You frequently profess your desire to resolve the issues by negotiation. I now ask you a number of questions designed to make the record clear on this point.

### A Series of Questions

First, are you prepared to discuss measures leading to the mutual de-escalation of the conflict? Specifically, will you discuss measures to end your invasion and withdraw your troops back to North Vietnam?

Second, are you prepared to separate the consideration of military issues from that of political issues, along the lines of the proposal previously made to you?

Third, are you prepared to discuss a combination of this approach with that of an over-all political settlement, as proposed in our side's eight points of Jan. 25?

Fourth, are you willing to discuss the application of the terms of the Geneva convention to the prisoners of war held by both sides in the present conflict?

Fifth, do you recognize that the negotiating process

itself depends upon give-and-take in negotiations and is negated by setting forth your demands on a take-it-or-leave-it basis? Are you prepared to address yourselves constructively to the proposals we have made for a settlement of the conflict?

Sixth, will you discuss restoration by both sides of the status quo ante March 30, 1972?

Seventh, will you discuss a mutual return to the circumstances that surrounded the cessation of acts of force against the D.R.V. in 1968?

Eighth, will you consider any political solution that does not include the overthrow of the elected leadership of South Vietnam and discuss these matters directly with the Government of the Republic of Vietnam as presently constituted?

Please respond to these questions as precisely and as explicitly as you can. You will of course understand that our judgment on the utility of continuing to have these meetings with you will depend in great measure upon the nature of your response.

### TO THE PRESS

You guessed it right. They came back with no answers to any questions, either because they were not authorized to go into such matters or because they don't know what to say. Consequently, Ambassador [Pham Dam] Lam, speaking for our side, told them we would not agree to set a date for the next meeting. Now, don't get the idea that this is the result purely of this meeting held here today. It repre-

sents also a complete lack of progress in every available channel.

## By Mrs. Binh

### AT THE CONFERENCE

As far as the two key problems of a solution to the South Vietnam question are concerned, the way the U.S. Government poses the problem and the solution it contemplates are in complete opposition with that of the provisional revolutionary government of the Republic of South Vietnam.

### 1. Regarding the withdrawal of U. S. troops and the cessation of all U. S. military activities in Vietnam:

The U.S. eight-point proposal ambiguously puts forth "a total withdrawal from South Vietnam of all U.S. forces and other foreign forces within six months of an agreement. So the U.S. Government not only refuses to set a precise date for the withdrawal of all its troops, but it also links such troop withdrawal to an agreement on an over-all solution. In other words, the United States refuses to pull out all its troops so long as a solution based on its own conditions has not been reached. This implies the maintenance of American troops in South Vietnam to exert pressure upon a political solution and to pose absurd conditions for the total withdrawal of all American troops.

Reality has clearly proved that the Nixon Administration has prolonged the U.S. military occupation of South Vietnam to back the Vietna-

# Delegates at the Session of the Paris Talks on Vietnam

maization of the war. In fact, concerning the dateline for the troop withdrawal, had the United States responded to our seven points, all the American troops would have returned home in 1971.

The provisional revolutionary government of the Republic of South Vietnam rejects the U.S. way of posing conditions and reaffirms: Since the United States has sent its troops to invade South Vietnam, it should end its aggression, stop all its military activities, rapidly and completely withdraw from South Vietnam all U.S. troops, advisers, military personnel, weapons and war materials and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp, and dismantle the U.S. military bases in South Vietnam. The U.S. Government should set a specific terminal date for such total troop withdrawals without posing any conditions whatsoever.

## 2. Regarding the political problem in South Vietnam:

The United States eight-point proposal refers to the holding of "presidential general elections" in South Vietnam and to the resignation of Thieu-Huong one month before these elections, which means that these general elections would be held within the framework of the present regime in Saigon and under the control of its machine of coercion and repression, while those who wage the resistance war against United States aggression should give up their fight.

By its very nature, to take this position is simply to demand that the South Vietnamese people accept the U.S.-

set up administration and to deny the existence of the provisional revolutionary government, the genuine and legal representative of the South Vietnamese people.

This is an absurd demand. In order to settle correctly the political problem in South Vietnam, the provisional revolutionary government demands that the U.S. Government really respect the South Vietnamese people's right to self-determination and put an end to all its interferences in the South Vietnamese people's own affairs.

It is the United States which has set up the Nguyen Van Thieu administration and its huge machine of coercion and repression. Nguyen Van Thieu has obstinately pursued the "four No's" policy and used this machine of coercion to brutally repress and terrorize the people of all strata, all political and religious forces, including those who do not work hand in glove with them. This is the main obstacle to the settlement of the political problem in South Vietnam.

Therefore, Nguyen Van Thieu should resign immediately, and the Saigon administration should end its warlike policy, disband at once its machinery of oppression and constraint against the people, stop its "pacification" policy, dismantle the concentration camps, set free all persons arrested on political grounds and guarantee the democratic liberties as provided for by the 1954 Geneva agreements of Vietnam.

The resignation of Thieu, the change of the Saigon ad-

ministration's policy and the dismantling of its machine of oppression and constraint are absolutely necessary if one wants the people to recover their democratic liberties and to proceed to really democratic and fair elections.

## Paving Way to Elections

After the above has been achieved, the provisional revolutionary government of the Republic of South Vietnam will immediately discuss with the Saigon administration the formation of a three-segment government of national concord with a view to organizing general elections in South Vietnam, to elect a constituent assembly, work out a constitution and set up a definitive government of South Vietnam. The general elections will be held according to procedures agreed upon among the political forces in South Vietnam so as to insure effectively their free, democratic and fair character.

The provisional revolutionary Government does not demand monopoly of control on political life in South Vietnam. A "take-over," as the United States puts it, simply does not exist. On the contrary, we stand for the achievement of broad national concord.

It should be pointed out that the aforesaid two key problems are closely interrelated. As soon as an agreement on these two problems has been reached, other questions will be solved without difficulties so as to end the war and restore peace in Vietnam.

The provisional revolutionary government's seven-point plan whose two key

problems have been elaborated has really provided a basis for this conference to reach a comprehensive agreement. Yet it is difficult to reach an agreement if the U. S. Government obstinately sticks to its policy of aggression. This is why I call once more on the U. S. Government to give up that policy, enter into real negotiations and respond positively to our peace proposals.

## TO THE PRESS

Today the American side once again unilaterally adjourned the conference on Vietnam sine die, in the evident aim of avoiding negotiations and to open the way to new acts of escalation of war. This action demonstrates once more, clearly, that it is the United States and nobody else that refuses to negotiate, that seeks military victory, piling up crimes against the Vietnamese people, particularly by raids and savage bombings of the civilian population of South Vietnam in the zones they can no longer control, and in North Vietnam.

We severely condemn this act of sabotage by the United States, and we alert opinion on the subject of new steps of escalation of war by the United States. If the Nixon Administration thinks that it can use intimidation and force to subjugate the Vietnamese people, it is mistaken. We still advocate a political solution to the Vietnamese problem, and we demand that the Paris conference meet as customary. The United States must shoulder the responsibility for the consequences ensuing from their act of sabotage of the conference.