## NYTimes 1972 MAY 13 From Excerpts Statement by Tho

Special to The New York Times

PARIS, May 12-Following are excerpts from a statement at a news conference by Le Duc Tho, the chief negotiator for the North Vietnamese delegation to the Paris peace conference, as translated from the Vietnam-ese by the delegation:

While feverishly intensifying and expanding the war, Mr. Nixon boasted that he had neither expanded nor escalated the war. According to what he said, he was the one who wanted to end the war and achieve a lasting peace more than anyone else while the Vietnamese people refused to negotiate serious-ly and wanted more war. Those are most arrogant allegations which cannot be acceptable by any man of conscience.

The Paris negotiations have asted four years but still remain in a deadlock because Mr. Nixon wants to "Vietnamize" the war rather than to negotiate seriously.

Through more than 140 plenary sessions of the Paris conference on Vietnam and many private meetings between us and Mr. Kissinger, the U.S. side has maintained its position of proceedings. its position of neo-colonial-ism. Everyone knows that the most arduous problem now existing between the two sides is the problem of power in South Vietnam.

power in South Vietnam.

Until the last private meeting of May 2, 1972, Mr. Kissinger offered nothing other than the old eight points! Instead he tried by every means to maintain the Nguyen Van Thieu administration, which the Vietnamese people will never accept. We have made repeated public statements never accept. We have made repeated public statements and told Mr. Kissinger in priand told Mr. Rissinger in private meetings that the government of the D.R.V.N. [North Vietnam] and the P.R.G. of the R.S.V.N. [provisional revolutionary government of the Vietcong] have never intended to impose a Communist regime in South Vietnam Vietnam.

What we want in South Vietnam is a three-segment government of broad national concord reflecting the real political situation of South Vietnam. We have no other desire than to see all Vietnamese live, when the war ends, in peace, independence, freedem and beautiful freedem and beautiful freedem and beautiful freedem. freedom and happiness, wipe out all enmity and together rebuild the country in a spir-it of solidarity and national concord.

Yet Mr. Nixon deliberate-I st. MIT. NIXON deliberate-ly slanders that we want to impose a Communist regime in South Vietnam and threat-ens the South Vietnam peo-ple of what he called "a bloodbath" of terror. In fact, it is Mr. Nixon who has drowned the South Vietnam people in a bloodbath for dozens of years now. How can he father such a fabrication on us? I am sure Mr. Kissinger will be not able to challenge me on what I have challenge me on what I have said today.

## Denies Surrender Demand

Contrary to Mr. Nixon's statements, we have never demanded a surrender from the United States, we have never had intention to humiliate anyone. We only demand that the United States side negotiate seriously to settle the Vietnam problem on the basis of respect for the Viet-name people's fundamental national rights provided for by the 1954 Geneva agree-

Hitherto in history, there are two ways to end wars: Either one party inflicts a to-tal defeat on the other and forces it to surrender, or the two belligerent parties nego-tiate to seek a reasonable and logical solution to the benefit of both parties. We have chosen the second course; that is the best way to end We have the war and to restore peace in Vietnam and also an honorable way for the United States to get out of Vietnam. That is the reason why we

have perseveringly partici-pated in the negotiations for the past four years at the Paris conference on Vietnam and at private meetings with the United States side. During these four years, Mr. Nixon has missed many op-portunities to peacefully setportunities to peacefully settle the Vietnam problem. Particularly last summer, when we advanced our nine-point peace initiative and the P.R.G. of the R.S.V.N. Its seven-point solution, a very fair and reasonable solution that has won the approval and support of broad sectors of public opinion in the world and in the United States. However, the United States side did not respond to our goodwill and obdurately maintained its position. goodwill and obdurmaintained its position.

maintained its position.

Moreover, before or after each private meeting, it always made military pressure on us, hoping to compel us to accept its terms. I will only point out the latest case. While the two sides were arranging the May 2, 1972, private meeting, Mr. Nixon ordered fierce bombing raids against Hanoi and Haiphong on April 16, 1972. Besides, the lack of good faith on the part of the United States side is evident. It requested a private meeting on May 2, 1972, but it brought no new probut it brought no new proposal. It insisted on a public announcement that a private meeting had taken place.

We recalled the previous

agreement that the private meetings should not be made public by either side and we emphasized that the United States side should not violate that agreement again as it had done twice previously. Mr. Kissinger agreed to that. But as everyone knows, on May 8, 1972, Mr. Nixon unilaterally divulged the May 2, 1972, private meeting.

## Deception Is Charged

Thus, the only conclusion possible is that, when requesting the May 2, 1972, private meeting, the U. S. side did not aim at peacefully settling the Vietnam problem; instead it wanted to use that private meeting. to use that private meeting to publicly distort the truth afterward, to soothe and to deceive public opinion, particularly in the United States during this election year.

during this election year.

At the same time, it sought a pretext for its extremely serious May 8 war escalation against the D.R.V.N. and for its acts of sabotaging the Paris conference on Vietnam. The Nixon Administration must bear full responsibility for the continuation of the war and the deadlock of the negotiations in Paris. The Vietnamese people energetically denounce people energetically denounce Mr. Nixon's maneuvers to elude serious negotiations. We will not negotiate under U.S. military pressure.

I wish to reaffirm here today our desire to peacefully settle the Vietnam problem. The best way for the Vietnamese people and problem. The best way for the Vietnamese people and American people to follow for the sake of peace in Southeast Asia and the world is that of serious negotia-

Our correct and constant position is: to fix a specific terminal date for the complete and rapid withdrawal from South Vietnam of U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp, and to establish in South Vietnam a three-seg-ment government of broad national concord, as pro-posed in the P.R.G. sevenpoint solution and its two key points elaborated on Feb. 2, 1972.

We demand that the U.S. Government honour its commitment to completely and unconditionally stop bombardments against D.R.V.N. It must not pose conditions as Mr. Nixon did in his May 8 speech to compel the Vietnamese people to pay a price for the cessation of the U.S. present acts of war in North Vietnam. We demand that the U.S. Government stop sabotaging the Paris conference on Vietnam and resume the weekly, plenary sessions as usual.