

SARASOTA, FLA.  
HERALD-TRIBUNE

M-24,256

S-30,184

FEB 2 1966

CPYRGHT

## Editorials:

# Who Is Keeping The War Going?

CPYRGHT

It was without the faintest hint of enthusiasm that President Johnson resumed bombings north of the 17th parallel in Vietnam. It appears that he had been persuaded by his predominantly non-military circle of policy-makers that this will increase the pressure on Hanoi for a negotiated settlement.

And beyond Hanoi, so their pattern of reasoning goes, we are thereby pressuring Communist China — serving notice that we are prepared to escalate and extend the attacks as may be necessary to get a cessation of hostilities in South Vietnam.

Underlying this policy decision, it seems, is the assumption that Red China and its infant nuclear potential is the major problem facing the United States today. That, as was effectively pointed out by columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott on this page on Monday, is the premise of the Rusk-McNamara-Goldberg-Rostow faction at the White House. It assumes that the rivalry between China and Russia is so intense that the Soviet government will cooperate with U.S. efforts to contain the Chinese attempt to expand into Southeast Asia, or elsewhere.

It supposes, in brief, that it is to our interest to take Russia's side against China.

But there is a faction that takes a contrary view.

Its spokesmen are CIA Director Raborn and J. Edgar Hoover and Speaker McCormack and Senators Russell and Dodd and others. They insist that Russia has done nothing to demonstrate that it has abandoned its long range plan to bury us and that therefore it is not in our national interest to let ourselves be lured into trying to bury China by force of arms.

For we would thus remove a worry that has been keeping the Kremlin from stirring up trouble in other corners of the world — as it would if it had nothing to fear along the vast and disputed Sino-Soviet borderlands.

Well, if the Rusk group is correct, then we might reasonably expect that the Soviet Union would welcome any opportunity to help us thwart China and stabilize the situation in Southeast Asia — such an opportunity as, for example, a resolution to put the Vietnam question to the U.N. Security Council.

But what happens? When the U.S. representative suggests precisely that, as he did yesterday, the Soviet delegate charges that the Pentagon is trying to expand its aggressive war.

This is not to suggest that the U.N. effort is hopeless, that we cannot get a settlement in Vietnam before we get deeper into a war trap in Asia.

It does suggest, however, that we should not rely on support from Soviet Russia for any policy that does not lead us to a showdown with Red China.

That, in essence, is what the Raborn group in Washington has been warning of.

And this view is not out of line with the warnings from General Matt Ridgeway and General James Gavin against committing massed U.S. forces to a major land war in Asia.

There is hope, as David Lawrence carefully suggests in his column today, that out of the Security Council proposal there will evolve some kind of Vietnam truce.

But if so, it will apparently come over the objections of the Soviet leaders whose every visible move in recent months has had the effect of fueling the fires of war in Southeast Asia.