

Viet Policy Also JFK's, Rusk Says

Held Independence Of Saigon Crucial, He Tells Veterans

By Chalmers M. Roberts
Washington Post Staff Writer

Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday drew on his official relationship with John F. Kennedy to imply that the late President would be doing what President Johnson is doing today in Vietnam.

Speaking at the opening session in New York of the Veterans of Foreign Wars 67th national convention, Rusk recalled that in 1956 as a Senator Mr. Kennedy had said that South Vietnam's independence was "crucial to the free world."

Then Rusk added: "If, as President, he ever had any doubt about that, he never indicated it to his Secretary of State. Never to my knowledge did he falter in his resolve to do whatever might be necessary to prevent the Communists from seizing South Vietnam and Southeast Asia."

Rusk later said that "anyone

See **IEWS**, A8, Col. 1

U.S. experts bank on increase in imports as Viet economy balancer.

Page A10.

B-52 bombers from Guam twice attack two Vietcong bases in South Vietnam.

Page A10.

who thinks" that President Johnson "can be swerved" from his determination to resist Communist aggression "gravely misjudges one of the most resolute Presidents we have ever had."

The Secretary offered no word of hope on how or when the war will end. But in a *Look* magazine article out today, he is quoted as saying that like the Berlin blockade and the Cuban missile crisis, the current crisis "is going to end with the freedom of South Vietnam. It's going to break fast one of these days."

The Secretary told the veterans' convention that "when I see an occasional picket carrying a 'peace in Vietnam' sign, I feel like saying, 'let me help you carry that sign because President Johnson has taken that sign into every capital in the world . . . but they (the Communists) still keep coming.'"

As Stated Before

Much of what Rusk said he has said often before: the United States will "continue to explore every possibility of an honorable peace" but it will not be driven out by force or agree to a settlement which does not assure "peace and a free choice" to South Vietnam.

He also once again compared the results of appeasement in Europe before World War II to what might happen if the United States were to pull out of Vietnam. The President, he said, has met aggression there "to avoid a general conflagration."

And once again he also said that "if anybody from Hanoi can be in Geneva tomorrow to talk peace, I will be there."

The Secretary echoed another current theme in official Washington, that free Asian nations hope and believe the United States will win.

Says 100 Will Applaud

"There will be 100 small nations who will clap their hands with joy," he said, "because they will know that they, too, will have a share in world peace because of the stand against aggression by the United States."

After his VWF speech, Rusk spent an hour with United Nations Secretary General U Thant in Thant's office. Rusk said they discussed possible de-escalation of the war and strengthening of the International Control Commission. But Rusk added that "the other side has shown little interest.

Except for a possible visit to

Cambodia by Ambassador W. Averell Harriman no potentially fruitful peace moves are known to be afoot.

A State Department spokesman said yesterday that Cambodia's Prince Sihanouk still has not formally told Harriman he would not be welcomed despite a public statement to that effect. This has encouraged Washington to think that in the end Harriman will make the visit.

Meanwhile, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) said yesterday he thought French President de Gaulle's visit to Cambodia, just before that of Harriman, "well might produce more tentative steps toward negotiations" of the Vietnam war. Mansfield added that he felt "Hanoi would be likely to give its attention to any suggestions that de Gaulle might make."

No Sign of Change

However, de Gaulle is known to have told his Russian hosts during his June visit to Moscow that he did not think the time then was ripe for any new peace move. There has been no sign from Paris since then of a change of opinion.

Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) told the Senate yesterday he wanted everybody to know that he has not altered his views on the war despite his recently stated belief that Peking, Moscow and Hanoi would be "grievously deceiving themselves if they underestimated the military spirit" in the United States.

Fulbright said he wanted to make his position clear because some had misinterpreted his remarks as indicating a change of view. He then repeated his statement that "a clear majority of Congress supports the President in his war policy — indeed, many seem more determined than he is to escalate the war."