

# ROGERS SEES HOPE FOR VIETNAM TALK

But He Still Appears More  
Dubious Than White House

—Ziegler Denies Split

JUL 16 1970

By HEDRICK SMITH

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 15 —

Secretary of State William P. Rogers, in an apparent effort to move his position on Vietnam closer to that of the White House, said today that there were "reasonable prospects" for the peace negotiations in the long run but that the short-run prospects were not bright.

More explicitly than previously, Mr. Rogers said that he felt that the Communist powers would "not be inclined to negotiate" after the setbacks they suffered in Cambodia and this meant that the prospect for the negotiations "in the next couple of months are not too bright."

At the White House, the Presidential press secretary, Ronald L. Ziegler, sought to combat the idea that there were differences in the Nixon

Continued on Page 7, Column 3

Continued From Page 1, Col. 6

Administration over the impact of the Cambodian operation on the talks in Paris.

But Mr. Rogers's comments, made during a surprise appearance at the State Department's regular noon briefing, still had a more negative tenor than anything the White House has said publicly.

Since the incursion into Cambodia on April 30, White House officials have taken the position that the allied offensive would improve the prospects for negotiation, though they did not rule out new enemy offensives this summer as well.

In an interview Sunday with the Westinghouse Broadcasting Company, Secretary Rogers advanced a much more pessimistic view. He suggested that peace was no closer than it was a year ago and that the conflict might end with a situation of "no war and no peace." He said that Communist China, with its doctrine of protracted warfare and declared opposition to negotiations, had gained influence in North Vietnam as a result of the Cambodian operation.

Today Mr. Rogers backtracked somewhat. He suggested that the allied military success in Cambodia "does increase the probabilities that the enemy—somewhere along the line—will negotiate," but he also remarked that this might not happen.

President Nixon told a nationwide television audience on July 1 that the Cambodian operation had changed the military balance in Indochina and that, historically speaking, that was the time when negotiations usually became more fruitful.

He was careful to say that he could not be sure the enemy would negotiate but that he thought the Cambodian success "might help — only time will tell."

Mr. Nixon did not make any references to possible negative effects of the operation on negotiations, as did Mr. Rogers.

## Ziegler Denies Disunity

Mr. Ziegler told newsmen that they should not draw conclusions that there were differences in the Administration on foreign policy. "It is wrong for you to draw the conclusion there is any lack of unanimity," he said. "There is not."

Nonetheless, in a comment that suggested some White House pique at Mr. Rogers, who is known to have spoken out strongly against using American troops in Cambodia, Mr. Ziegler added that there were "no problems where the key decisions are made—that's by the President of the United States; that's where foreign-

policy decisions come from."

It was not apparent whether the difference on the negotiating prospects was a hangover from earlier debates over whether it reflected disagreement on the public posture the Administration should take.

Mr. Rogers went out of his way today, as he put it, "to be sure we don't create false hopes" about the next round of negotiations in Paris after David K. E. Bruce, the new chief American delegate, takes his post in two weeks.

## Divergence on Mideast

On other topics, Secretary Rogers made these points:

¶He expects that any Middle East settlement would require removal of foreign troops from Arab countries, including Soviet combat personnel. Contrary to some White House assessments, Mr. Rogers said he did not think the Soviet Union was trying to establish a permanent combat or military base in the United Arab Republic but was trying to bolster the position of the Arab states.

¶The Soviet Ambassador, Anatoly F. Dobrynin, indicated that the Arabs would reply "before long" to the American appeal for a 90-day standstill cease-fire in the Middle East to allow for resumption of peace talks. Mr. Rogers said he was encouraged that the Soviet leaders meeting in Moscow with the Egyptian President, Gamal Abdel Nasser, were taking so long to produce their response.

¶He shares the view of Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird that the Soviet Union is continuing to build up its force of intercontinental ballistic missiles but he said that this does not adversely affect the prospects for Soviet-American agreement on the limitation of strategic arms in the talks in Vienna.