



U. S. INFORMATION SERVICE  
PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS BRANCH

FILE  
DATE 8/69  
SUBJ  
SUB-CAT

SPECIAL REPORT

## ニュース特報

TEXT OF AN INTERVIEW BY SECRETARY OF STATE ROGERS  
ON THE SINO-SOVIET BORDER CLASH AND THE VIETNAM LULL  
FOR NATIONWIDE TELECASTING BY AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.  
SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 1969

(John Scali) The first question deals with today's reported fighting between Russian and Chinese troops in Sinkiang Province. Is there danger of the conflict escalating into all-out war?

(Secretary Rogers) I think our best assessment is that there probably will not. The Chinese Communists would be very ill-advised to attack the Soviet Union because they are inferior militarily. Furthermore, the Soviet Union has placed a lot of military equipment in that border area and they have a lot of men there. So, I would doubt very much if the Chinese Communists would start that kind of attack. I think that, on the other hand, that the Soviet Union would recognize -- does recognize -- that any attack on the mainland of China might enmesh them or involve them in a situation that would be very difficult for them to cope with. They might have initial victories, but because of the tremendous manpower of Communist China they might well get bogged down in mainland China in a long, long war. So I doubt very much if they would start it.

There always is a possibility though, that these border clashes could escalate into a major conflict and that's one of the things we would very much oppose. We'd be very unhappy if that occurred.

(Scali) How do we stand in this argument, Mr. Secretary? Are we neutral?

May be reproduced with or without attribution to the U.S. Information Service.

69-87

AMERICAN EMBASSY - TOKYO

(The Secretary) Well, I don't like to say we're neutral. Our position is that we are going to attempt to become more friendly with both the Soviet Union and Communist China, and we're not going to play one against the other. We're not going to exploit the differences between the two. But we are going to see if we can relieve tensions by becoming friendly with both of them.

(Scali) On Vietnam, sir, does it look as if the lull is over now?

(The Secretary) I think it's too early to tell whether the lull is over or not. We're naturally disappointed that the enemy has decided at this time to step up the offensive. But whether it's of short duration and whether it's merely an attempt to show us that they're not discouraged by the losses they've taken, we're not sure.

We hope it's not an end to the lull. We hope that the lull continues because if the enemy was willing to deescalate the war in this manner, even though they failed to communicate with us, then we have to take that into our calculations in deciding what steps to take next.

\*\*\*