

# dear editor

Right vs. left

Dear editor,

After all the strikes, marches, sit-ins and arrests that have happened to our community in the past year, and the resentments that both sides have felt over the total situation, I think it is time that both sides try to come to an understanding of why the other side thinks the way it does. This is the main gap that no one has been able to breach yet. When you get right down to it, it is the only block to any progressive, unified action.

For those of you on the left, there is a very good reason why right-wingers, the people presently in power, believe so strongly in the government as 99% good and incapable of doing anything much wrong.

Most of the adult generation was raised in a depression. People had very little of anything, including food and clothing. The central government pulled those people out of that, so naturally a strong government seemed good to them.

Okay, for you people on the right the left has a very good viewpoint, too. The younger generation has not been raised in poverty, at least not most of it. Most everyone in the country has food and clothing and a place to stay.

So left-wingers do not have the same faith in the central government as you do. Where right-wingers see good in more government control, left people see repression of the individual. Where right-wingers see the government's involvement in Asia as protecting freedom and giving our righteous ideals to others, left-wingers see protection of nothing but the economy and world wide status, and forcing our ideals where they may not be wanted. And where right-wingers believe our killing in this war is stopping the spread of Communism, left-wingers see this killing as just that, plain out-right murder.

I have to admit that I lean to the left some, if a right-left definition is necessary. I don't like it when legal demonstrations and rap sessions are "discouraged" when free speech is guaranteed in the Constitution. I don't like it at all when killing is justified for political reasons. That should be against everybody's morals, but it doesn't seem to be. The central government is getting too much control over peoples' minds when somethings like that happens. And I don't like it when people call you "Un-American" because you have long hair or believe in change of the system. So many people think that because a few radicals are stupid enough to blow up some buildings, everybody wanting change thinks that way. Not so. Change when change is needed is encouraged in the Constitution, not discouraged.

Well, for the sake of a conclusion, maybe if everyone read the Constitution it would start a little more understanding. And maybe if everyone read their morals and compared them with what the government is doing in Asia, they might realize we aren't so just in our actions. Maybe, but this would take time, and people don't seem to have much of that anymore.

Doug Raymond



'I WAS LUCKY, MOST OF MY WITNESSES WERE, ER... DECEASED'



Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden

## Jitters at the White House

WASHINGTON—Twice in the last week, President Nixon has gone out of his way publicly to disavow any American intention to interfere with China. There is nevertheless a slight nervousness at the White House, and each time the North Vietnamese make implied threats that "China will not stand by with folded arms," the nervousness increases. We can expect more presidential disavowals.

This is a city with a short memory for political scandal but a long one for blunders in national strategy. But MacArthur's march to the Yalu and the subsequent intervention of Chinese volunteers is very much on Mr. Nixon's mind. As one White House aide put it with grim humor: "You know, they (the Chinese) volunteer at the drop of a shoe."

### No Chinese Intervention

Nevertheless, the White House logic is that China will not intervene, even if the bombing in North Vietnam is stepped up. The logic goes like this:

First, it is argued, North Vietnam does not really want Chinese intervention, no matter how much its spokesmen raise the specter. Ancient animosity and fear are stronger, so the logic goes, than immediate advantage.

Second, as the White House continually points out both publicly and privately, the Chinese have no reason to feel threatened. "We have no intention," says a White House spokesman, "no intention whatever of approaching China's borders." This is a point in logic which may be stronger in Washington than in Peking, which is why it is being trumpeted so loudly.

Third, and most important in White House thinking, is that a Chinese intervention would not accomplish anything. North Vietnam has as many troops as it can get down the Ho Chi Minh Trail, and Chinese troops would only add to the supply problem.

The logic seems sound, but it is the logic of our side, and there remains the possibility that the Chinese won't see it that way. As Sen. George McGovern pointed out in his accusation that President Nixon was flirting with World War III:

"spreading the war in the direction of China is inviting response from the Chinese"

### Chinese logic

In a nightmarish way, it is possible to construct another kind of logic—a Chinese logic, if you will—which leads to another conclusion.

First, it must now be clear to China that Mr. Nixon has no intention of clearing out of Indochina when the President says we are getting out. What he really means is that we will maintain troops there for as long as it is necessary to prop up an anti-Communist government in Saigon. This means an Air Force, and supply and logistics forces, and enough combat troops to protect them for an unforeseeable number of years to come.

Second, the President's assertion that he would place no restrictions on our bombing anywhere in Indochina, and Vice President Ky's hints that the South Vietnamese army might have to enter North Vietnam, might be seen in Peking as threatening a victory over North Vietnam. Former Ambassador Averell Harriman has warned that China would intervene if there was any danger of a full-fledged North Vietnamese defeat.

Third in the nightmare logic is the President's promise that "our air power" would not use tactical nuclear weapons in Indochina. The President's failure to say also that we would not use tactical nuclear weapons on the ground is at least noteworthy. A disavowal of tactical nuclear weapons in any case—considering the Administration's reliance on precision in language to wriggle out of past declaration—would have been preferable.

All three points in the "nightmare" logic point to a wider war, a longer war and the possibility of an unfriendly anti-Communist government on China's borders when the war is done.

It is not the logic of the White House but it is logic that others might find compelling—and that many in Washington find fearful.