

litor (NDO)

## If We Abandon Saigon And Phnom Penh...

To the Editor:

A Communist - pacifist - isolationist coalition, backed by the Democratic leadership in Congress, seems determined to force Communism upon South Vietnam and Cambodia by cutting off further U.S. financial aid. What are the arguments advanced for this suicidal policy?

1. Saigon has repeatedly violated the 1973 cease-fire agreement.

Blame for the cease-fire collapse rests squarely upon Hanoi. When the Canadian delegation withdrew in disgust from the International Control Commission set up to oversee the cease-fire, it charged Hanoi with primary responsibility for continuation of the fighting.

2. No matter what support we provide to Saigon and Phnom Penh, the Communists will crush both Governments eventually, so why prolong the agony?

This defeatist argument crops up whenever pro-democratic causes are under mortal challenge. Charles Lindbergh assured us that the Nazi war machine could not be defeated even if the U.S. entered World War II. After the war, how often did we hear that Communism was the wave of the future and that it was useless for the American people to aid the threatened Western European democracies?

The people of South Vietnam and Cambodia have demonstrated that they are opposed to Communism far more than they are to their present obviously inadequate Governments. They are fighting bravely against Communist aggression despite the slashing of American aid.

3. "We must stop the killing."

Yet we know very well that mass killings will go on if the Communists crush the Saigon and Phnom Penh armies. Everyone suspected of opposition to a Communist regime will be hunted down. When Hanoi's troops captured the city of Hue, execution squads carrying lists of their intended victims rounded up and butchered several thousand anti-Communists.

4. Thieu and Lon Nol are dictators and don't deserve our support.

If we abandon the Saigon and Phnom Penh Governments we are in fact supporting the establishment of much more repressive Communist dictatorships. We are obliterating the strong potential for evolution toward democracy evident in both South Vietnam and Cambodia. Worse still, we are opening the door to large-scale killing through Communist-instigated insurrections in Thailand, Malaya, Singapore and Burma.

Do we really want to tell the world that America is a faithless ally, scrap our great investment of blood and treasure in South Vietnam and signal the Communist powers that they may proceed unopposed with future "wars of national liberation"? If so, we are almost certainly setting the stage for a much greater war of national survival.

RONALD S. KAIN

Washington, Feb. 6, 1975

To the Editor:

There is Appalachia; there are people who cannot make it without food stamps; there are the aged who need a nursing home but can't get in; there are those on marginal Social Security obliged to pay rents so high that there is little left for the other necessities of life; there are the many unemployed seeking jobs; there are schools desperately in need of repair and upgrading; there are bright, eager and hopeful youngsters yearning for an education but without enough money to make it; there are slums, and there are cities rotting; there is an urgent need for mass transportation and for decent housing for millions, and for playgrounds and day-care centers.

Yet, did we not just hear that this Administration proposes to give another \$550 million to South Vietnam? And did we not just hear that our ongoing aid to Cambodia is being diverted to that Government's so-called "enemy insurgents"? We had thought that this nation, having been blistered, battered and exhausted both physically and financially in Southeast Asia, and having mortgaged its children's future by its arrogant misuse of power, would have renounced its policy of challenging the little Communists while romancing the big ones.

R. STANLEY BANK, M.D.

Harrisburg, Pa., Jan. 31, 1975

To the Editor:

A letter written to the editor on Jan. 31 deploring increased aid to South Vietnam said that a peace agreement was signed two years ago, our troops were withdrawn and our prisoners of war came home. This last statement does not sit well with me. Only a portion of our prisoners of war came home, a fact of which everyone should be aware. Too many people are willing to write off 1,300 men while the President and the State Department are asking for support for Thieu's unpopular Government in South Vietnam. So many men died uselessly, and we still will not allow peace to come to Vietnam.

The sister of an M.I.A., I do not want to be in Washington, throwing any additional red carnations or carrying any additional lighted candles in honor of our prisoners of war and our M.I.A.'s I don't believe we have a "moral obligation" to support South Vietnam in a war with North Vietnam. I believe we have a moral obligation to heal the wounds and to soothe the anguish which the war in Vietnam has inflicted upon the peoples of Vietnam and upon ourselves.

PAULA B. COPACK

New York, Jan. 31, 1975