

Illogical Vietnamization

Dear Editor:
 Philip C. Clarke deplures "the illogic of pundits who demand total, unilateral United States withdrawal from Vietnam." [Letter, March 31.]

And he applauds President Nixon's policy of "gradual withdrawal." However, the pre-election promise was "a plan to end the war." Would Mr. Clarke not agree that by the end of President Nixon's term, the war not yet having ended, the promise was broken and four years of "gradual withdrawal" is attenuating even "gradual"? Or does he suggest perpetuating our presence there?

He asks that Americans "give Vietnamization the support it deserves." The idea that over five and a half million United States armed forces, together with one million South Vietnamese armed forces, plus contingents from South Korea, Thailand, Australia and other such allies could not inflict military defeat upon the "enemy" but that Vietnamization (that is, letting the South Vietnamese unilaterally undertake the fighting) could do so was a hoax and a farce even in its most halcyon days. But to advance such a preposterous chimera now, after the rout of the cream of our Vietnamized troops in Laos—what was it you said about "illogic"?

BERNARD BRODSKY
 Far Rockaway, N. Y., March 31, 1971