WXFost Dear President Thieu MAY ...

ELEASE OF THE text of two letters that President Nixon wrote President Thien removes what few doubts remained about the nature of Mr. Nixon's promises to meet with force any North Vietnamese violations of the Paris Accords. On Nov. 14, 1972, he pledged, "swift and severe retaliatory action" and on Jan. 5. 1973, he promised to "respond with full force," Against, these words one must set Henry Kissinger's statement on Jan. 25, 1973, the day the accords were signed-There are no secret understandings." Would we reacts with force to North Vietnamese violations? he was asked. He replied, "I don't want to speculate on hypothetical situations that we don't expect to arise." With the Nixon letters now published, presumably the Ford administration will stoo pretending that nothing was offered secretly that was not explained publicly at the time. That argument is over

But what about Mr. Nixon, Reflect on the nature of the policy that he inherited and that he himself pursued, one of conducting a limited war whose success depended on convincing the enemy that the United States would hang in indefinitely and on convincing an increasingly restive American public that the United States would get out. Concealment and dissimulation were not aristrary, a mere bureaucratic convenience they were fundamental to the nature of the policy. At virtually any point in the war, to have informed the public of the costs and risks that officials privately felt lay shead would have invited the public's refusal to go along, which in turn would have invited a level of dissent that Hanoi could only take as evidence that the United States would not hang in In brief, the policy could not succeed if the people were to be told the full truth about it. Its fundamental flaw, in fact, may well have been its incompatibility with the workings of a free and open society.

So it was from the beginning in Vietnam, throughout the war, and at the end. Fresident Thier was deeply alarmed—and, as events showed, not without reason—that the Paris Accords let North Vietnam keep

troops in the South. But President Nixon was mined to end American involvement in the v to recover American POW. And for the latte pose, if not the former, he required an agreement only between the United States and Hanoi but tween Hanol and Saigon. To gain Mr. Thieu's sugfor the necessary accords. Mr. Nixon thus founnecessary to promise "full force." Had he of a that promise South Vietnam might have balk the withdrawal of the remaining American tree denounced Washington and refused to sign the arments with Hanoi, Had he made the promise but North Vietnam might have refused to accept the cefire terms with the South. This almost cortainly have torpedued the agreement on the Polyte a all of the various two-sided agreements and various parties-Hanoi, Saigon and Washington were interlecked and conditioned on each offer, a gress and the American public, of course, would I gone up the wall. Mr. Nixon was the prisoner of own policy

This certainly does not mean that the cinen lying to one's public is tolerable or an mitments to acts of war are acceptable. The a. ... "lesson" is not so much that states, real should be as it is that they should not conceive and or all a sowhose success depends on tying. In Vietne at clear that the necessary foundation of a place of war-a clear impression, conveyed to the sormy, that the United States would stick it out collaborate Aslittle by little, the public's sense of the ready of Vietnam grew, its faste for prosecuting a war there shrank. Unless President Nixon was prepared to charge his policy and to declare that the United States would no longer have anything to do with trying to shape the outcome in Viotnam-in which case he might have been able to recover the LOWe but might also have had some difficulty extracting the American rooms well as civilians still in South Vietnam - 100 eaught in the trap from which he ided to escape a his secret a urances to President Titlet