The recent South Vietnamese invasion of Laos is significant in several respects.

First, it demonstrates that the people of that besieged nation are determined to resist ON ALL FRONTS the totalitarian "liberators" from the North.

Second, the absence of Moral Outrage which swept the campuses last spring after Cambodia

seems to suggest either that the option by the South Vietnamese for freedom is hardly a position to criticize; or that it is just too cold outside for any expression of said outrage. (So much for their passionate convictions).

Thirdly, that the invasion is justified can scarcely be denied. In 1962, a treaty signed by North Vietnam went into effect. In this treaty, that government agreed to respect the neutrality of Laos and to refrain from using supply routes through Laos. That same treaty has been flagrantly violated by the Hanoi regime is all too obvious. By deliberately breaking the treaty, North Vietnam was well aware that retaliatory consequences were to be expected.

International law also claims that the army of a nation in a state of was is justified in crossing the boundaries of a "neutral" nation, if that neutral nation is being used by the enemy for sanctuaries and supply routes.

Fourthly, the news media glee-fully reports the intensive level of fighting and the heavy losses sustained by the South Vietnamese in the Laotian incursion. What is not pointed out is that the main reason for the action is NOT to liberate Laos from Communist control; it is simply to cut the supply routes which the Communists promised not to use over eight years ago. (And which they have been using for over eight years).

That the U.S. could not win a war in South East Asia is absurd; that it refuses to win is fact. We are in the process of turning the war over to the peoples of Indochina; and I, for one, am glad that they are not as fearful as we of victory.

Mary Fisk