

Editor — By overthrowing President Allende, the military has not only violated the Chilean Constitution and offended Allende's followers, but also stirred world opinion.

The military leaders claim to have complete control of the country, but the question remains just what kind of control and how are they going to make it work? How are they going to restore confidence to approximately 44 per cent of the population who supported Allende's coalition, the Popular Unity? Obviously not by jailing, persecuting and executing the leaders and the active supporters of the Popular Unity as they are now doing. How are they going to improve the economy in shambles that Allende inherited from Eduardo Frei and other previous administrations? Obviously not by naming Eduardo Frei the new president . . .

With this coup d'état, the so-called "low profile" doctrine of the Nixon Administration toward Latin America has been fully exposed once again. While the U.S. did its best to impose an economic blockade of Chile and cooled its relations with the Allende government, it kept providing, perhaps in greater amounts, military aid to the Chilean armed forces with the hope, as it has happened in the past, that sooner or later it would overthrow Allende. . .

ENRIQUE RANGEL.

Visalia.

• • •

Editor — Would President Nixon adopt a "hands off policy" if he were advised that a communist takeover of the French government was set for the following day, as he allegedly did in the case of Chile? Not likely. Mr. Nixon is hardly known for a "hands off policy" (cf. Vietnam, Cambodia, the Democratic National Headquarters, Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office etc.). Any American interested in promoting the cause of democracy throughout the world

will deplore Mr. Nixon's passive (at least) participation in the coup d'état against President Allende, and his callousness in not even expressing regret over the assassination of a constitutionally elected leader. Of course, the Watergate revelations including the CIA-ITT connection in Chile, go a long way toward explaining Mr. Nixon's actions, for if there is one lesson to be learned from Watergate it is that Mr. Nixon cares little for the personal freedom and the liberty of those, like Allende, who do not agree with him.

MERRITT RUHLEN.

Stanford.

• • •

Editor — . . . It will be instructive to observe changes in the spectrum of U.S. aid to Chile once the generals have become secure in Santiago. Our non-military aid to Chile's freely elected government was squeezed to a virtual trickle during Allende's incumbency. Our aid to the friendly armed forces, meanwhile, soared.

Let us watch closely. If the American pursestrings are now loosened in a flood of economic aid to the junta, the sham of our majestic innocence and rectitude in this sorry matter will be exposed to all.

JOHN W. RATCLIFFE.

San Mateo.

• • •

Editor — Linus Pauling is protesting Chile's coup. Four other Nobel Prize winners are requesting a commission to be sent to Chile to protect those 10,000 to 15,000 "political refugees." Their protests and worries are not justified. Probably they are ignoring the fact (due to incomplete and unfair reporting in the press) that the Chilean supreme court, whose decisions were ignored in Allende's regime, is intact and supporting the junta, together with the Christian-Democrats and the national parties. They represent the Chilean judiciary and more than 70 per cent of the popular vote. They

would not allow an unfair treatment of prisoners.

It is really unbelievable how the thinking of those five intellectual celebrities goes. They worry about thousands of foreign guerrillas armed up to their teeth and seeking violent destruction of the institutions of their host country. . .

RICHARD WETTKE.

San Francisco.

• • •

Editor — The recent coup by the military junta in Chile resulting in Allende's fall and the destruction of his Marxist regime merely again confirms Machiavelli's statement about Savonarolla concerning unarmed prophets.

A group of puerile academes gabbling nonsense about CIA involvement doesn't alter the fact that if you don't have the military with you, you're taking a hell of a chance . . .

J. A. BABANDO.

Santa Cruz.

• • •

Editor — The violent downfall of the Allende regime in Chile may not appear to threaten world peace, but it could well do so. Allende's regime stood for a more equitable sharing of wealth, without opulence at one end or desperate poverty at the other.

It is this inequality of wealth which is the "most explosive issue of our time," according to Mexico's President Luis Echeverria . . .

President Nixon strongly opposed Allende's regime and helped to bring it down through boycott, especially after Allende nationalized the American copper interests there. Thus he was opposing that nation's right to its own resources and a more equitable sharing of the world's wealth.

The hostile U.S. attitude and the violent coup are, in effect, telling the people of the underdeveloped world, you can't have significant change by electoral means.

GREGORY BERGMAN.

Berkeley.