

Letters to the Editor

Buchanan: The Imperfect 'Prince'

To the Editor:

Patrick Buchanan's appearance before the Watergate committee showed us, with startling clarity, an interesting phenomenon that appears to be at the root of the White House malaise. For weeks, in the appearances of the young men from the White House culminating in the testimony of Mr. Buchanan, we have seen these princes of the realm come before the cameras to whine about our treatment of toads.

When Mr. Buchanan speaks of his attacking the "establishment," it is hard to keep in mind that an established prince is addressing us. What could be more established than the Nixon Administration of 1972? But instead of recognizing their position ("I am the President"), they are busily attacking the "establishment."

Evidently by "establishment," the White House means the intellectual establishment. They want everything—power, position and intellectual assent. When the whole loaf of bread is theirs, they cannot even countenance a little leavening of dissent, without fearfully coming to the conclusion: We are not the establishment—*They* are.

It is both amazing and instructive to see how tough, cool, arrogant and hard-nosed men can be without having the power of self-confidence that allows others to differ without being objects of attack.

If Richard Nixon knew who he was and the White House princes knew

they were princes, not toads, Watergate would still be an office and apartment complex, not our name for things that go bump in the night.

EDWARD MCC. ROBERTS
Noroton, Conn., Sept. 27, 1973

To the Editor:

Patrick Buchanan argued forcefully before the Senate Select Committee that President Nixon's 1972 election "was not stolen" in the sense that it was not fraudulent or a "political coup by the President of the United States." It was rather surprising to see the committee appear to acquiesce in Buchanan's supporting arguments, which dealt largely with strategies and tactics of the primary campaigns and of the Democratic Convention.

Surely the overriding fact is that the White House cover-up of Watergate and its other "horrors" represented a campaign fraud of massive proportions on the American people. It is hard to believe that Nixon could have obtained anything like the vote he did if by last November we had known even half of what has now been revealed.

No one can be sure that McGovern would have been elected, of course, but it is not stretching logic to say that Nixon's election was a "political coup" under the circumstances.

ROBERT N. MAGILL
Foreign Service Officer (retired)
Morristown, N. J., Sept. 27, 1973

'Face Value' Under Assault

To the Editor:

One of the frightening effects of watching the Watergate hearings is the feeling that we can no longer trust in the reality of our experience.

We have witnessed so much facade, contrivance and deception in our political and economic processes—planted demonstrations, fabricated telegrams and pamphlets, members of one political party masquerading as members of the opposition, etc.—that one has the sensation of living in a kind of movie-set society where the people and the buildings look real but are actually hollow.

In considering the damage Watergate has done to so many of our accepted values, perhaps the one that has been most dangerously undermined is face value—that reality is what we perceive it to be. Our common acceptance of this principle is essentially the cement that holds a society together.

ROBERT STRUNSKY
Kingston, N. J., Sept. 26, 1973