

# More on the Endorsement

To the Editor:

In its editorials regarding the Presidency, The Times focuses on two areas which properly establish a profile for achievement: humanitarian and moral priorities for our country and qualities of leadership to implement those goals.

In stating these objectives, it seems to me, your logic fails in recommending Senator McGovern as the preferred candidate to accomplish them. Careful examination of his positions from primary to convention and beyond, reveals a compromising fluidity as his constituency enlarged. I feel his priorities were more available for "pragmatic change" in the political process during eight months of 1972 than your oft-cited litany of Richard Nixon's metamorphosis in the last twenty years of his public service.

Relying on an intuitive feeling toward Senator McGovern's sense of purpose without assurance from previous positive accomplishments weakens your argument in his favor. In contrast, President Nixon's Administration in the last four years has stabilized our inflated economy, created a new direction in foreign policy, proposed genuine realignment in managing our welfare process and, notwithstanding Mr. McGovern's fervor, effectively reduced our commitment in Southeast Asia to the satisfaction of the majority of the American people.

On this last issue, Mr. Nixon has demonstrated responsible leadership in dealing with the Indochina involvement. The noble instinct and desire for total withdrawal does not face the reality of our P.O.W.'s and the orderly establishment of a new government. Students of history realize unilateral altruism, indeed decency, will not by itself guarantee moral reciprocity.

Granted, Mr. McGovern initially forged his primary victories by generating a refreshing high level of integrity in the political process, but if he is unable to articulate his proposals, choose his associates, and determine a resourceful program, particularly in regard to income distribution, then how can he direct a plan of action to reach his goals? I believe that Mr. Nixon has demonstrated leadership in an imperfect social order and that his leadership has reduced the conflicts within our nation, and furthered an accommodation in our relations with the rest of the world.


PETER E. GORRY  
Brooklyn, Oct. 2, 1972

To the Editor:

Our very hearty appreciation for your courageous editorial in support of the candidacy of George McGovern. My wife and I both come from families that have traditionally been supporters of the Republican ticket.

We are proud of the fact that a grandfather in our family, now 82, will cast his vote for George McGovern. He has been a faithful supporter of Republican policies as a retired farmer, but he denominates Richard Nixon "the speculator's President."

Our home is located in an area of farms and small towns. We live among good solid conservative folk whatever their party affiliation. Since we are living in a day when moral issues



Milton Harris

and the climate of our nation is an important concern I trust that you and your readers will be interested in a poll taken in our area. Among the clergy of the Protestant and Catholic churches of this region the vote is five to one in favor of George McGovern.

I am sure that these perceptive servants of the faith are aware of the direction in which our nation should be moving and it is my hope that your editorial endorsement will encourage many others to support a needed change in the leadership of our nation.

OTTO REIMHERR  
Lewisburg, Pa., Oct. 5, 1972

To the Editor:

Having read The Times for many years and its coverage of past Presidential campaigns, I was of the opinion that your newspaper was prepared to endorse Richard Nixon this time. This feeling was based on careful reading of the various accounts reported by those covering the campaign of George McGovern. It was most surprising to me, therefore, to find the endorsement of George McGovern in your newspaper last week.

It is impossible to isolate the Eagleton affair as an aberration and ignore what it tells about George McGovern. All of the excellent qualities attributed to Senator McGovern were brought to the test. We looked for and expected a depth of feeling and sympathy in the candidate; we found shallow expediency. We heard words of unqualified support, only to find that the actions spoke louder than the words and the support crumbled.

In this situation the opportunity existed for George McGovern to demonstrate qualities of kindness, sincerity, forthrightness, credibility and competence.

He failed, and it is not possible for this reader, at least, to feel that failing will not manifest itself again when he is put to another test.

Your Sept. 28 editorial displays a naive desire to trust the words and ignore the reality—hardly what one expects from a great and discerning newspaper.

MARY GOLDBERG  
North Bergen, N. J., Oct. 3, 1972

To the Editor:

I congratulate you on your McGovern editorial.

In the light of the Watergate and wheat scandals, it is a forthright statement for clean government and moral and spiritual values which McGovern stands for.

It is a timely editorial—six weeks before election. It affords people an opportunity to think and digest the endless war in Vietnam—the domestic problems of unemployment and inflation and above all, integrity in government.

The editorial is a shot in the arm in the McGovern campaign. Again, congratulations. JACOB S. POTOFKY  
New York, Sept. 30, 1972  
The writer is General President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

To the Editor:

Political scientists observe—often with disapproval—that the American voter tends to vote on personalities rather than issues and that he tends to vote against a candidate rather than for his opponent. It strikes me, actually, that that's a rather sensible way for the electorate to make its judgments. What is certainly not sensible is to make your judgment that way without enough self-consciousness to recognize what you're doing, for then you're likely to take the defects of the candidate you're against, translate them into the corresponding virtues, and uncritically project these virtues onto your villain's opponent.

It seems to me that this is exactly what The Times has done in its editorial supporting Senator McGovern for President. As one who has voted against Richard Nixon in every Presidential election since I came of age in 1952 (except for 1964, when I voted against his proxy), I cannot dissent from your recital of his flaws. Unfortunately—and that is a word I feel most deeply—I do not see how this translates into a recital of Mr. McGovern's virtues.

On the contrary, it seems to me that the Senator's entire record in public life, as a legislator and as an administrator, can only be characterized as lightweight. His fumbling over issues, over the Vice-Presidential choice, and over the management of his own campaign could be glossed over if they did not confirm the judgment that anyone could have drawn from his earlier history—and which, in fact, most of the working press had drawn until they were dazzled by his supposed "victories" in the primaries.

The electorate is faced with an unappetizing menu this November. Many will probably react by staying away from the feast. I think that it is always possible to choose. Mr. Nixon has two main advantages over his opponent and I shall vote for him because of them: (1) His faults are familiar and, experience has shown, tolerable. Mr. McGovern may be a better President but, on his record, that would be a poor bet, and the chances are entirely too great that he would be worse. (2) President Nixon cannot run for reelection in 1976 but a President McGovern could (and, if history is a guide, probably would). Thus we have two chances to better our present choice four years from now if Mr. Nixon is reelected but probably only one if the Senator wins.

CHARLES CHRISTENSON  
Cambridge, Mass., Oct. 2, 1972



To the Editor:

In your editorial urging people to vote for George McGovern you present many noble aspirations. The trouble is that Mr. McGovern has amply demonstrated that he is not the man capable of carrying them out.

I am writing you as an Independent voter who has never belonged to any political party over the years.

MAY R. MAYERS, M.D.  
New York, Oct. 1, 1972

To the Editor:

The letters opposing The Times' endorsement of Senator McGovern are full of empty rhetoric, and it is not hard to reply.

Courage? An outstanding McGovern quality—in wartime, and as a Democrat campaigning in an overwhelmingly Republican state. And who can forget his superb face-to-face handling of the hostile radicals at the Doral Hotel in Miami? (The sign when Mr. Nixon was there summarizes his Administration: "Closed to the public.")

Eagleton? To anyone who values both compassion and the honest functioning of the democratic process, McGovern was admirable.

Radicalism? Ask radicals. Read all or any McGovern proposals and you see a consistent, indeed heroic effort to preserve the system by making it fair. (The Nixon attack on the Constitution, Congress, the courts, free press, etc., is actually subversive.)

Organizational ability? Outstanding in underdog campaigns for Congress, fruitful administration of the Food for Peace program and the shoestring effort that won the nomination. The wonder is that his present difficulties are not greater—the California challenge, Meany, Eagleton, etc., drained off huge amounts of time and effort.

Ideas? To cite only one, his Economic Conversion Act would help in-



Fred Schwab

dustry and labor work on mass transportation, etc., instead of ABM's, etc.

Economics? His plan has been praised by a Nobel-prize economist, and his often-stated goal is to be fair to the middle-income taxpayer, who bears the welfare burden while the wealthy enjoy loopholes. (Nixon enormously increased unemployment and the deficit, while shrinking the dollar.)

The Times' editorial was too kind to Mr. Nixon, who, among other things, has hurt relations with India, Japan, Canada, Western Europe and more. As to China, he was a roadblock for a generation—to give him credit is to thank him for removing himself.

Gargantuan piles of misinformation blanket America. Your endorsement was a valiant attempt to shed light in a dark world.

ELEANOR CLARK FRENCH  
New York, Oct. 8, 1972

To the Editor:

Since Senator George McGovern "is far behind in the Presidential race" (editorial Sept. 28) it is apparent the vast majority of the American people do not agree with the editors of The Times, who support McGovern's election.

The Times accuses this Administration with "meretricious appeals" ignoring similar appeals by McGovern. It is blind to McGovern's glib rodomontade of peace cynically flung at a nation groping for peace. It ignores his various blandishments calculated to lull a trusting and gullible people into a false sense of security.

The Times recognizes the "ill-considered comments on specific points that McGovern has subsequently modified or corrected." It concedes McGovern's "many faltering statements." A campaign characterized by uncertainty and lack of conviction in his pronouncements do not inspire confidence in a candidate seeking to lead the nation.

How can McGovern "succeed in the next few weeks in getting his basic philosophy of democratic government across to the electorate" when he so miserably failed to do so in the past two years of campaigning?

Mr. McGovern's sincere, but ill-considered, intense, humane appeals may lure emotional segments but fail to impress the intelligence of the majority electorate.

B. GARRISON LIPTON, M.D.  
New York, Sept. 30, 1972

To the Editor:

I noticed that eight out of ten correspondents whose letters appeared Oct. 5 disagreed with your editorial choice of Senator McGovern for President. Is this indicative of the general reader response to your endorsement of Senator McGovern? I'm sure many of your readers would be interested in a tabulation of Times readers. How about a box score—to date.

H. W. HARTMAN  
Mt. Vernon, N. Y., Oct. 5, 1972

In general, the letters published by The Times on each side of a given issue reflect proportionately the number of letters received—except that on subjects on which The Times has taken an editorial position, we give added weight to letters expressing a viewpoint opposed to that of The Times.

Of the letters thus far received commenting on The Times' editorial endorsement of Senator McGovern, 54 percent were favorable.—The Editor.