

6-23-73
2 y 1

... And Others Share Their Later Thoughts on Mr. Buchanan

To the Editor:

Patrick J. Buchanan's latest fling at mental gymnastics could end up costing him his varsity letter 'N,' should the newest White House game plan again have to be called on account of blame.

Like his previous Op-Ed Page contributions, "A White House Response" (June 11) displays an arrogant and pernicious disregard for historical fact. It once again shows that when it comes to the dissemination of what it calls "ideological plugola," the White House marketing team knows few peers.

As Mr. Buchanan knows perfectly well—being the only one at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue who claims to read the papers—the suggestion for a coalition government is based not on the outcome of the 1972 elections but on the programming (read "rigging") of that pseudo event. That if it weren't for Mr. Segretti's pranks during the Florida primary, that spurious "Canuck" letter that White House aide Ken Clawson once claimed credit for (and later rescinded as inoperative) and the many other dirty tricks played before, during and after the actual Watergate burglary, it is quite conceivable that Mr. Nixon might have had to run against a real opponent, Senator Edmund S. Muskie.

Furthermore—given the extrapolations of various pre-Watergate polls that put Mr. Muskie well ahead of Mr. Nixon, or a replay of the contrasting telecasts the night before the '70 midterm election—it is conceivable that Mr. Nixon might have lost the '72 Presidential race.

Possibly it's high time that someone on the "new" White House team take player Buchanan aside and quietly point out to him that even in polemics it is possible to be defensive without becoming offensive.

Another scrimmage like this might give us all an ideological hernia.

F. PERRER MOPPEL
New York City

To the Editor:

Patrick Buchanan implies that the "stealing" of the 1960 Presidential election was a greater scandal than is that of Watergate today.

Let us assume that the election was indeed stolen; two wrongs do not make a right. Watergate is no less of an outrage.

Second, if the election was stolen, the time to complain was November, 1960, not June, 1973.

Third, if, as conservatives charge, Mayor Daley did indeed dig up the ten thousand graveyard votes needed for John Kennedy to take Illinois from Richard Nixon, the electoral vote would still have been Kennedy 277, Nixon 245. Texas, the other closely contested state with an alleged tradition of corrupt politics, gave Kennedy a victory margin of 46,000 votes, a margin too large for doubt.

Mr. Buchanan ought to be aware that there are very good reasons why his boss, President Nixon, has never challenged the result of the 1960 Presidential election. MARK WESTON
Armonk, N.Y.

To the Editor:

I found Patrick Buchanan's column opposing suggestions that Mr. Nixon resign or open his Administration to bipartisan control, truly remarkable. The entire thrust of Mr. Buchanan's defense is Mr. Nixon's stunning "mandate of 1972," in which he amassed a 60 per cent majority. For Mr. Nixon to share power with others, the argument goes, would be to "betray the mandate."

What Mr. Buchanan does not dis-

cuss, however, is that in the six months since the election Mr. Nixon's popularity and the public's confidence in him have plummeted to all-time lows. Recent polls indicate that only 45 per cent of the electorate now approve of the way Mr. Nixon is handling the Presidency. Even more devastating is that 41 per cent believe Mr. Nixon had actual knowledge of the Watergate cover-up.

In view of these indications of current public opinion and the ever-tightening circle around the President, hiding behind Mr. Nixon's "mandate" seems both pathetic and absurd.

LEWIS M. TAFFER
Pittsburgh

To the Editor:

I was so contented by Mr. Buchanan's article that I sat down to write a letter to a newspaper, a thing I do not believe in doing.

For months and months I have been reading your newspaper and the tone of your articles and reports has been, it seemed to me, that you dislike the people who voted for Nixon, you think they didn't know what they were doing and you were sure you could convince them of their wrong-headedness. I voted for Nixon. I would do so again today, especially if he ran against McGovern.

I am a Democrat or anyway I have a liberal-progressive background. So many of us voted for Nixon. He was, and is, more experienced. He re-established contact with the most numerous people in the world. We must have peace. In order to have peace we must talk with each other. He is trying to get to do something about relating to Russia as well. This I know without reading your interminable boring and spiteful articles about his troubles. I never voted for The New York

Times. Unfortunately I must buy it. There is no other paper to read. The TV news is, if anything, more hateful to the people who do not think Ellsberg and Jack Anderson saints and would vote again for Nixon right now if push came to shove. Of course it is sad and mortifying, the whole thing. Embarrassing. But I would surely love to bug the files of The New York Times myself. Boy, O boy, what a dirty bag of laundry you must have there!

ROSE DRACHTER
Brooklyn, N. Y.

To the Editor:

One comes to only one conclusion: Mr. Buchanan is as isolated from the world around him as is his mentor. Just as Mr. Nixon reassures himself by wrapping a national security blanket around him, Mr. Buchanan allows himself to be mesmerized by the apparent landslide of the 1972 national election that seems to support the legitimacy of our current regime.

As for the 1972 national election, it goes down in history as not only the most blatantly purchased undertaking the G.O.P. has made to date, but also as the one in which the least number of eligible voters participated. To take the results of such a poorly subscribed event and tout them as any kind of a mandate is to reveal an intimate knowledge of a popular book of a few years ago, "How to Lie With Statistics." Then to use the results of state preferential primary elections, the most notorious, nonparticipatory, and therefore nondemocratic events in our political process to clinch his thesis, is to add insult to injury.

STEPHEN F. DUFFY
Sea Bright, N. J.

To the Editor:

There are no more refreshing and imaginative views than those of Mr.

Buchanan. He is a Galbraith of our Republican party.

But let's consider what is apparently the President's and his position that any alteration of the Presidency, or even in the composition of the Administration, would constitute "the brokered disfranchisement of forty million Americans, the imposition upon the majority, of men and policies they have repeatedly rejected."

Mr. Buchanan overlooks that when the forty million voted they did not know a lot of things they have since learned. No need to recte them again, either gavel to gavel, or indictment to indictment.

When there is even talk of grounds for impeachment, or actual indictments of Cabinet members; or paralysis of the executive branch; and above all, a drop-off of public confidence from a Gallup doing-job-well-rating of about 70 per cent to less than 50 per cent, must not one, even of the colorful and partisan Buchanan strain, concede that some major step, giving promise of integrity for the future, is in the public interest?

And is there any surer way to achieve this than by bringing in a Vance, a Ball, or some of the other able members of the "opposition" whose abilities and integrity are unquestionable? The imperatives are no different than those prompting the appointment of prosecutor Cox.

I do hope that our Republican party in these, to say the least, unusual times, does not prove itself so insecure as to reject this surest way to bring about unity, the kind of unity that is so obviously needed to restore our Government's effectiveness, internationally, economically, and, most importantly, morally.

ETHAN A. HINGENCOCK
New York City