

SF Chronicle APR 26 1973
Congress would dare suggest raising individual taxes now, after last year's huge corporate tax giveaway, so we're going to pay the piper through inflation. . . .

You think the war is over, but this is just a lull to recycle POWs. . . . If you didn't care six years ago, why should you care now? Because even if you don't give a damn how many slopes get shot on, you sure as hell squeal about the price of hamburger.

Look at it this way: every day the slaughter roars on is another cent on the price of beef.

CHARLES T. HOARD.

Oakland.

Editor — Thirty-five dollars a week as an economy budget for a family of four? Who's kidding whom? . . .

ELLEN SMITH.

Palo Alto.

In Three Acts

Editor — The Watergate scenario is now unfolding in exactly the sequence that might have been anticipated. Administration involvement was successfully obscured until after the election. Then when it became so obvious to all that somebody higher up than Hunt, Liddy or McCord must have been involved, the President bravely announced that his investigation (!) had revealed such involvement.

The next "act" will start with the resignation of some higher-ups under a cloud (as in the case of Sherman Adams). It will reach a climax with a "Checkers-type" speech, replete with noble phrases and Ben Franklin maxims, in which all that has happened will be turned to the advantage of the Administration.

The third "act" is not so predictable; it will depend on the American public. Will it recognize that the Watergate is not unique, but is typical of the way the current Administration operates?

Watergate has distracted the attention of the public from many other affairs that are a departure

from the ethical standards of conduct we have demanded of our elected officials and civil servants. These include the ITT affair, the leak of information on the Russian grain deal to the benefit of certain insiders, Mexican money, the favors to the dairy industry in return for political contributions, the technicalities resorted to in order to avoid disclosure of other political contributors (who probably received similar favors).

If Watergate dominates our public attention, the key members of the Administration who directed the foregoing incidents will be permitted to continue in office and do more of the same. The suspense in this "play" will be provided by the reaction of the American public in the next election. Will they perceive what is happening but accept it on the basis that they all do it? Or will they demand an upgrading of the ethical standards which guide the actions of our elected officials?

HARRY J. GOETT

Los Altos Hills

Editor — I hope Jean Larkin has seen her President on television completely reversing his stand on Watergate . . . It was indeed a stupid act, but well financed with huge amounts of money that was shuttled around in another country to cover the source of the donors.

ARTHUR E. LEGIER.

Hydesville.

Questions

Editor — I have some questions for Mr. Tawasha of the Arab Information Office, whose letter you published April 17.

Who created the refugee problem? Who has kept it alive for 25 years? How many refugees has Syria accepted? Egypt? Iraq? Libya? How many million acres of Arab land, now lying idle, could be made to bloom if settled by these refugees? How many billions of dollars in Arab oil revenue is being allocated to take care of them? . . .

REBECCA HORN.

San Francisco.