

Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican of Arizona, wrote three articles for the Op-Ed Page of The Times in which he assessed the effects of Watergate on the nation and on his party. Senator Goldwater called for a "complete clearing of the air," and said that a new sense of conservatism was needed in the highest councils of government. He also speculated on who

SEP 22 1973

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1973

might lead the country out of its malaise. Readers responded strongly to the article.

Then on September 14, Bob Brumfield, a Cincinnati columnist, wrote a short essay in which he excoriated housewives for what he held to be their various shortcomings, and he wound up by saying that housewives made him "sick." Many, many, many readers answered.

Some Readers Take Mr.

To the Editor:

In his first article, Senator Goldwater makes a fervent plea for fairness to the Administration—and political stability on the part of the American people.

But like so many others, he complains about the *effects* rather than the *causes* of so much that is troubling all of us today. Let him address himself to the deceptions of a Government determined to wage a war that was immoral and illegal.

Let him address himself to the acts of governmental encouragement of violent protest, through paid informers, to create an atmosphere of civil strife.

Let him address himself to the acts of an Administration whose key members have dealt in illegal wiretapping, burglary, perjury, improper and illegal use of Government agencies, and other acts that have eroded the faith of a nation.

For in the final analysis, the courts have begun to assume their roles in the resolution of the guilt or innocence of men who may or may not have attempted to subvert the principles of our Constitution. The courts are dealing with cynical men who relied on a people's faith in Government to shield them from disclosure and punishment. Spies on campaign trains in any election will never command the attention of a nation or shake its faith—even though they shake former candidate Goldwater.

But Senator Goldwater does devote one paragraph to what I believe goes to the heart of the matter: America has survived disasters that have destroyed other nations and forms of government. And, as a people, we have the inner strength and faith to overcome the divisive political and economic strains that began over a decade ago.

BERNARD D. GARY
Bronxville, N. Y.

To the Editor:

I fully agree with Senator Goldwater that it is contrary to our American ideals to practice "the end justifies the means" whether it is done by the right or the left, the liberals or the conservatives. Unfortunately it was this pernicious doctrine which seemed to be inspiring the Nixon team until recently. We must thank Watergate for exposing it and for having President Nixon assure us that it won't happen again.

I had hoped that Senator Goldwater would take the opportunity to declare inoperative his own Weatherman version of the same doctrine pronounced by him some years ago, i.e., "Extremism in pursuit of liberty is no vice." Instead he joins those trying to equate attempts directed from within the White House to subvert or "tilt" our constitutional form of government with the McCarthy horrors. This seriously weakens his position as leader of the conservatives, to help bring our Government back into proper balance. WALTER A. SHELDON

Lido Beach, N. Y.

To the Editor:

Barry Goldwater is once again seen at his best. After muddying the waters for approximately 2,300 words, he describes Watergate in its "proper terms"—deplorable, illegal, un-American, frightening, scandalous, reprehensible, and lest we forget, stupid. . . .

He finally calls upon the courts to work "the kind of justice in which our nation has always prided itself."

In between, he vilifies the televised Senate hearings, Senator Ervin, the news media, the courts and Congress, as well as "political spokesmen, commentators and editorial writers who have pilloried the Watergate guilty."

I for one do not feel that "Watergate" is anything but the very tip of an extremely large iceberg—and thank God for the stupidity which exposed that tip.

LEE DRECHSLER
Palisades, N. Y.

To the Editor:

Senator Goldwater's second thoughtful article in The Times raises a very serious matter of definition. According to this article the liberal viewpoint in this country calls for "unlimited government, excessive Federal spending, endless engineering in the area of social welfare, unilateral disarmament and a policy of isolationism in foreign affairs." Further on it refers to the liberals as having been led "to the virtual enshrining of Angela Davis, the Berrigan brothers, the peace rioters and the war dissenters even though serious violations of the law were involved."

The overwhelming majority of thoughtful men and women calling themselves liberals would certainly describe liberalism as "tolerance, concern and compassion," whereas the Senator seems to see liberalism as

Goldwater to Task, and...

"self-righteousness, espousal of causes and arrogance." If the choice is between conservatism and "tolerance, concern and compassion," then it is surely the latter and not the former that best expresses the American soul.

S. J. TREVES
New York City

To the Editor:

There seems to be a great contradiction as to how he wants to "clear the air" on Watergate. On one hand, he wishes to put aside the verbal indictments raging back and forth among the press, Congressmen, and White House staff, leaving the job of justice to its rightful place, in the courts. On the other hand, he openly advocates a nationally televised debate between the chairman of the select committee and the President.

Is it possible that the Senator is talking from both sides of his mouth?

SUSAN DANOW
Hartsdale, N. Y.

To the Editor:

The second of the three Goldwater articles read more like a propagandist's tract than an essay on Watergate which was conceived with any degree of detachment. The Senator protests a rival columnist's assertion that "Goldwaterism," as manifested in the 1964 Presidential campaign, was spiritual ancestor to the excesses and crimes of the 1972 campaign, by writing, in part, that in his campaign, "... the extremists and radical types did not predominate or even come to my attention very often." Aside from the curiously equivocal nature of this disclaimer, I would refer the Senator to Nelson Rockefeller, who literally was hooted from the dais at the Republican convention controlled by his supporters, because he dared to contest the Arizona's candidacy.

He raises a strawman of liberal efforts to equate Watergate with conservative principles (an equation I have only seen or heard in like rhetoric of conservative spokesmen) and proceeds to denounce the same as the "big lie." Yet can any observer who has yet to be completely polarized by the times believe, as Senator Goldwater wrote, that citizens of liberal political persuasion "urged" the burning of draft cards, or "cheered" the desertion of military men? I count myself as a liberal and I have scorned the former as an empty and frivolous

act of exhibitionism, and decried the latter as a serious crime. No more do I, or other liberals, maintain that conservatives urged the "irregularities" of Watergate, or continue to cheer (I hope) the apparently congenital difficulty of Barry Goldwater with use of the English language.

If there exists a "vicious double standard," as the Senator claims, it is in the minds of politicians like Barry Goldwater and Richard Nixon, who palm themselves off as paragons of moral virtue while continuing to pursue the lowest common denominator of political discourse.

HERMANN ROSENBERGER 2d
Philadelphia

To the Editor:

Senator Goldwater perpetuates the myth of the President's "24-hour-a-day battle with the news media."

This pseudo "war" is of Mr. Nixon's own making. Mr. Nixon's most recent press conference was still another example: the premise of a hostile media out "to get him."

For someone with immediate access to all major channels at will—the image of a media-harried Chief Executive is fuzzy indeed.

DOUGLAS BRIN
New York City

To the Editor:

Mr. Goldwater speaks for conservatism with the voice of reaction, while ascribing to liberalism the actions of radicalism. But how many real people are pure any of those four categories? In case after case, real people choose liberalism when their own interests are at stake while opting for conservative treatment of others' goals. Hopefully, few will regard as gospel Mr. Goldwater's oversimplifications, generalizations and categorizations.

PAUL B. LEVINE
Hamden, Conn.

To the Editor:

As a liberal Democrat it is refreshing to read the common sense by Senator Barry Goldwater. At this moment I see Senator Goldwater himself as the Republican "Mr. Clean" and Mr. Clark Clifford as the Democrat "Mr. Clean." In my own 1976 fantasy this would give the American people a choice of two men of maturity, experience and objectivity. It would be the cleanest election in our history.

O. GREGORY BURNS Jr.
Washington