

Editor's Mail Box

Viewpoints on Watergate report

To the Editor:-

Deeply moved by the courageous report of William Randolph Hearst Jr. ("A facing of facts," May 2). It was stern but compassionate. The words of the transcripts lead us to a conclusion identical to yours:

**DAVID and
VIRGINIA THOMPSON**
Aptos

Congratulations on the best Editor's Report to date. The choice of metaphors and analogies adroitly exposed the whole Watergate mess for what it is . . . Most importantly the facts have been examined, the evidence weighed, the truth discerned and the opinion courageously expressed . . .

GEORGE REBISCHUNG
San Francisco

The report is verbose, at times articulate, generally comprised of conjecture and innuendo and is consistently lacking in one thing: no place does Hearst set forth one impeachable offense committed or alleged to have been committed by President Richard M. Nixon. The reason, of course, is that the President is wholly innocent and has been completely candid with the American people who fortunately will not be influenced by Mr. Hearst's falacious rhetoric.

THOMAS M. EDWARDS
San Francisco

The report was tough and brilliant. Why should we Democrats join him in killing this goose as long as he keeps laying these golden eggs.

GORDON McCARTHY
Palo Alto

Mr. Hearst has finally become disenchanted with the deceit and immorality of the President. All I can say is welcome at long last, to the club.

ARTHUR J. OST
Foster City

Mr. Hearst now seems sure that the President has a "moral blind spot." Moral blind spots seem to be a common disability afflicting not only Nixon but Hearst himself and 95 percent of American publishers . . .

STUART OLIVER
Oakland

Hearst is to be commended for his Editor's Report. I suppose it's too much to hope that someday Hearst will realize that Governor Reagan is just as despicable as President Nixon.

SAM HUGHES
San Francisco

Richard M. Nixon's place in U.S. history is assured. He will be credited with reforming the U.S. Constitution, a reform that must take place . . . The "Nixon amendment" or the "bill of wrongs" will guarantee that never again can a handful of men hold this country hostage, meanwhile defiling the institutions and offices that held us together for almost 200 years.

PAUL PRINCE
San Francisco

In that eventful month of March, Mr. Nixon could have announced that he was going to burn the tapes - and then do so publicly. While the flames crackled and the smoke rose, he could have acknowledged his downright carelessness through-

out the campaign overkill and I believe he would be in the clear today . . .

SEAN FARRELL
San Francisco

It would have been so easy to sit by and not say anything because the President is an old friend . . . I hope that others in all fields will fall in line and think "our country first" and try to end the confusion we are in.

H. WILLIAM WAY
San Francisco

The Editor's Report is commendable. Yet still what is incomprehensible to me is that it took so long to realize what at least 20 million of us knew in 1972 . . . I guess it's better late than never but at what price? That is most sorrowful.

MARILYN CHRISTENSEN
San Francisco

Mr. Hearst is to be congratulated for *finally* coming to the realization of what Nixon is really like: the head of a gang . . .

BRUCE W. NUSBAUM
San Francisco

Mr. Hearst's well presented points are shared by many of us, regarding the strange and limited thinking of our President. One finds himself both sad, embarrassed and disillusioned . . .

VAUGHN BAKER
Vallejo

A few weeks ago Mr. Hearst was calling those of us who attacked the conduct of Mr. Nixon "jackals." Our jaundiced eye is now cast on a weasling Congress, who will start accusatory proceedings with only the evidence the accused selects for them to have and defended by an experienced criminal attorney . . .

WILLIAM COYLE
Project City

The excellent column by William R. Hearst on "A conflict of rights," (April 28) is vitiated by an assumption regarding "freedom of the press" which is unfounded. He assumes that the press provides all varieties of opinion as well as balanced presentation of the news . . . No editorial writer is free in the sense that he may independently write in opposition to the views of the owner or publisher who has sole control.

Almost steadily since FDR the papers have marched together to endorse the Republican candidate for President. It is hard to believe that the majority of them will not express their joy if Mr. Nixon is NOT impeached.

Liberal columnists are accepted. Note that most of them live in Washington, have no part to play in

the papers they write for, except to write. Adverse opinions to especially outrageous editorials may be attempted . . . and invariably they are rejected as too long . . . Freedom of the press is both a precious treasure and a large suppressed reality in this country . . . not by government but by the owners of the newspapers . . .

**REV. RALPH DOUGLAS
HYSLOP**
Menlo Park