

NYTimes

The Liberal Menace

To the Editor:

At this moment in the Watergate war, I doubt that any faction will move from its rock-bound position, each side bursting with allegedly valid reasons for predicting victory.

This is why it is incumbent on a biased press to present the one point that has remained unaltered: that is, the reasons for which we voted Nixon are unchanged. The menace of tyrannizing liberals is larger, closer, clearer now than in 1972. The shriller the editorials, the more our fear of self-righteous reformers.

We have no illusions about politicians—or journalists. But history has proven that the reaction to “liberal” crusades is always excessive in blood-letting. In a word—I’d rather be exploited by the “ins” than the “outs”—by the rich than by the poor.

One group will throw the dog his bone—the other will devour him.

FLORENCE M. BRANDT

Kew Gardens, N. Y., May 7, 1974

Willy Brandt's Example

To the Editor:

Let's thank Willy Brandt for the reassurance that leaders of great nations can be morally sensitive, humble and penitent.

His country and his party, he knows, will not collapse without his leadership. They will be lifted from a serious crisis, perhaps to new levels of self-understanding and ethical commitment. The implied judgment upon the

MAY 14 1974

self-serving style of our country's present leadership is obvious and devastating.

HERBERT HOEFER

New York, May 7, 1974

Of Innocence and the Law

To the Editor:

Contrary to the proliferation of both lay and learned opinion (April 25 letter by Cameron K. Wehringer); no presumption of innocence exists regarding any conduct of Richard M. Nixon.

This claim of presumption is made by the same propagandists, die-hard loyalists and lazy thinkers (this latter group—most of us—responds with a Dr. Strangelove-type reflex to any stimulus sounding in American idealism) who seek to defuse public opinion against Nixon by claiming an absence of proof of wrongdoing.

The only problem with both such claims is that they are simply specious in that an adjudicative setting is required to assert either. A presumption of innocence is the . . . “conclusion drawn by law in favor of one brought to trial on criminal charge, requiring acquittal unless guilt is established by sufficient evidence” (Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, 1957). If Mr. Nixon wants the benefit of such presumption, let's get on with the trial in the Senate. Otherwise, I would ask those who serve him (especially attorneys) not to suborn statements which, if offered in court, might well violate Canon 22, regarding candor and fairness.

ROBERT H. BLETCHEMAN

Manchester, Conn., April 25, 1974