Barry Goldwater for President

Throughout the 84 years of its existence the Los Angeles Times has believed that individual liberty, and the concept of private enterprise which makes individual liberty a practical philosophy, have best been served by the Republican Party.

The Times believes today, as it always has, that the principle of individual liberty, restricted only by the absolute needs of all the people, must continue to be the paramount factor in making decisions concerning this nation’s welfare. And The Times further believes that only by maintaining a strong two-party system, a comparative balance between conservatism and liberalism, can individual liberty be preserved.

This nation is faced with the prospect of a cold war continuing long into the future. The Times believes, as it has contended in its editorials, that the fate of western civilization depends upon the internal vitality and the external vigilance of the United States.

The Times agrees with Sen. Barry Goldwater that this nation must strengthen its free economy and the free economies of its allies, and of the non-aligned nations, for the competitive struggle against a totalitarian world empire. It must restore the vigor and imagination of its own system of free enterprise. It must rip off the shackles of unwise legislation in the fields of taxation, of never-ending national deficits and profligate spending, of subsidized and useless agricultural surpluses, of restrictive labor codes and pointless bureaucratic regulations that strangle production.

The Times believes that these objectives can best be achieved through a Republican victory in November.

We therefore strongly recommend the election of the Republican Party’s candidate for President, Barry Goldwater.

During this campaign, The Times has discussed the major issues, and has agreed and disagreed with both candidates. We will continue to say what we think about the candidates and issues during the remaining weeks of the campaign.

In pledging its support to Barry Goldwater, The Times does not contend that Lyndon Johnson has been a bad President, or that if Mr. Johnson is elected this nation will have sealed its fate in the continuing cold war.

Mr. Johnson must be given credit for pushing through Congress the first major reduction in income taxes since the beginning of the New Deal. He must be given credit for constructive leadership in settling crucial labor disputes and for strong yet restrained action at Guantanamo Bay, in Panama and in the Gulf of Tonkin. He must be given credit for insisting upon the passage of the civil rights law—a bill, however, which obtained greater proportional support by Republicans than by Democrats.

But Mr. Johnson must also accept a share in the blame for the tragic series of disasters in South Vietnam, for the generally indecisive policy toward Communist Cuba, and for such fancily conceived and politically inspired programs as his war on poverty and his Medicare proposal, a tax upon every paycheck of every working man. Nor can Mr. Johnson’s achievements wash away the suspicions of ethical laxity in Washington that grew from the Bobby Baker investigations.

The Times has vigorously disagreed with Barry Goldwater on the civil rights law, on the nuclear test ban agreement, and on the sale of American grain to Soviet Russia. The Times most strongly disagrees with Sen. Goldwater’s original position, as we understood his meaning, on the control of smaller nuclear weapons by NATO field commanders.

But the over-riding consideration for supporting the candidacy of Sen. Goldwater, in the opinion of The Times, is that we believe that with the help of responsible Republicans and of responsible Democrats, he will attempt the reforms which we consider essential in the fields of taxation, deficit spending, agricultural and labor legislation. Lyndon Johnson, we believe, is too much the political prisoner of economic pressure groups and big labor to attempt doing that.

The Times believes Barry Goldwater deserves the support and the votes of all moderates and all conservatives of both parties.