Page 6-B

Letter To The Herald Editor

It is not my intent, nor my desire, to wage a personal vendetta but, in my opinion, I must respond to a letter published March 1. Mr. Browder's response to my original letter, published February 23, deserves a prompt response.

My original letter in no way attacked Mr. Browder's character, integrity or profession. Mr. Browder's inaccuracies were the sole purpose for my original letter. Accuracy of dates, places and facts must be adhered to in any form of debate. I simply corrected Mr. Browder's inaccuracies as would a referee in a debate.

Mr. Browder, in his original letter mentioned careful research and study. In another public medium he requested others to engage in careful research and study. I again re-iterate that the inaccuracies I found in his original letter had to be presented to the public. I would have written my original letter no matter who had presented these inaccuracies to the public.

Nowhere in my original letter do I state that I am a proponent or an opponent of ERA. I may be like a "dog howling", but I honestly feel that accuracy has to be of the utmost importance in any debate, discussion or action taken in any public forum.

I did not refute, nor did I accept Dr. Bane's statement for one very simple reason - I was questioning the name."Welly College", not Dr. Bane and her statement. My basic consideration in writing my original letter was to show distortion of facts, not to question theses. Mr. Browder has again heaped inaccuracy upon inaccuracy in his latest letter. He stated, in both letters, that the Women's Movement became "vocal" in 1968. In my original letter I also used the word "vocal". I, too, can deal in semantics. I do, in a sense, acquiesce to Mr. Browder. Perhaps the Women's Movement did not become vocal in this area until 1968, but I can assure everyone Women's that the Movement became very vocal, in other areas of this country, before 1968.

An emotional diatribe such as Mr. Browder presented in his latest letter does not, in my opinion, belong in any public forum.



The "dog howling" metaphor may be applicable, but it is not applicable to someone who has only sought to correct very basic inaccuracies.

There is one other major point in Mr. Browder's latest letter that I must bring forth. I believe very strongly in separation of Church and State. I did not question Mr. Browder's faith nor his position as a Minister in this community. I resent his bringing religion into his letter as an answer to my letter. I will not defend my God, because my Gcd does not need to be defended.

Sincerely, Susan M. Andrew

(Editor's Note: Mr. Browder had the "first shot" and now Mrs. Andrew has the final round. Thus endeth this exchange. LFA.)



