

Dr. Lawrence Mead, in his letter published on Feb. 22 comparing British and American impeachment systems, commented: "... Parliament ... never (except in the revolutionary moments of 1640 and 1688) threatened the king himself, who, as the head of the executive, was the functional equivalent of the American President."

Dr. Mead overlooked the removal of Edward II, which established the principle that the king is removable by the Parliament for the public good. No revolutionary motivation was involved, and the deposed king was replaced by the next in lawful line of succession. Edward was deposed on grounds that he was incompetent to govern, that he had been controlled by others who had given him evil advice, that throughout his reign he had been unwilling to hear or adopt good counsel, that he had given himself to unseemly works and occupations, neglecting the good of the realm. It was not, in Sir Arthur Bryant's phrase, "against their hereditary Crown that Englishmen had rebelled, but against a failure to wear it as usage and justice dictated." The great constitutional principle defined by Edward's removal is a basic precedent for modern impeachment concepts.

FRANK B. CASE.

Colonel, U.S.A.-Ret.

Alexandria.