

To the Editor:

In a May 2 letter, Stephen Enke protested that "impeachment can serve no social purpose. The justification of punishment is that it may deter. 'Watergate' must have already deterred this and future Presidents from any wrongdoing."

However, the Constitution of the United States does not provide impeachment as a means of reforming the moral characters of our Presidents but as a means of getting rid of those found morally unfit to govern. A sea captain whose carelessness damages his ship is not fired in order to reform him but because his employers are afraid to trust a ship to him. Nor can they be certain that public exposure of his carelessness will deter him and future captains from any wrongdoing.

STRINGFELLOW BARR  
Kingston, N. J., May 2, 1974

### The Proper Shock

To the Editor:

"What is shocking," your May 12 editorial complains, "is the low level at which the President and his most trusted advisers perceived their problems and tried to cope with them." It seems to me that this oversimplification of Richard Nixon evades what is truly shocking—what he tells us about ourselves.

As I said to some English friends before the 1972 elections, if we returned this man to office, at least we would find out what kind of people we are. Well, we did, and we have. We are the people who elected Richard Nixon to be President of the United States. As Lady Brett remarks of another moral bankrupt in Hemingway's novel, he is our sort of thing.

By all means let's be shocked, but for the right reasons.

JOHN GUENTHER  
Rye, N. Y., May 12, 1974

### Transcripts and Fairness

To the Editor:

I am appalled and angered by the inability of The Times editorial staff to treat the Presidential transcripts in a fair and reasonable manner. It were as if your staff is composed of nothing more than sophomore history students

who start out with a premise and then quote only that information which supports your arguments.

There are many sections of those transcripts which give lie to your statements. Space only permits one case in point:

You contend right and wrong are never discussed. In the following excerpt, the President is deciding whether or not to fire Haldeman or Ehrlichman, a difficult decision as it would prejudice their innocence or guilt.

P "I want to know what is the right thing to do and understand we are going to come out of this thing. The Justice Department and the Presidency are going to come out clean because I don't tolerate this kind of stuff. But the point is, Dick, I also. I can't let an innocent man down. That's my point."

There are numerous sections which reveal an honorable man attempting to do the right thing in a highly complex situation. I'm certain The Times could find them if it wished to practice the doctrine of fair play.

JAMES A. SUTTON  
New York, May 10, 1974

### The President's Supporters

To the Editor:

In recent weeks the power base of the President has truly begun to erode. Yet calls for resignation and impeachment appear to leave the Nixon camp unscathed. The President continues to cling to his office with outright tenacity.

The political forces which are trying to undermine the Nixon Administration and force the President's resignation have failed to realize that he still retains the support of the people he feels he needs most: the corporate interests. The corporations are the base of Mr. Nixon's power, and their consideration of his ability is one based upon profit, not on the morality or legality of his actions.

It will not be possible to force the resignation of the President until this greatest source of his political power is undermined. Once this base is toppled, and the corporate interests are forced to desert the President, then his resignation or impeachment will be a mere formality.

ROBERT F. MUNOZ  
Englishtown, N. J., May 23, 1974