

WXPost
The Indictments, the President and Impeachment
MAR 10 1974

The indictments returned March 1 against top White House aides should put to rest forever the too frequently heard contention that "Watergate" is an invention of the media to harass honest Americans.

The indictments do show that honesty in high places is indeed seriously questioned by those citizens of the realm who are charged under the Constitution with the duty to distinguish between slander and substance—a grand jury.

The indictments do not establish guilt. In the fullness of time, since justice moves slowly in a system zealous in protecting the rights of the accused, all may be acquitted. So be it! But, the grand jury has answered those who say: "One year of Watergate is enough." The resounding answer to that, given by the only body fully qualified under our system to give an answer, is that one year most certainly has not been enough to resolve the serious and substantial issues raised by Watergate.

JOHN M. REYNOLDS.

McLean.

In 1945 the House Un-American Activities Committee adopted the following standard, recommended by the Brookings Institution, to help determine the nature of un-American activities:

It is un-American for any group secretly to conspire through concerted action to bring about a change in the Constitution or the laws by preventing the people in general from being informed as to the purpose, extent, and methods of the movement and by denying to them the opportunity to take such lawful action as they may see fit in opposition to the change.

The recent indictments of "two of the finest public servants it has been (Richard Nixon's) privilege to know," and five other former administration officials, suggest a pattern which should shock and horrify all who sympathized with the efforts of HUAC.

KAVITA KAPUR.

Washington.

I returned to the United States in October of 1973 after having lived in Europe for almost five years. I did keep up with what was happening here by reading the International Herald Tribune as well as the local papers.

Since my return, I've become more and more convinced that both The Washington Post and the New York

Times are doing the same thing Joseph McCarthy did in the '50s against the liberals, in the way you are treating and handling the Watergate affair against Nixon. Then it was a one-man witch hunt against thousands; now it is thousands against one man. I consider both equally reprehensible. It is a witch hunt.

Mind you, I am not a Republican. I am a Democrat and was an active worker against our involvement in Vietnam from the moment President Kennedy sent his 20,000 "advisers" into that tragic country.

I mention the above to show you that there are liberal Democrats who are repelled by the treatment of President Nixon by your paper and others.

MRS. SAMUEL M. KRAMER.

Philadelphia, Pa.

As I understand Mr. St. Clair's brief on what constitutes an impeachable offense, he maintains that the Constitution sets a "lower standard" for removal of federal judges by providing that they should serve during "good behavior". Is this a lower standard? Since a judge's misbehavior might not involve an indictable crime, it seems to me that if misbehavior alone is an impeachable offense then it is a more stringent standard of conduct than a standard that restricts an impeachable offense only to an indictable crime.

Mr. St. Clair also contends that, "Since judges otherwise serve for life, while Presidents can be turned out after four years, there should be a different standard." I agree with this contention, but believe the tenure is immaterial and that the standard must be directly related to the power and trust vested in the office which the public official occupies. The greater the power and trust, the more exemplary the standard of conduct of the incumbent of that office must be.

HENRY J. SCHNEIDER.

Falls Church.

I am outraged that you have printed what you have called inside information about the contents of a secret letter given to Judge Sirica, which contents you say declare the President's involvement in Watergate and its cover-up. Perhaps he is so involved, I do not know; neither do you. Your insinuations are presumptuous and irresponsible.

R. A. W. BRUEHL.

Minister, First United Methodist Church,
Glenn Elynn, Ill.