NYTimes Impeachment Alternative: Change the Constitution

To the Editor:

The, House Judiciary Committee now agonizes over the difficult legal niceties of what constitutes an "impeachable offense" under the Constitution. Perhaps some lawyers could reasonably argue that, despite the avalanche of evidence establishing the moral corruption of the President and his disregard of the constitutional rights of the Congress itself as well as those of individual Americans, the foul record may not legally spell out "high crimes or misdemeanors."

What then?

History deals with facts and their consequences. A failure to impeach would establish that all acts of which Mr. Nixon is accused constitute permissible conduct of the President under our Constitution. Future Presidents could, with impunity, perform the same or similar acts. Thus would be established a constitutional standard modeled on the conceptions of Presidential power practiced by Mr. Nixon.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Nixon has not exhausted the possibilities for misuse of power. He has, however, established the path to be followed by those holding his office. Is our nation willing to accept this consequence? The dilemma

unleashed by the impeachment inquiry can only be resolved in one of two ways: Either impeach or change the Constitution.

New York, July 18, 1974

How Not to Clean a Statue To the Editor:

I couldn't agree more with Herman G. Weinberg (letter July 15) about the deplorable condition of our public monuments. His recommendation for sandblasting, however, is worse than the demeaning graffiti. One single sandblasting produces emosion equivalent to fifty years of wind and weather. It is like suggesting that a person have his entire skin remove to cure his acne.

A startling example of such blasting damage can be see Washington Arch in Greeny. The faces of the figure, washington are pocked their chins have fall strength of the strongly of the strongl