

Impeach Now

Peter Gadiel

My son was one of the nearly 3000 people murdered on September 11, 2001 by nineteen illegal aliens. It was easy for the 19 monsters who committed these acts to get into our country and once in to remain here unchallenged and at their leisure plan, rehearse, finance and carry out their mass murder. The 9/11 attacks, the murder of my son and thousands of others, were made possible, even inevitable, by the open borders policies instigated by the likes of Ted Kennedy, Charles Schumer, John McCain and others who are in the pockets of the Open Borders Lobby (the Domestic OBL). They share in the responsibility for those deaths. Today, the same OBL is pressing for amnesty that will allow terrorists just like those of 9/11 to remain legally in the US. Today, the ringleader of the OBL is Pres. George W. Bush.

It was to oppose the Open Borders Lobby that a dozen 9/11 family members founded 9/11 Families for a Secure America in 2003. As one of the officers of that organization it has been a necessary but very painful part of my work to meet hundreds of others who lost beloved family members in the 9/11 attacks. As 9/11 FSA became widely known for its advocacy in Congress and the states on border security and secure I.D. issues we found we were being contacted by many whose relatives were murdered by illegal aliens in 'ordinary' street crimes and vehicular homicides, and other victims who survived violent crimes committed by illegals. This led to 9/11 FSA becoming an advocacy group for victims of any violent crime committed by illegals whether these be the terrorist acts or individual crimes. This is a logical development, for the mass murders of September 11 and every other individual rape, murder, highway homicide or violent act committed by illegal aliens share certain factors in common. First of course, are the overwhelming physical and emotional trauma inflicted on the victims and their families. And compounding the horror is the fact that every single one of these crimes was preventable...if only Kennedy, McCain, et al. had not opened our borders and made it so easy for foreign terrorists and 'ordinary' criminals to enter the United States in large numbers.

Whether the crimes were committed by an Islamic fanatic like Osama Bin Ladin (the other OBL, the Arab OBL), or a thug like the Railroad Killer allowed into the country by the Open Borders Lobby (the Domestic OBL), the fact is that Kennedy, Lindsey Graham, the Clintons have aided and abetted these criminals. As guilty as are Kennedy and his fellow senators who are owned by the open borders profiteers, for six years and four months, the person most responsible for the failure to exclude dangerous aliens from our country, most responsible for refusing to use his power to remove those already here, has been America's Chief Disregarder of the Law, George W. Bush.

Americans are being murdered, raped, or otherwise injured, and George Bush just doesn't care. The crimes committed against Americans by illegals are so horrific and numerous, so widely known, that it is impossible any longer to absolve this man of his responsibility for this suffering. George Bush is guilty of permitting these crimes to occur. I have met too many people whose families have suffered so grievously and so unnecessarily because of George Bush's amoral advocacy of the Open Borders Lobby's agenda. Thus, even though I have been a Republican all my adult life I have to join with those on the extreme left who want this man removed from his office. Congress should impeach him without further delay.

Two months ago, Republican Representative Dana Rohrabacher warned Pres. Bush that if Jose Compean or Ignacio Ramos (the Border Patrol agents railroaded to prison by the Bush Administration) were murdered while in federal custody there would be talk of impeachment in Congress. Americans who respect the law and value American sovereignty are indebted to Mr. Rohrabacher for standing up to Mr. Bush, the man guilty of appointing the US Attorney and the federal judge who presided over the kangaroo court which resulted in these two innocent men being sentenced to prison. However, with all respect to Mr. Rohrabacher, I must ask: why make impeachment of Bush contingent on the death of one of these decent men? The deaths and injuries already attributable to Bush's failure to live up to his sworn Constitutional obligations are more than sufficient reason to impeach and remove him today. Why must we wait for additional crimes to be committed by or with the connivance of this Administration?

It is beyond dispute that Bush has intentionally and maliciously violated many of the duties imposed on him by the Constitution. For those who haven't paid attention, here's a list of his high crimes, his violations of his Constitutional obligations:

- The Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional the grant by Congress to the President of the power to exercise a line item veto of appropriations bills. In outright defiance of this ruling Bush has unilaterally created what in effect is a line item veto of *all* bills crossing his desk. He has done this by appending "signing statements" describing what portions of those laws he will enforce.
- Rather than repelling foreign invasion as he is required to do, he has *invited* it and he has provided aid and comfort to the invaders and those who give them employment and the other benefits, without which the incentive for illegals to sneak into our country would disappear.
- Rather than acting to insure domestic tranquility he has done his best to destroy it. His presidency has been devoted to tolerating and encouraging infiltration of our country by violent criminal aliens who, once inside our country, commit crimes as individuals, as part of organized international gangs or as agents of violent religious movements emanating from such enemy

nations as Saudi Arabia. He has consorted with the leaders of Saudi Arabia, Mexico as if they were allies rather than enemies.

- He has encouraged the erosion of American sovereignty, and aided those who would destroy our independence. It has become the publicly expressed policy of the Mexican government to influence the internal affairs of the United States and this policy has been put into effect using the 48 Mexican consuls in the US. Lobbying by these foreign enemies, which is in violation of treaties, is now common, widespread, and done openly. Mexican officials and illegal aliens acting in concert with them lobby elected and appointed officials throughout the United States; in small towns and large cities, in county commissions, state legislatures and the Congress. The President of the United States refuses to end these practices, even though he could do so with a simple instruction to Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice that she order the expulsion of the offending diplomats and closure of the consulates.
- Bush's open refusal to enforce immigration laws already on the books amounts to an assumption of the power to repeal legislation without the involvement of any other Branch of government.
- Armed Mexican troops have invaded US territory. This in itself is not an unprecedented event, but Bush's failure to respond with force or even a public condemnation is unique in our history.

The Americans who have been murdered and otherwise brutalized are the moral justification for removing this failed president from office. His clear violations of his Constitutional obligations provide the legal justification. Decency and a sense of honor require that Congress put an end to this maladministration for what he has already done to the people of our country. But Bush is not satisfied with the damage he has achieved to this time. He now is doing his best to allow millions of lawbreaking illegal aliens to gain US citizenship; among whom are unknown, unidentified thousands of violent felons and terrorists. With the Kyl-Kennedy-Bush Mass Amnesty Bill, S.1248, George of the Silver Foot in Mouth will in one blow legitimize the invasion he encouraged, the erosion of our sovereignty he encouraged, the destruction of our domestic tranquility. Should he succeed, this man will have done more than any other single individual since the Civil War to undermine the United States.

Consider: Four of the Fort Dix Six would have been eligible for the Bush Amnesty. Several of those who were involved in the 1993 World Trade Center attacks (including ringleader Ramzi Yousef) had been granted legal permanent resident status thanks to the 1986 amnesty (specifically the Agricultural Worker provision authored by then NYC Representative Charles Schumer, presumably on behalf of the strawberry farmers of Brooklyn). All of the 9/11 terrorists would have been eligible for the Bush amnesty if they had postponed their attacks until after passage of the Kyl-Kennedy-Bush bill. The list of these amnestied or eligible-for-amnesty criminals goes on and on. And we really only know of the criminals whose crimes made the front

pages. How many other Americans were killed or raped in crimes committed by Bush amnesty eligible aliens in crimes that did not make the headlines?

It is important that Americans understand that all illegal aliens are, as LaRaza, the ACLU et al. like to say, "undocumented." That is an admission that every single illegal is a person whose true identity is unknown. Thus, any illegal may be a violent felon or terrorist agent of the Arab OBL. Experience has shown that many of these "undocumented" illegals have been exactly that, working day jobs for the Domestic OBL only to kill Americans when the opportunity presents. Hence the tens of thousands of victims of illegal immigration crimes and terrorist acts.

The simple inescapable fact is that if Bush's amnesty passes, Americans will die. They'll die in terrorist mass murder, they'll die in individual murders, in highway homicides. Killers, rapists, terrorists, identity thieves, drug dealers, gang members. All will be eligible for amnesty.

And the Commander in Chief of the effort to let Americans die is George W. Bush.

Both morality and law provide full justification for removing Bush, but because only Congress has the power to do so it won't be either morality or law that will lead to lead us to that happy result. All that will matter is the politics. And what of the politics? Could removal be accomplished and can it done rapidly enough so as to minimize the period of distraction and transition? The answer to both questions is "yes." The Bush presidency is like a dead, rotted tree in a gale; sufficient force will topple it. A Republican myself, I have found in my travels that Republicans by and large despise this man. It is very difficult to find a Republican who does not feel betrayed by him, who does not hold him in contempt. (Even the most dedicated Republicans routinely include an expletive prior to saying the name "Bush.") These are the people who can, if they are willing, provide the political will that will end this miserable presidency.

This anger results both from his malfeasance as chief executive and his failure as leader of his party. Republicans recognize that he was the architect of what he himself admitted was a "thumping" of his party in the 2006 election. More than just the architect of that beating he was the general contractor, carpenter, bricklayer, and ditch digger for the whole disaster. All over the country candidates of both parties understood that his name was the kiss of death for anyone running on the Republican ticket in 2006. A review of Democratic candidates' websites showed that almost all linked their Republican opponents' names with that of the despised Bush: "Bush/Mike DeWine," "Bush/Jim Leach," "Bush/Rick Santorum," "Bush/Nancy Johnson," "Bush/John Hostettler," "Bush /Sue Kelly, and even "Bush/Chafee."

That last is particularly telling. Senator Lincoln Chafee had admitted to *voting for John Kerry* in 2004; he opposed almost every item in the Bush program except for amnesty for illegal aliens. This guy was the ultimate unBush and even he couldn't escape the Bush curse.

Almost all grassroots Republicans know that Bush's betrayal of their principles, and of the Nation, is the reason for the current sad state of the Party. They came to their realization about Bush long prior to the 2004 presidential election, and throughout that campaign these voters freely expressed their contempt for their party's candidate. Nevertheless, in 2004 these Republican voters, in the end, came out and voted for Bush, but for only one single reason: the certainty that two Supreme Court vacancies were soon to occur. The thought of John Kerry filling these vacancies was even more abhorrent to them than voting for Bush. In essence, the Supreme Court was Bush's election insurance in '04, but once those two seats were safely filled, for many Republicans the only reason to support him evaporated.

If the possibility of a Kerry Supreme Court was Bush's *après moi le deluge* insurance policy in 2004, in 2006 he benefited from another such threat, the potential loss of Republican majorities in both houses of Congress. And to a degree this threat did cause Republican voters to mute their *public* expressions of anti-Bush sentiment. Although open rebellion within the party was avoided, this time the fear was not sufficient to get Republican voters to the polls and thus the Republican "thumping" in '06.

Now that the last election of the Bush presidency is behind us the last of Bush's insurance policies has lapsed. Yet as a term limited incumbent he arrogantly continues his defiance of the wishes of the American people and his oath of office by collaborating with Reid-Kennedy-Pelosi on a policy of national suicide. Republicans' dislike, even hatred, of him grows while reasons to conceal those emotions ended when the polling places closed their doors on November XXXXX, 2006.

Republicans may confirm this fact with a little experiment: tell another Republican that you hope Bush is impeached. Watch the response. The subject of your experiment will not laugh, not even if he or she is in a position as a member of Congress to be able to initiate the process. Instead, what you likely will hear is a look of sadness and a wistful look that implies: "Yes, if only..." ...If only some Republicans in the U.S. House would decide not to wait for President Bush to again betray his country. In a moment your subject's 'if only' look will disappear and he's likely to respond with one or more of the following objections: 1. "But then we'll get Cheney and he won't be any better." 2. "But then Nancy Pelosi would become president should something happen to a President Cheney." 3. "But then we Republicans will find ourselves in alliance with the likes of Ramsey Clark and the rest of the lunatic left." 4. "Republicans shouldn't cooperate in removing

a Republican president because Democrats blocked all efforts to impeach the equally corrupt Bill Clinton.” 5. “Dumping Bush will harm Republican chances for victory in '08.” 6. Weakening George Bush will harm the war against terror in Iraq.”

All these objections are nonsense.

Objections #1. Cheney will be president and won't be any better

Wrong. No matter what Cheney's intentions, he cannot be as bad as Bush because, as an un-elected president his power will be limited. As weak as is Bush's influence with Congress, a Pres. Cheney's would be even less. Thus he could not pose a threat to that presented by the continuation of the Bush disaster.

#2. Pelosi will be second in line to the presidency.

So what? Let us suppose that Pres. Cheney does not live through the remaining months of the Bush second term. Can anyone believe that Pelosi, a double-unelected president could possibly do as much damage as this hopelessly arrogant George Bush will in the same period? I've been a Republican all my adult life, but the actions of this president leave no doubt in my mind that a President Pelosi is a lesser threat than seventeen more months of President Bush.

#3. Republicans will be in alliance with Ramsey Clark and the rest of the hate-America-lunatic-left.

Here Republicans should look to the example of Winston Churchill. For his entire life from the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution to his death he was the world's greatest and most eloquent opponent of Communism, yet he did not hesitate to form an alliance with Stalin after German invasion of the USSR in 1941. At that moment the greatest threat to his nation was not Stalin but Hitler. He did not hesitate to make an alliance with his Communist enemy, while simultaneously affirming that he would “never unsay of word” of his many comments about the dehumanizing effects of Marxism. Today Republicans must recognize that no matter how despicable are the leftist leaders of the impeachment movement are, people such as Ramsey Clark, they are a lesser threat to this country than Bush. I have nothing but contempt for Clark, a man who has devoted much of his life defending murderous tyrants, and anyone else who hates the United States of America. Clark is no doubt an enemy of this Nation, but it is Bush not Clark who poses the greater threat to our country.

4. Republicans shouldn't remove Bush because Democrats refused to remove Clinton.

There is logic and justice to this argument. After all, Clinton made the presidency and the Nation a laughingstock around the globe by, for example, exploiting the Oval Office to satisfy his sexual appetite and turning tail and running after the Black Hawk Down incident in Somalia. This was a man so corrupt, with such deep contempt for truth and his fellow citizens that he could publicly argue about the meaning of the word “is.” It was Bill Clinton who should have been held accountable for the mass murder at Waco, Texas, and the FBI sniper murder in Ruby Ridge. It

was Clinton who was president when the World Trade Center was attacked in 1993 and his administration which concealed its true implications by treating it as a criminal rather than terrorist act. It was Bill Clinton who throughout the 1990's allowed binLadin to escape justice and to strengthen his terror network and then lay the foundations for the attacks of September 11. It is Bill Clinton, far more than George Bush, who bears responsibility for the 3000 dead of September 11. (The full extent of Clinton's negligence will never be known thanks to the thefts of original Top Secret documents relating to 9/11 from the National Archives by his former National Security Advisor Sandy Berger. Considering Berger's former status, the number of documents taken and the risks involved in taking them, several conclusions are inescapable: The documents must constitute proof of Clinton negligence and responsibility for 9/11. For Clinton to assign Berger the task of a theft of this sort the potential injury to Clinton's reputation must be astounding.)

So Republicans could feel justified in imitating the Democrats' blocking the removal of, their corrupt, incompetent president. But the harm being done to the Nation *today* is being inflicted by George Bush, not Bill Clinton. Concern for the country requires Republicans to rise above their justifiable resentment of the other party. Republicans must ask themselves whether their failure to act on behalf of the Nation's welfare is truly justified merely because of the Democrats' failed to rise above their lowest political instincts during the Clinton regime.

5. Would Republican support for impeachment harm or help their chances of victory in 2008? Even Republicans who have no thought about the danger of two more years of Bush should understand that dumping this man is may help Republican candidates in 2008. How many Republicans, including the nominee for president will want to have their names linked to Bush? Will even a single Republican want to offer his Democratic opponent the opportunity to say of him: "He supported Bush to the bitter end."? Far better for those Republican candidates to be able to say: "I put my country above my party and I voted to impeach."

6. As to the war in Iraq: What's the use of saving Iraq, even in the event that's possible, if the President behind that war is intent on destroying the United States itself? If it is necessary to sacrifice Iraq to save our own country, then so be it.

Republicans have to face the facts: Here is a thoroughly arrogant man contemptuous of the suffering he has caused so many ordinary Americans, oblivious of the welfare of our country and its sovereignty. For him the Constitution is nothing but a scrap of paper and he violates the duties it imposes on him despite the oath he took to uphold it.

Shortly after 9/11, George Bush stood on the ruins of the World Trade Center and told the American people: "I hear you." Presumably when he said that he was promising he would do all

in his power to prevent another such attack. Instead he has done just the opposite, making more attacks inevitable. His subsequent actions betray that for him the mass grave that was Ground Zero nothing but a background for a photo op, for when he stood on the ruins he lied. He lies today; he has lied every day in between. Americans die because of his lies.

This is one Republican who believes that Republicans in the House of Representatives should put their duty to the Constitution and the people of this country above misplaced loyalty to this execrable human being. The Constitution provides a way to remove such a man from office. Today it is time for Republicans in the House to rise above the precedent set by Democrats in the Clinton era, and to begin the process of removing the president; time to join with Democrats to make the process a quick one. Congressional Republicans must emulate Churchill and face up to the necessity of cooperating with the left to fight the greatest and most immediate threat to this Nation's well being. And that threat is Pres. George W. Bush.