

< Back < Back Next > Next > X

--CONTENT GOES HERE (static)--

< Back < Back Next > Next > Close

--CONTENT GOES HERE (static)--

VDARE.COM - http://www.vdare.com/gadiel/070602_impeach.htm

June 02, 2007

A 9/11 Father, Lifelong Republican, Says: Time To Impeach Bush Over Immigration

From [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.

They share in the responsibility for those deaths.

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. 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, is the overwhelming physical and emotional trauma inflicted on the victims and their families. But, 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 Laden (OBL), or a thug like the [Railroad Killer](#) allowed into the country by the [Open Borders Lobby](#) (the other OBL), the fact is that Kennedy and Lindsey Graham have [aided and abetted](#) these criminals.

But as guilty as Kennedy and his fellow senators are, 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](#): President George W. Bush.

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](#).

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?

I have met too many people whose families have suffered so grievously, so unnecessarily because of George Bush’s [amoral advocacy](#) of the Open Borders Lobby’s agenda. 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.

Republican Representative Dana Rohrabacher [recently 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.

But 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. [**Vdare.com note:** *Impeachment is popular these days, but oddly enough, the Wikipedia article "[Movement to impeach George W. Bush](#)" doesn't even mention Congressman Rohrabacher's warning.*]

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:

- 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 to those who give them employment.
- 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 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. 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 [Condoleezza 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.

I acknowledge, of course, that other Americans have other reasons for wanting to impeach Bush. The most publicized is the war in Iraq. As a lawyer, I must admit that I am concerned about his unilaterally creation of what in effect is a line item veto, declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. He has done this by appending [“signing statements”](#) to all bills crossing his desk, describing what portions of those laws he will enforce.

But I believe that, all by themselves, 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 to enforce immigration law](#) provide the legal justification. Decency and a sense of honor require that Congress put an end to this maladministration.

But, because only Congress has the power, it won't be either morality or law that will lead to that result. All that will count is the politics.

So what of the politics? Could removal be accomplished, and 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](#). 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 against Bush](#) in the 2004 Presidential election; 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: he was [easily defeated](#).

The last election of the Bush presidency is behind us. 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. All reason to conceal those emotions ended when the polling places closed their doors on November 7, 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:

- *“But then we'll get Cheney and he won't be any better.”*

- *“But then Nancy Pelosi would become president should something happen to a President Cheney.”*

- *“But then we Republicans will find ourselves in alliance with the likes of Ramsey Clark and the rest of the lunatic left.”*

- *“Republicans shouldn't cooperate in removing a Republican president because Democrats blocked all efforts to impeach the equally corrupt Bill Clinton.”*

- *“Dumping Bush will harm Republican chances for victory in '08.”*

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 President Cheney's would be even less. Thus he could not pose a threat to that presented by the continuation of the Bush disaster.

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

So what? 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? Although I've been a Republican all my adult life, 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.

Objection #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 the [German invasion of the USSR in 1941](#). At that moment the greatest threat to his nation was not Stalin but Hitler. He did this while simultaneously affirming that he would ["unsay no 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, they are a lesser threat to this country than Bush.

I have nothing but contempt for Ramsey 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 America. But it is Bush not Clark who poses the greater threat to our country.

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

I accept that there is logic and justice to this argument. But the harm being done to America *today* is being inflicted by George Bush, not [Bill Clinton](#). Concern for country requires Republicans to rise above their justifiable resentment of the other party.

Objection # 5: "Dumping Bush will harm Republican chances for victory in '08."

Even Republicans who have no thought about the danger of two more years of Bush should understand that dumping this man 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 Republican candidates to be able to say: **"I voted to impeach."**

Republicans have to face the facts: Their President is a thoroughly arrogant man, contemptuous of the suffering he has caused [so many ordinary Americans](#), indifferent to the welfare of our country and its [sovereignty](#). For him the Constitution is nothing but a scrap of paper. 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. Clearly, that day on what amounted to a mass grave was for Bush nothing but 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

In 1974, [Barry Goldwater](#) was delegated by the senior members of his party to perform a last great service to his country. They asked him to [inform President Nixon](#) that the time to fight [had come to an end](#).

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. As soon as House Republicans face this fact, the sooner a new Barry Goldwater can wake up George W. Bush to the fact that he has failed and it's time to go back [to Crawford](#) for good.

Peter Gadiel ([email him](#)) is president of [9/11 Families for a Secure America](#). His son, 9/11 World Trade Center victim James Gadiel (North Tower, 103rd floor), was 23 at the time of his murder. The views expressed are his own.