

On June 2 in I wrote in VDare that law and morality require impeachment and removal of Pres Bush. I stressed that since only Congress has the power to impeach, neither law nor morality would be the basis of a decision to proceed; that politics alone would be the determining factor. As to the politics I was, and remain, confident that if impeachment proceedings were begun removal could be accomplished in sufficiently short time so as to minimize the period of distraction and transition. The reason this is so is because the Republican base hates the guy. Since then there has been some confirmation of my conclusion.

On July 8, Byron York wrote a column in the Washington Post (Base to Bush: It's Over) confirming that Republicans have given up on this president. Mr. York quotes a "conservative strategist" saying that Bush and his base are "in divorce court." Whoever that strategist is, his analogy of divorce between Bush and the Republican base is dead on. And like most divorces this one has been brewing for a very long time. It's a story as old as marriage itself. Hubby cheats. Wife ignores. Hubby cheats again. Wife confronts him. He apologizes ("I'll be faithful from now on"). His cheating becomes more flagrant more frequent. Wife steams, hopes for the best; starts muttering to herself but pretends to the neighbors that nothing's wrong. Finally, husband commits some truly perverse act right out in public. That tears it; wife goes to court.

So it is with the 'marriage' of Bush and his base. George II has a long history of cheating, particularly in matters of national security/national sovereignty/borders/illegal immigration (and add to the list offshoring of jobs/free trade/North American Union/NAFTA Super Corridor). The base had tried to keep the fallout of the marital breakdown confined to within the marital abode, but now, admitting Bush is beyond redemption, they've gone public.

In my own travels on behalf of 9/11 Families for a Secure America I have found that it's nearly impossible to find a Republican who doesn't feel "betrayed" by him, who does not hold him in contempt, who does not despise him with a passion that one can only feel when betrayed by one of your own. Even the most dedicated Republicans routinely include an expletive prior to saying the name "Bush." And these Republicans didn't switch overnight from happily married to desperate for divorce. It's been in the works for years.

This anger results from Republican recognition of both his malfeasance as chief executive and his betrayal as leader of his party. And like the spouse who only files for divorce after a long period of hoping for a return to fidelity, these Republicans have been aware of the infidelity since long before to the 2006 elections and even before 2004 presidential race. Throughout 2003 and '04 Republicans freely expressed their contempt for their party's candidate. Nevertheless, in 2004

these same Republicans reluctantly went to the polls and voted for Bush. But most did so for only one single reason: the certainty that two Supreme Court vacancies were soon to occur. To them the thought of John Kerry filling these vacancies was even more abhorrent 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.

The threat of a Kerry Supreme Court was Bush's *après moi, le deluge* insurance policy in 2004, and it kept the base in line. In 2006 Bush benefited from a similar insurance policy, 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 overcome the sense of betrayal; not enough to get Republican voters to the polls. Thus the Republican "thumping" in '06.

With the final Congressional election of the Bush presidency behind us the last of Bush's insurance policies has expired. As a term-limited incumbent he continues in his defiance of the wishes of his former base and violation of his oath of office by collaborating with Reid-Kennedy-Pelosi on a policy of national suicide. Republicans' dislike, even hatred, of him grows, while any incentive conceal those emotions disappeared the moment the polls closed on Election Day 2006.

To return to the divorce analogy. Once the husband's perversion is out in the open, wife has two choices. 1. Stay loyal to him and be quiet. 2. Start divorce proceedings and fervently denounce the evil he has done. Choice number one will lead to wife being branded as his collaborator and to shunning by society at large, but choice number two gives her a chance to be seen as his innocent victim, a woman worthy of remaining a part of decent society.

Republicans now have the same choice. Choice Number 1: keep muttering to themselves despite Bush's infidelity or Choice Number 2: make a final and public break. Mr. York's conservative strategist indicates that the Republican base has made its decision, and it's Choice Number Two.

Ah, but divorce isn't so easy when the case is entitled "President vs. the Members of His Party." In the Parliamentary system, when the Prime Minister's party loses confidence in their guy it can, through its Members of Parliament, fire him in mid term and immediately replace him. Both Tony Blair and Margaret Thatcher left office in this fashion and both will be judged on their records while in office not for being sent to political wilderness before their terms were up. If the Founding Fathers had chosen that system it seems very likely that Mr. Bush would now have a lot more time to spend with his wood pile. But in our system removal of the president can only be for "high

crimes and misdemeanors,” so it takes considerable courage for the Congress to do the right thing and begin the removal process; doing the right thing is not what members of Congress are known for.

The failure of members of Congress to live up to their Constitutional obligations and restrain this rogue president was a subject discussed on July 13 by Bruce Fein on the Bill Moyers’ Journal on PBS. Of course, Moyers’ opinions cannot be taken seriously. Just a militant Democratic liberal with a perfect record of bias and distortion he’s a guy who can be counted on to describe a parking ticket for a Republican politician as proof of major character flaws, while at the same time dismissing the worst any Democrat’s lies and corruption as just being at nothing more than evidence of Republican plotting.

Mr. Fein however is no liberal puppet, having held positions in the Reagan Justice Department, the American Enterprise Institute and the Heritage Foundation. He accuses Bush of being “totally heedless of any honor for law and accountability”. Speaking of the Congress’s duty under the Constitution to protect the Nation from a rogue president he said: “They [the Legislative Branch] have basically renounced-- walked away from their responsibility to oversee and check. It’s not an option. It’s an obligation when they take that oath to faithfully uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. And I think the reason why this is. They do not have convictions about the importance of the Constitution.”

Mr. Fein appears to agree that what we have at the highest levels of our government in the Legislative and Executive Branches are politicians with no regard for the Constitution and no sense of their duty anything other than their ambition and the need to generate next vote grabbing sound bite. Fein speaks of something else that is missing: “...in the past, there’s always been a few statesmen who have said, ‘You know, the political fallout doesn’t concern me as much as the Constitution of the United States.’ We have to keep that undefiled throughout posterity ‘cause if it’s not us, it will corrode. It will disappear on the installment plan.”

Congress has never, ever, been a convention of pure souls, but there have been at least a few with sufficient integrity, courage and moral authority to keep the government on its Constitutional tracks. Today, instead of Senators “Scoop” Jackson, or Estes Kefauver, Robert Taft or Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. we have Ted Kennedy, Harry Reid and Hillary Clinton; Chuck Hagel, Mel Martinez and Lindsey Graham. It is impossible to imagine any among this group of current Senators ever believing that “the political fallout doesn’t concern me as much as the Constitution of the United States.” And because they are incapable of such a thought, Pres. Bush will remain in his office until the calendar sets us free. Which perhaps brings us to the real problem. The

Founders, in creating our Constitution assumed that members of Congress, to whom they granted the power of impeachment, would have a decent respect for the law and morality. Looking at the Congress, we can see they assumed too much.