

The Case for Impeachment

Impeachment is the process by which charges are brought against a high official of the American government. Impeachment does not necessarily mean removal from office and thus is only the first step towards possible removal. Two recent presidents were close to being removed from office by way of impeachment, a process of accusations raised for failures in office: Richard Nixon, who laid down presidency shortly *before* being impeached in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal and transferred the authority to the non-elected vice-president Gerald Ford; and Bill Clinton was being impeached after the disclosure of having lied about his affair with Monica Lewinsky. He has other, far more impressive 'skeletons in the cupboard.' The present landlord of the White House has given not one but several occasions to be removed from office for breaching the constitution, worse than any of his predecessors since the foundation of USA, yet there are reasons to believe this will not happen. The purpose of this contribution is to review the relevant crimes and then the process of impeachment.

The Crimes

George W. Bush is not the first who stole the American presidency (he had a predecessor in 1876), but he is the first who did it twice. After converting the presidency to an unconstitutional monarchy, he is probably also not the last one.

There are good reasons to assume that Bush is not the real master in the American government. His frequent absence from his office (he prefers staying at his ranch in Crawford, Texas) marks a record disinterest and earned him the term 'pResident.' His avoidance of meeting questions from the press marks another record. He does deliver a lot of speeches but avoids questions after them and prefers statements rather than being questioned. During a meeting with his lame opposite candidate and lodge brother for presidency 2004, Bush was seen with a flat box behind his jacket, probably connected to an earpiece, earning him the designation of a 'remotely controlled straw-man.'

The eldest son of then CIA-director George H. W. Bush, he avoided being sent to Vietnam in his youth and instead defended Texas against Viet Cong. I believe, any good father would have done the same, only this father might have done a bit more for the other sons sent to Vietnam, not to mention the receiving country for this peculiar American aid. But for being impeached as a president, you first need to become one. Attentive readers will notice that I avoid writing 'President Bush,' simply because I challenge the right of an election thief to be called as such. However, he has surely enough been inaugurated twice. But that brings us to the first crimes:

1. Theft of Presidential Elections: In 2000, Bush lost the election. We recall the debacle how he managed to turn the fate during a strange strategy, by which he was declared the winner in Florida after several weeks, not because he became more votes there but because of a court order, which forbade further recounting. To avoid any further dead races, several states were supplied with election machines, which delivered the wanted result without leaving any paper trail. Moreover, the CEO of the leading commercial producer of such machines, Diebold Inc., is a keen supporter of Bush. Having placed a politician of nearly identical views on the key subjects (Iraq War, unconditional support of Israel, internal policies) as his oppositional candidate, Bush thought himself safe for the second presidential election in 2004. Still, it nearly went wrong. Many voters were driven by the hope for 'anybody else than Bush' and the hope that the other candidate would at least turn out to be a 'Bush-lite.' One of the Swing states Florida, Ohio or Pennsylvania would have sufficed to make John Kerry the next president and, had it not been for the excessive vote-fraud, he would have got them all. This is convincingly shown by the exit polls, as far as these were not manipulated – and even they were tuned. One example shall be shown mentioned: At the election evening, CNN presented an election poll from Ohio at 12:21, based on 1,963 respondents, according to which Kerry was leading 52:48% (screenshot orwellized but recorded). 80 min. later, 2,020 respondents inverted the figure and gave Bush a similar lead.

The list of vote irregularities is long and varied but *always* point in the same direction. Most impressive is the final result in relation to the latest (possibly even

manipulated as shown above) exit poll. In the states with voting machines, 5% of the votes were transferred from Kerry to Bush. If Kerry would have been a better president can be doubted but at least the democratic candidate for vice-presidency, John Edmonds, is not a Skull-and-Bones lodge member, as the only of the four (with also Cheney included).

2. 9/11: Bush has the best alibi for this "Attack on America" (by its own government). He was deposed to Florida for a presence in a school, reading goat stories. He knew about what was going to happen [see: *'The Dog that did not Bark,'* in *'Who Were Responsible for 9/11?'*] and he obstructed all attempts to solve the case later on. In contrast, Vice-President Dick Cheney and then-Security Advisor Condoleeza Rice seem to have been actively involved, quite contrary to the Muslim patsies who were claimed to have hijacked four planes. Since those, who committed this crime, are the same as those, who are in power in Washington, no spectacular revelations can be expected; indeed, the plot stands today as it was presented within the first two days from official side, which is certainly no proof that this fairy tale is true.

3. Loss of a Fortune of State Money: On September 10, 2001, Secretary of 'Defence,' Donald Rumsfeld, acknowledged that \$2,3 trillions had disappeared from Pentagon. The events the following day prevented any unpatriotic questions. Is Bush co-responsible? The question would have come up if the issue of responsibility had ever been raised – but it was not.

4. Lie for War: The War against Iraq was based on a lie about the presence of 'Weapons of Mass-Destruction.' As shown in *'Leaked Documents for the War in Iraq,'* this warfare was agreed between Bush and Blair in 2002. Also another country, Denmark, has a similar bad conscience, for which they decided to punish the messenger. Bush and Blair's attempts to provoke the Iraqi regime to a defensive action through massive bombing were already an act of warfare, for which they should both be impeached. Moreover, Bush transferred \$700 million from the budget for the war in Afghanistan for war preparations in Iraq in July 2002, illegally (i.e., without congressional approval).

5. Violation of the Protocols of the Geneva Convention: The public has slowly realized the lawless behaviour related to the prison at Guantanamo Bay. How bad it is to keep men under humiliating conditions there for years without any juridical persecution, the torture and killing in Afghanistan, Iraq, Uzbekistan and Northern Africa is certainly some degrees worse. The kidnapping of people in Europe and the 'outsourcing' of torture (rendition) had been described in *'The Torture Scandal.'* Under Bush, the United States has adopted the Israeli practice of preventive killings [1]. The latest such actions were an act of warfare on Pakistani territory, resulting in the killing of 18 persons, 6 of them children. The unmanned drone was directed from Las Vegas. Also the use of chemical warfare in Falludja (see *'Citizide'*) is a violation of the Geneva Conventions – who talked about Weapons of Mass Destruction?

6. Domestic Spying: After the Watergate Affair, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act [FISA] requires a court order before engaging in surveillance of American citizens. FISA has been asked to do so several times and has never denied approval. Still, arguing with emergency needs, Bush has authorized the National Security Agency [NSA] to tap the telephone and Internet communications of American citizens in thousands of cases without a warrant. This should have been revealed in the New York Times a year before but they retained the information until late December 2005 until it was clear that the author would publish it in a book [2], which then was released in early January. Bush then stated that this practice had been kept upright since 9/11. Last year he still argued: "Any time you hear the US government talking about wiretap, it requires -- a wiretap requires a court order. Nothing has changed, by the way. When we're talking about chasing down terrorists, we're talking about getting a court order before we do so" – an obvious and incontrovertible lie [3]. Now, he stated that he found this practice absolutely legal. In an uncontrolled moment, he called the constitution "just a goddamned peace of paper" [4]; and this man should be the first to defend the constitution? In the beginning of February, he suddenly claimed that this policy had

1 http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/ci_3476929

2 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/16/AR2005121600021.html>

3 <http://bulldogpolitics.blogspot.com/2005/12/gruesome-truth-revealed-in-lie.html>

4 http://www.capitolhillblue.com/artman/publish/article_7779.shtml

prevented an attempt to fly into the Liberty Tower in Los Angeles. Within minutes after this revelation, news channels brought sequences from a film where the tower is destructed by aliens. The mayor of Los Angeles was less prepared: although the assault should have occurred in 2002, he had never heard about it. Interesting was the statement that the members of the parliamentary control of this practice had not been involved because they had not been sufficiently tested by the secret services they should control [5]. In other words, the secret services control the parliament, not the reverse.

6. Breaking the Constitution: Bush is the first US-President in modern times who has in five years never vetoed a law - instead, he invented a new (unconstitutional) trick: the signatories. After signing 750 laws (10% of all in his stolen position as acting President), Bush added a comment that he did not find himself bound by any limits posed by the same law [6].

In summary, there are at least seven good reasons to demand an impeachment of the president, and now, in February 2006, also the vice-president has exposed himself further. Still, chances are much bigger that nothing will happen, or that a rebelling population will remove the whole government and its congress in tar and feathers, just as they in 1776 rose against another sovereign named George.

The impeachment process

We have been raised with the expectation that (some) crimes are persecuted by justice, eventually resulting in a sentence. We have not yet learned to live in a society governed by criminals – e.g., the ones who killed >2,800 people on 9/11, 2001.

Impeachment is a political process, not a legal one. When Clinton was locked up in the trap of Monica Lewinsky and planted his DNA traces in her pants (which she carefully kept for later analysis), he was questioned by a hostile senate commission. His lie, "I did not have sex with Monica Lewinsky," appears small when compared to the crimes cited above. The congress used \$ 65 million to clarify the matter (for 9/11, they only used about ¼ of that amount). Also Nixon faced a congress controlled by the other party. His deeds were perhaps more severe, still like a child's game as compared to the crimes committed by the Bush administration. With a totally corrupted congress in place, the Bush/Cheney impeachment remains the dream of civil rights propagates.

In order to bring justice under his control – a difficult agenda with many, still independently acting judges in the American juridical jungle – Bush has now finally taken care that the supreme court is dominated by arch-conservative judges. He and his near associates are now standing above the law. They will act accordingly.

A single State Suffices for Initiating the Process

Representative Yarbrough of Illinois stumbled on a little known and never utilized rule [7], Section 603 of Jefferson's Manual of the Rules of the United States House of Representatives, which allows federal impeachment proceedings to be initiated by joint resolution of a state legislature. From there, Illinois House Joint Resolution 125 (hereafter to be referred to as HJR0125) was born. Shortly after, also the Californian House shall decide upon it, and by their proposal, also Cheney is brought along in the boat [8]. They may not come through with it but there are still 48 States. And should the process ever be initiated (against fierce reactions from the ruling circle), it will probably be killed in Washington since it is, as mentioned above, a political process, not a juridical one. Given this scope, we must be satisfied that the word 'impeachment' makes the public aware that they are governed by scoundrels.

'Snoogate'

From my monthly files of press quotations of December, January and the first part of February, I have selected some others from Bush's latest scandal, the 'Snoogate:'

16.12.05, Wash. Post: "Bush signed a secret order in 2002 authorizing the National Security Agency to eavesdrop on U.S. citizens and foreign nationals in the United States,

5 <http://www.telepolis.de/r4/artikel/21/21778/1.html>

6 http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/04/30/bush_challenges_hundreds_of_laws/

7 http://www.opednews.com/articles/opedne_steven_I_060422_bush_impeachment_t.htm

8 <http://www.democrats.com/node/8696>

despite previous legal prohibitions against such domestic spying" [9]. 18.12.05, CNN: "After ... a claim that Bush gave the NSA license to eavesdrop on Americans communicating with people overseas, the president said that his actions were permissible, but that leaking the revelation to the media was illegal" [10]. 20.12.05, Sydney Morning Herald: "A feisty and sometimes angry George Bush has accused those who leaked the fact he had authorised wiretaps on hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Americans without judicial warrants, of having compromised US security" [11]. 22.12.05, MSNBC: "The president was so desperate to kill The New York Times' eavesdropping story, he summoned the paper's editor and publisher to the Oval Office" [12]. Ending that year, the acting pResident took the initiative to 'kill the messenger;' from Reuters on 30.12.05: "US Justice Department has launched an investigation to determine who disclosed a secret NSA eavesdropping operation approved by President Bush after [9/11]" [13].

In 2006, the scandal increased, as if it had not sufficed what had already been revealed in the preceding year. A blog reported on 18.01.06: "One of the most noteworthy comments was that the Government had specified 60 Terabytes of *monthly* storage for digital versions of conversations" [14]. That would suffice for about 5 million conversations per month. The administration had by then only admitted the lawless snooping between Americans and callers from abroad.

In May 2006, USA-Today [15] could reveal that the 'Snoopgate' had even larger dimensions and predominantly involved domestic calls. In the aftermath of 9/11, three of the four big American phone companies had agreed to deliver all data of telephone connections to NSA. Only one company, Qwest, denied as they "concluded that these requests violated the privacy requirements of the Telecommunications Act" [16]. This media further reported "Responding quickly to a USA TODAY report that his administration has collected information on tens of millions of domestic phone calls, Bush said everything the NSA has done is legal, protects the privacy of Americans and helps guard the nation against terrorist attacks; NSA's efforts strictly target al-Qaeda and their known affiliates."

In the middle of this outrageous revelation, a poll allegedly showed that "63 % of Americans said they found the NSA program to be an acceptable way to investigate terrorism, incl. 44 % who strongly endorsed the effort" [17]. Would you believe this report? Benjamin Franklin is quoted of saying "Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety" in 1776. 230 Years later, this wisdom can be cooked down to a short sentence: 'The thieves of Privacy and Security are identical.' The poll is rather an evidence that such are cooked up in support of the ruling mafia and that polls are at least as unreliable as the above-mentioned stolen elections, only much easier to falsify (how, else, can you explain that 30% support Bush?). We do not know what the general American think about it but rumours will know that they are close to a rebellion.

Beyond the Law

On April 30, the Boston Globe managed a scoop that should have caused extensive attention. Instead, no other mainstream media (except International Herald Tribune) referred it: Bush has quietly claimed the authority to disobey more than 750 laws enacted since he took office, asserting that he has the power to set aside any statute passed by Congress whenever it conflicts with his interpretation of the Constitution [18]. Among the laws Bush said he can ignore are military rules and regulations, affirmative-

9 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/16/AR2005121600021.html>

10 <http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/index.html>

11 <http://smh.com.au/news/world/bush-accuses-leak-instigators-of-helping-enemy/2005/12/20/1135032020008.html>

12 <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/10536559/site/newsweek/>

13 http://today.reuters.com/news/NewsArticle.aspx?type=topNews&storyID=2005-12-30T154345Z_01_EIC055795_RTRUKOC_0_US-SECURITY-EAVESDROPPING.xml

14 http://www.libertyforum.org/showflat.php?Cat=&Board=news_constitution&Number=294340124

15 http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2006-05-11-phone-records_x.htm

16 http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2006-05-12-hayden-support_x.htm

17 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/05/12/AR2006051202048.html>

18 http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/04/30/bush_challenges_hundreds_of_laws/

action provisions, requirements that Congress be told about immigration services problems, 'whistle-blower' protections for nuclear regulatory officials, and safeguards against political interference in federally funded research.

It is a crime openly to break the law, and even if the president must sign it to bring it into effect, he is not himself standing above the law. It is not his task to interpret the American constitution. The crime has taken place over the past 5 years. The revelation comes along with the emphasis, that Bush is the first president in modern history who has never vetoed a bill. His signatories were often coinciding ceremonies in which the president made no mention of the objections he was about to raise in the bill, even as he signed it into law [19].

Los Angeles Times let out a desperate warning: "Latest NSA revelations show that the White House can't be trusted to draw the line on liberties" [20]. It is worse than that; Bush is clearly acting as a dictator now, he has hardly any opposition in the Congress and the cautious treatment of his open crimes in the mainstream media gives reason for additional concern that the conversion of society has emerged too far to be peacefully stopped. Before impeachment stands a war with Iran and during that (possibly using another 9/11 event in USA or Europe as an excuse), the Emperor will secure his absolutism beyond any legal intervention and there is no child to be heard, stating that he has no clothes on.

August 14, 2006

Fulfilling the Step

The crucial event was widely ignored by the mainstream media: towards the end of September, Bush agreed with some Republican senators on a new legislation, which toward the end of September went through the congress (but may be halted by the Supreme Court [21]). At first, it seemed an addition to the terrorizing anti-terror-laws, legalizing torture and the military courts. However, the new law broaden the definition of enemy combatants beyond the traditional definition used in wartime, to include American citizens and anyone determined to be an enemy combatant under criteria defined by the president or secretary of defense [22]. Whether the Supreme Court, with its present composition, will indeed oppose this unconstitutional legislation, is another question. And should they do, Newton Gingrich suggested that Supreme Court decisions that are "so clearly at variance with the national will" should be overridden by the other branches of government [23].

Alternative medias brought the warning further. *Infowars* wrote: the new law "is giving the president and his agents the power to capture, torture and imprison forever anyone - American citizens included - whom they arbitrarily decide is an 'enemy combatant.' This also includes those who merely give 'terrorism' some kind of 'support,' defined so vaguely that many experts say it could encompass legal advice, innocent gifts to charities or even political opposition to US government policy within its draconian strictures" [24]; *Prisonplanet* commented: "Under this bill, the president or his designee can simply decide that someone poses a threat, call them an unlawful enemy combatant, and lock them away. Yes, they are entitled to a determination by the Combatant Status Review Tribunal of whether they in fact meet the definition of unlawful enemy combatant. But the law doesn't impose a time limit. The government could simply postpone that hearing indefinitely, and the detainee would have the status of "awaiting such determination," and not be given access to federal court" [25]; and *Antiwar* added "The compromise legislation authorizes the president to seize American citizens as enemy combatants, even if they have never left the US. And once thrown into military prison, they cannot expect a trial by their peers or any other of the normal protections of

19 http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/05/03/hearing_vowed_on_bushs_powers/

20 <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/editorials/la-ed-nsa12may12.0.3278229.story?coll=la-news-comment-editorials>

21 http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/09/30/us_terrorism_trials_face_court_challenges/

22 http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/29/washington/29detain.html?_r=1&oref=slogin

23 http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/national/1154AP_Gingrich_Scotus.html

24 http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/100206A.shtml

25 <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/October2006/021006detainee.htm>

the Bill of Rights" [26]. Given the endless detainment of an undisclosed number of prisoners more than five years after 9/11, this is no new threat but legalizing the abuse makes us realize, what moral detour the once free nation has taken. The comparison to 1933 in Germany is difficult to oversee.

In New York, Hugo Chavez, the Venezuelan president, claimed similarity between Bush and the devil. That is an insult of the devil, who is equally evil, but intelligent. But another equality must be admitted: both are dangerous. With the new law, the American concentration camps can open their gates; Big Brother's Reign has been fulfilled!

October 7, 2006

John Schou