

THE CASE FOR IMPEACHMENT

page 2	topic alpha: in a class by itself >domestic spying	The indefensible defense
page 3	selected quotes	I said this / I meant that
pages 4 - 8	topic one: elections > 2004 GAO report > 2000 – 2002 consortium review	Ohio becomes Ukraine Florida ends democracy
pages 9 - 15	topic two: 9-11 > Warnings strange actions > Laws of physics official story: bogus > Cover-up any crime: who benefits?	Little stuff matters Random hit means random tip The Butler didn't do it
pages 16 - 24	topic three: Iraq > Intent precedes reason secret agenda > Lies and deceit fake, fake, fake > Atrocities un-American activities	Divert attention, get oil Bad intelligence or shrewd thieves Detention, torture, terror: we're # 1
pages 25 - 31	topic four: Abuse of power > Secrecy and cronyism nation at risk – for what? > Budget mayhem trickle trick > Criminal actions in defense of bad policy the outing	Here and abroad, Clique first, America second The legacy: massive debt, lots of interest Fight honesty with state secrets
page 32	summary > Conclusion: impeach Bush now	We've seen enough

###

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The compilation of evidence showing that grounds for impeachment of George W. Bush do exist and that Articles of Impeachment should be initiated in the House of Representatives without delay.

This work is the result of efforts by United States citizens who gathered and edited information from credited and public sources as a public service.

Free distribution, copying, circulation and further publication of unaltered text is hereby authorized.

The enclosed material is intended for use in constructive debate and for purposes intended to better the condition of these United States and all the citizens of these United States of America by challenging government to serve the people honestly and efficiently.

Edited and published in MyRubberRoom.

Jan helped

© 2005 All rights reserved.

THE INDEFENSIBLE DEFENSE

There is a common thread between the Reagan, Nixon and Bush II administrations.

It's not the economy. Nixon presided over sensible budgets to the good of the country.
It's not arrogance. Reagan was generally not arrogant and was somewhat grandfatherly.
It's not communication. Bush is no Reagan and Reagan is no great communicator;
great communicator .. there's a fabricated myth for you.

The thread is the incredible disrespect for the Constitution each of them swore to uphold.

It's the common feeling they shared that 'president' is Latin for 'king.'

Even LBJ, who thought highly of himself for reasons few can understand, did not make the cut.

Reagan's adherence to the trickle-down trick – even after his own budget director showed him the folly – and his administration's in-your-face defiance of Congress with Iran-Contra gave him the inside track in the race to “worst president ever.”

Nixon, of course, had already made a name for himself but, Nixon's claim to bad-boy fame paled, if blatant abuse of power can pale.

But, in a full court press, Bush takes the prize. Full steam ahead since 1999, this regime tops all in the disrespect department. Disrespect for the people and their will, if you will, rampant disrespect for law and order, disrespect for the Constitution and a serious lack of concern for ethics and discipline mark the current regime.

And, though that common thread remains, Bush, Nixon and Reagan, holier than thou, self-centered and erroneously proud, W and his cronies have taken bad – sold out – government to the nth degree.

The actions, Iran-Contra, Watergate and, now, the NSA snoop license, carry the common thread of impeachability but, it's really the defense that gets the gold medal for Bush. When the first hint of major scandal hit the Reagan administration, defenses went up and denials hit the streets in great number. But, the matter was investigated and exposed. Reagan soon admitted that he'd been part of a plan “gone wrong.” Nixon, of course, tripped over his own ego and his own fascination with power and intrigue. He reluctantly admitted to some wrongs and left the scene.

Bush is unique. He's neither power maniac nor grandfatherly type. A moderate ego, G. W. simply does what he now can for friends he's always needed. His friends and friends of those friends put him in a position to be important to them. Not qualified. Not competent. Not good for or important to the country; important to them. And, that's a position George takes seriously.

How do you serve your supportive friends? Operating at your own expense is certainly verboten. As do those friends, you use the assets of others, resources you control but do not own, to pay off.

One can get carried away in that ‘paying off’ process, which is exactly what George has done. Taking royal license for himself, he's moved heaven and Earth, well, law and order, actually, and our treasury, in order to repay his personal debts.

To ice the cake, he defends all of his bad policies and his un-American activity and promises more of the same. And, that, dear friends, cuts it. George has to go. Real patriots know that.

Now, all Americans must become real patriots. Not listen-to-the-radio patriots. Not root-for-the-troops patriots. Real patriots. It's time to think, crunch numbers, add good and subtract bad, swallow the bitter pill and face reality. George must go. Dick, Don and Condi, too. We must protect our Constitution.

The Constitution, which is about what type of country the United States is to be, depends on it. Amazing, isn't it? We depend on our Constitution and it depends on us. What a country.

See also: summary, page 32

Selected quotes .. Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq and life itself

"Victory means exit strategy, and it's important for the president to explain to us what the exit strategy is."
George W. Bush, 4/9/99 criticizing President Clinton on Kosovo

"I think it's also important for the president to lay out a timetable as to how long they will be involved and when they will be withdrawn."
George W. Bush, 6/5/99

"It doesn't make any sense to have a timetable. You know, if you give a timetable, you're — you're conceding too much to the enemy."
George W. Bush, 6/24/05

"Explain to the mothers and fathers of American servicemen that may come home in body bags why their son or daughter have to give up their life."
Sean Hannity, Fox News, 4/6/99

"[The] President...is once again releasing American military might on a foreign country with an ill-defined objective and no exit strategy. He has yet to tell the Congress how much this operation will cost. And he has not informed our nation's armed forces about how long they will be away from home. These strikes do not make for a sound foreign policy."
Sen. Rick Santorum (R-PA) criticizing Clinton

"American foreign policy is now one huge big mystery. Simply put, the administration is trying to lead the world with a feel-good foreign policy."
Rep Tom Delay (R-TX) criticizing Clinton

"If we are going to commit American troops, we must be certain they have a clear mission, an achievable goal and an exit strategy."
Karen Hughes, speaking on behalf of George W Bush .. criticizing Clinton

"I had doubts about the bombing campaign from the beginning...I didn't think we had done enough in the diplomatic area."
Senator Trent Lott (R-MS) criticizing Clinton

"I cannot support a failed foreign policy. History teaches us that it is often easier to make war than peace. This administration is just learning that lesson right now. The President began this mission with very vague objectives and lots of unanswered questions. A month later, these questions are still unanswered. There are no clarified rules of engagement. There is no timetable. There is no legitimate definition of victory. There is no contingency plan for mission creep. There is no clear funding program. There is no agenda to bolster our over-extended military. There is no explanation defining what vital national interests are at stake. There was no strategic plan for war when the President started this thing, and there still is no plan today"
Rep. Tom DeLay (R-TX) criticizing Clinton

"I'm a firm believer in feeding people their own words back to them, when it's appropriate."
Senator Trent Lott (R-MS)

"Secondly, there are such things as roving wiretaps. Now, by the way, any time you hear the United States 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. It's important for our fellow citizens to understand, when you think Patriot Act, constitutional guarantees are in place when it comes to doing what is necessary to protect our homeland, because we value the Constitution."

G. W. Bush, lying about wiretaps in April, 04, long after illegally authorizing domestic wiretaps without warrants

"Do I have the legal authority to do this? The answer is absolutely"

"As president and commander in chief, I have the constitutional responsibility and the constitutional authority to protect our country," he said. "Article II of the Constitution gives me that responsibility and the authority necessary to fulfill it."

G. W. Bush, 12/ 19/05, Press Conference, explaining why he doesn't need to explain .. or to seek warrants
(Article II does no such thing, of course, but, the sheep won't look that up..and that's the key to usurping power)

George W. Bush appears to have claimed the world's most powerful office by blocking a court-ordered recount of votes that likely would have elected Al Gore to be president of the United States.

A document, revealed by Newsweek, indicates that the Florida recount -- stopped last year by five Supreme Court Republicans would have taken into account so-called "over-votes" that heavily favored Gore. If those "over-votes" were counted, as it appears they would have been, Gore would have carried Florida regardless of what standard of chad -- dimpled, hanging, punched-through -- was used in counting the so-called "under-votes," according to an examination of those ballots by a group of leading news organizations.

In other words, Bush lost not only the national popular vote by more than a half million ballots, but he would have lost the key state of Florida and thus the presidency, if Florida's authorities had been allowed to count the votes that met the state's legal requirement of demonstrating the clear intent of the voter. The Newsweek disclosure -- a memo that the presiding judge in the state recount sent to a county canvassing board -- shows that the judge was instructing the county boards to collect "over-votes" that had been rejected for indicating two choices for president when, in reality, the voters had made clear their one choice.

"If you would segregate 'over-votes' as you describe and indicate in your final report how many where you determined the clear intent of the voter," wrote Judge Terry Lewis, who had been named by the Florida Supreme Court to oversee the statewide recount, "I will rule on the issue for all counties." Lewis's memo to the Charlotte County canvassing board chairman was written on Dec. 9, 2000, hours before Bush succeeded in getting five conservative justices on the U.S. Supreme Court to stop the Florida recount.

Lewis has said in more recent interviews that he might well have expanded the recount to include those "over-votes." Indeed, it would be hard to imagine that he wouldn't count those legitimate votes once they were recovered by the counties and were submitted to Lewis. The "over-votes" in which voters marked the name of their choice and also wrote in his name would be even more clearly legal votes than the so-called "under-votes" which were kicked out for failing to register a choice that could be read by voting machines.

Misguided Articles

This new information indicating that the wrong presidential candidate moved into the White House also makes a mockery of the Nov. 12 front-page stories of the New York Times, the Washington Post and other leading news outlets, which stated that Bush would have won regardless of the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling.

Those stories were based on the hypothetical results if the state-ordered recount had looked only at "under-votes." The news organizations assumed, incorrectly it now appears, that the "over-votes" would have been excluded from such a tally, leaving Bush with a tiny lead. With the "Bush Wins" headlines, news outlets downplayed their more dramatic finding that Gore would have won if a full statewide recount had been conducted in accordance with state law. Using the clear-intent-of-the-voter standard, Gore beat Bush by margins ranging from 60 to 171 votes, depending on what standard was used in judging the "under-votes."

Beyond the big newspapers' false assumptions about the state recount, the news stories showed a pro-Bush bias in their choice of language and the overall slant of the articles. The New York Times, for instance, used the word "would" and even declarative statements when referring to Bush prevailing in hypothetical partial recounts. By contrast, the word "might" was used when mentioning that Gore topped Bush if all ballots were considered.

"A comprehensive review of the uncounted Florida ballots," the Times wrote, "reveal that George W. Bush would have won even if the United States Supreme Court had allowed the statewide manual recount of the votes that the Florida Supreme Court had ordered to go forward. Contrary to what many partisans of former Vice President Al Gore have charged, the United State Supreme Court did not award an election to Mr. Bush that otherwise would have been won by Mr. Gore."

Two paragraphs later, the Times noted that the examination of all rejected ballots “found that Mr. Gore might have won if the courts had ordered a full statewide recount. ... The findings indicate that Mr. Gore might have eked out a victory if he had pursued in court a course like the one he publicly advocated when he called on the state to ‘count all the votes.’”

Left out of that formulation, which suggests that Gore was a hypocrite, is the fact that Bush rejected Gore’s early proposal for a full statewide recount. Bush also waged a relentless campaign of obstruction that left no time for the state courts to address the equal-protection-under-the-law concerns raised by the U.S. Supreme Court in its final ruling on Dec. 12, 2000. Note also how the Times denigrates as misguided Gore “partisans” those American citizens who concluded, apparently correctly, that the U.S. Supreme Court awarded the election to Bush. The headlines, too, favored Bush. The Times’ front-page headline on Nov. 12 read, “Study of Disputed Florida Ballots Finds Justices Did Not Cast the Deciding Vote.” The Washington Post’s headline read, “Florida Recounts Would Have Favored Bush.”

Spreading Confusion

The pro-Bush themes in the headlines and stories were repeated over and over by television and other newspapers, creating a widespread belief among casual news consumers that Bush had prevailed in the full statewide recount, rather than only in truncated recounts based on dubious hypotheses.

Now, Judge Lewis’s memo undercuts both the tone and the content of those news reports. It is certainly not clear anymore that the state-ordered recount would have favored Bush. It also appears likely that the interference by the U.S. Supreme Court was decisive. Based on the new evidence, the major newspapers look to be wrong on both these high-profile points.

Beyond Gore’s narrow victory from the recoverable ballots, the news organizations concluded – but played down – that Gore lost thousands of unrecoverable ballots because of flawed ballot designs in several Democratic strongholds. Gore lost other votes because Gov. Jeb Bush’s administration disqualified hundreds of predominantly black voters who were falsely labeled felons. The New York Times also reported that Bush achieved a net gain of about 290 votes by getting illegally cast absentee votes counted in Republican counties while enforcing the rules strictly in Democratic counties. Though the new recount tallies did not include any adjustments for these irregularities, the news organizations estimated that Gore lost tens of thousands of votes from these disparities, compared to Bush’s official victory margin of 537 votes.

For months, the leading news organizations have been bending over backwards to protect Bush’s fragile legitimacy, possibly out of concern for the nation’s image in a time of crisis. Yet, whatever the motivation for trying to make Bush look good, the evidence is now overwhelming that Bush strong-armed his way, illegitimately, to the presidency. In the days immediately after the election, Bush obstructed a full-and-fair recount in Florida, even dispatching hooligans from outside the state to intimidate vote counters.

When Gore pressed for recounts in the courts, Bush sent in lawyers to prevent the tallies. Then, after losing before the Florida Supreme Court and the federal appeals court, Bush ultimately got a friendly hearing from five political allies on the U.S. Supreme Court.

If Bush truly respected the precepts of democracy and what those principles mean to the world, he could have joined Gore in demanding as full and fair a Florida recount as possible. He could have accepted the results, win or lose. Instead Bush opted for the opposite course, deciding that his getting the White House was more important than the voters having their judgment accepted, both nationally and in Florida. By refusing to hold Bush accountable for his key role in thwarting the voters’ will, the major news organizations are not doing the cause of democracy any service.

It turns out that the thousands of demonstrators who protested Bush’s Inauguration were closer to the truth when they shouted at his motorcade, “Hail to the Thief!”

[For more on studies about the election results, see Consortiumnews.com stories of [May 12](#), [June 2](#), [July 16](#) and [Nov. 12](#).]