

Population Tells Congress: Impeach Cheney, Bush Now!

by Nancy Spannaus

Those Democratic Congressmen who had the guts to call town meetings in their districts over the Memorial Day recess, found out precisely what many of them didn't want to hear: The population is in a rage at Congress's inactivity, and *it wants impeachment*. Exemplary were meetings held May 29 in Detroit, and May 30 in Seattle, where Congressmen John Conyers, chair of the House Judiciary Committee, and Jim McDermott, a normally outspoken senior liberal Democrat, were confronted with the demands from their constituency to act *now*.

The dynamic reflected in both meetings, like that in the recent Democratic state conventions in California and Massachusetts, bears out Lyndon LaRouche's judgment that the U.S. population is way ahead of the Congress on the question of getting rid of the Vice President and the President, and that the efforts by the leadership of the Democratic Party to suppress the movement for impeachment, are going to backfire on their careers, unless a decisive change is made.

The statistics don't tell the story, but they are indicative. On the national level, there are only three Congressmen who have had the nerve to join with Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) on his resolution for impeachment of Dick Cheney. On the state level, there are resolutions for impeachment of Bush, or both Bush and Cheney, introduced in 11 state legislatures: Maine, California, Hawaii, Illinois, Vermont, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. On the state level, resolutions have been passed by 14 Democratic Party conventions. However, on the grassroots level, 85 cities and towns have passed resolutions calling for impeachment, and the movement is growing by leaps and bounds.

To be effective nationally, therefore, Democrats around the United States are going to have to follow the leadership of LaRouche and his youth movement (LYM), who were not only the first to call for impeachment of Cheney, but represent the quality of future-oriented, bold leadership which the nation needs. The LYM is not going to take "no" for an answer.

'Your Life Depends on It'

Two hundred and fifty people showed up at the Detroit town meeting dedicated to the question of impeachment. The meeting was sponsored by Veterans for Peace and other activist organizations, and featured the Detroit City Council members who had pushed through a resolution for double impeachment in the Council on May 16. The two leaders were Council members JoAnn Watson and Monica Conyers, the wife of Representative Conyers.

"We must impeach Cheney like our life depended on it—because it does," Watson told the crowd. She urged those present to organize the population into a movement that will achieve the goal.

Among those present, the mood was primarily one of rage at Congress's capitulation to Cheney and Bush's demands for war. There was open talk about leaving the Democratic Party out of disgust with its inactivity.

Into this situation came Conyers, who was a prominent spokesman for impeachment prior to the Democrats taking control of Congress in November 2006. He stayed only a few minutes, but he clearly got a whiff of the popular anger, both at this meeting, and at his own town meeting which was dedicated to the problem of rising gas prices.

Conyers' own meeting drew nearly 100 people, and they were equally enraged, so enraged that the Detroit police were brought in to stand at the back of the hall, in case they were needed to restore order. Those present were furious over the economic collapse, home foreclosures, and the inability to afford gas for their cars, and they were in no mood to be mollified. An attempt by Conyers to talk about hybrid cars, as a project Congress was working on, was met with an angry woman's retort: "I can't even afford \$5 of gas, or pay my bills on housing, and you're here talking about alternate energies?"

Thanks to the presence of LYM organizers, there were some solutions put on the table: not only impeachment, but the

FDR-style economic recovery measures that LaRouche put in his Emergency Reconstruction Act of 2006, particularly for retooling the auto industry. What was clear was that the electorate is boiling over with rage at the destruction of the nation, through the destruction of industry as well as the war, but that nothing *positive* will happen unless it heeds the direction of LaRouche.

Only One Issue on the Agenda: Impeachment

The city of Seattle is by no means as destroyed as Detroit, but the mood at the over 100-person meeting called by Congressman McDermott on May 30 was very similar to the Michigan event. People are demanding impeachment, and they don't want to hear their representatives' cowardly excuses for doing nothing.

A LYM member was the first to bring up impeachment at the McDermott meeting, but the crowd was all primed to go. Immediately, 20 hands flew up and stayed up for the remainder of the discussion. Many of those speaking for impeachment were very clear about the threat of Cheney-Bush action against Iran. One woman asked: "Our democracy is decaying... You are a senior representative... I beg you to sign on to Kucinich's resolution." There was much applause and cheering.

The Congressman was shaken up, and asked. "You tell me, how is it gonna happen?" There was a lot of commotion at this point. The drive to impeach Richard Nixon was brought up, which McDermott responded to later by saying that the Nixon affair took a long time, implying that other useful things could be done instead of going for impeachment. Yet as the meeting went on, each concern that was raised by the crowd or McDermott himself: the troops, the economy (in vague terms), the threat of an Iran confrontation, etc., was met with the defeatist statement that nothing could be done because of this Administration.

"We can't do it, we don't have the votes, and they know we don't have the votes," McDermott whined.

"But Jiiim! The reason why they think that is because you're standing there saying it!" was the response.

When McDermott tried to find safe haven by changing the subject to Global Warming, the people demanded: What about impeachment?

The last, and most crucial, question was asked by LYM organizer Sarah Stuart, who brought up the principle of Classical tragedy. She directly challenged the Congressman's pessimistic worldview, including his assertion that war with Iran is inevitable, saying that it was that type of thinking which is the essence of tragedy. "The question is not, 'What will happen if we go for impeachment?' but 'What will happen if we don't go for impeachment?'"

Having lost his cool under the barrage of tough-love from his constituents, McDermott could only reply by whining, "What do you think we should do?! Look, I'm not a dictator!"

There is little question but that such scenes were repeated

around the country, over this recess, although, without the participation of the LYM, there would have been no solutions put on the table. The question is thus posed: How will the population succeed in getting Congress to carry out the tasks which it elected them to accomplish? Not only to stop *this* war, but to prevent the next one, and put the U.S. back on a road to prosperity, in collaboration with its neighbors.

In fact, as the LYM organizer in Seattle said, these Congressmen suffer primarily from being pessimistic. True, they are under heavy pressure from the Synarchist wing of the party—the Rohatyns, and hedge fund operators who have "invested" in the Democrats, in order to prevent them from taking the radical FDR measure required. But, fundamentally, they don't understand that the removal of Cheney can open up the entire political situation for the good, permitting the Congress to take the urgent measures required to save the country from destruction in the onrushing economic breakdown crisis. They haven't faced the reality of the breakdown crisis, and the urgency of their action.

But, as was said in the 1960s, times are a-changing. And with LYM leadership on the scene, they can accomplish the necessary tasks, starting with impeaching Cheney now!

Gore: No Impeachment!

In a Public Broadcasting System interview with Gwen Ifill on May 30, Al Gore attacked the idea of impeachment as a waste of time. At one point in the interview, Gore referred to Dick Cheney's role: "Although President Bush has since tried to specifically distance himself from that argument [that Saddam Hussein caused 9/11], Vice President Cheney still has not, so maybe there's a split within the Administration."

At the mention of Cheney, the interviewer then asked about impeachment:

Ifill: You've been a leader. You served in Bill Clinton's Administration as Vice President. You watched as the Republican Congress impeached him. Do you think that the Democratic-led Congress right now should be making efforts to impeach George W. Bush?

Gore: I haven't made that case. . . .

Ifill: Why not?

Gore: Well, with a year and a half to go in his term and with no consensus in the nation as a whole to support such a proposition, any realistic analysis of that as a policy option would lead one to question the allocation of time and resources.

Ifill: You don't think it's a good use of time?

Gore: Well, I don't think it is. I don't think it would be likely to be successful.