

istrate had “rendered himself obnoxious,” recourse was had to assassination.

Obama has certainly “rendered himself obnoxious,” as well as endangered the very existence of the Republic. It’s time for him to go.

Documentation

House Judiciary Examines Impeachment

Aug. 12—An official report was prepared by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives (93rd Congress) in February 1974, titled “Constitutional Grounds for Presidential Impeachment,” in the context of the impeachment inquiry against President Richard Nixon. Relevant excerpts follow.

“The debates on impeachment at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia focus principally on its applicability to the President. The framers sought to create a responsible though strong executive: they hoped, in the words of Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, that the maxim would never be adopted here that the chief Magistrate could do [no] wrong. Impeachment was to be one of the central elements of executive responsibility in the framework of the new government as they conceived it. . . .

“The framers intended impeachment to be a constitutional safeguard of the public trust, the powers of government conferred upon the President and other civil officers, and the division of powers among the legislative, judicial and executive departments.”

Under a subsection called “The Purpose of the Impeachment Remedy” the report declares:

“One of the first decisions of the delegates was that their new plan should include a separate executive, judiciary, and legislature. However, the framers sought to avoid the creation of a too-powerful executive. The Revolution had been fought against the tyranny of a king and his council, and the framers sought to build in safeguards against executive abuse and usurpation of power.”

The Congressional report concluded:

“Impeachment is a constitutional remedy addressed to serious offenses against the system of government, . . . constitutional wrongs that subvert the structure of

government, or undermine the integrity of the office and even the Constitution itself, and thus are high offenses. . . . The framers understood quite clearly that the constitutional system they were creating must include some ultimate check on the conduct of the executive. While insistent that balance between the executive and legislative branches be maintained so that the executive would not become the creature of the legislature, dismissible at its will, the framers also recognized that some means would be needed to deal with excesses by the executive. Impeachment was familiar to them. They understood its essential constitutional functions and perceived its adaptability to the American context. . . .

“The emphasis has been on the significant effects of the conduct—undermining the integrity of office, disregard of constitutional duties and oath of office, arrogation of power, abuse of the governmental process, adverse impact on the system on government. Clearly, these effects can be brought about in ways not anticipated by the criminal law. Criminal standards and criminal courts were established to control individual conduct. *Impeachment was evolved by Parliament to cope with both the inadequacy of criminal standards and the impotence of courts to deal with the conduct of great public figures* (emphasis added). . . .

“...[T]he crucial factor is not the intrinsic quality of behavior but the significance of its effect upon our constitutional system or the functioning of our government.

“...The duty of a president to ‘preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution’ to the best of his ability includes the duty not to abuse his powers or transgress their limits, nor violate the rights of citizens, such as those guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, and not to act in derogation of powers vested elsewhere by the Constitution.

“...The facts must be considered as a whole in the context of the office, not in terms of separate or isolated events. Because impeachment of a President is a grave step for the nation, it is to be predicated only upon conduct seriously incompatible with either the constitutional form and principles of our government or the proper performance of constitutional duties of the presidential office.”

The findings of this Congressional report ultimately informed the articles of impeachment that were drawn up against President Richard Nixon, which charged him with acting “in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.”