

We have a president who claims dictatorial power

Censure is the least he deserves

He tortures prisoners.

He keeps them in secret prisons.

He doesn't allow trials.

And now he's contracted with Halliburton to plan for the rapid construction of concentration camps on U.S. soil.

Enough is enough.

Spying on terrorists is not the issue; no one is suggesting we shouldn't—although deceitful Republican leaders want you to believe some are. The issue is: George W. Bush broke the law.

He broke a law—enacted after Nixon's abuses—designed to allow effective surveillance while protecting Americans from government officials who spy on political opponents. He not only broke the law, he shattered it. And NSA spying is not the only instance of ignoring laws—not by a long shot.

George Bush broke *hundreds* of laws by personally deeming them unconstitutional. He defiantly claims to retain the right to torture despite the great harm it does to our nation, and Congress's specific prohibitions against it. Using signing statement after signing statement—including a recent one which says he may ignore the oversight provisions of the PATRIOT Act renewal—this chief executive declares Congress to be irrelevant. He uses the contrived

Unitary Executive Theory to dismiss the judicial branch and to serve as apparent legal justification for dictatorial power. Instead of using courts to determine the constitutionality of statutes, he demands that *he* be allowed to make such determinations when deciding how he'll enforce a law.

The gauntlet is down

George Bush is challenging America by saying "I'm not going to obey your laws—what are you going to do about it?" If we do not censure now, he will rightfully conclude we do not have the courage to oppose him and will do what all unopposed dictators throughout history have done: grab more power until the true meaning of terror is realized.

The Unitary Executive Theory and Commander-in-Chief claims boil down to this: the Republican leadership wants you to believe our founding fathers intended, in time of war, to vest unlimited power in the hands of just one man. Utter nonsense.

Nowhere is it written the president has such power. You must "read into" the Constitution—just like an activist judge—to pretend to arrive at their new interpretation. Conversely, there are several *explicit* passages in the Constitution that refute their claims and bestow superior authority upon Congress.

Clearly, the interpretation we've used for well over 200 years, and

through many wars, is the proper one. If you believe our founding fathers suffered under the tyrannical rule of King George and wrote the Constitution to prevent his type of abuse from recurring in their new government . . . if you believe in the wisdom of checks and balances . . . if you believe the Constitution was written to *limit* government intrusion into citizen's lives, instead of to expand executive power . . . then defend these principles against those who seek to destroy them. Do not surrender to cowardice by trading freedom for protection from the threat of terrorist attacks. Put the good of the nation above all else: defy corrupt Republican leaders by supporting censure!

It can happen here

Incredibly, in mid March, former Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, during an address at Georgetown University, warned that we are already in the early stages of dictatorship. Until recently, very few believed such a thing could happen here, let alone publicly spoke of it.

But if you look again at the evidence that's accumulated these past five years, it becomes obvious:

It *can* happen here.

It *is* happening here.

But *you* can stop it.

