

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

June 14, 2013 Vol. 40 No. 24

www.larouche.com \$10.00

Obama Appoints Warmongers as Syria Peace Efforts Falter
Mexico's Drought Demands 'NAWAPA-Plus'
FDR's First 100 Days Set Basis for Future Progress

**LaRouche: Oust Obama Now,
Or Face Overt Dictatorship**



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small,
Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William
Wertz*

Editor: *Nancy Spannaus*

Managing Editors: *Bonnie James, Susan Welsh*

Technology Editor: *Marsha Freeman*

Book Editor: *Katherine Notley*

Graphics Editor: *Alan Yue*

Photo Editor: *Stuart Lewis*

Circulation Manager: *Stanley Ezrol*

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: *Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg*

Economics: *John Hoefle, Marcia Merry Baker,
Paul Gallagher*

History: *Anton Chaitkin*

Ibero-America: *Dennis Small*

Law: *Edward Spannaus*

Russia and Eastern Europe: *Rachel Douglas*

United States: *Debra Freeman*

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: *Javier Almaro*

Berlin: *Rainer Apel*

Copenhagen: *Tom Gillesberg*

Houston: *Harley Schlanger*

Lima: *Sara Madueño*

Melbourne: *Robert Barwick*

Mexico City: *Gerardo Castilleja Chávez*

New Delhi: *Ramtanu Maitra*

Paris: *Christine Bierre*

Stockholm: *Ulf Sandmark*

United Nations, N.Y.C.: *Leni Rubinstein*

Washington, D.C.: *William Jones*

Wiesbaden: *Göran Haglund*

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.executiveintelligencereview.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: *John Sigerson*

Assistant Webmaster: *George Hollis*

Editor, Arabic-language edition: *Hussein Askary*

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly

(50 issues), by EIR News Service, Inc.,

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach

Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany

Tel: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>

e-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, Sankt Knuds Vej 11,

basement left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark.

Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40, Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail:

eirdk@hotmail.com.

Mexico City: EIR, Ave Morelos #60-A, Col Barrio

de San Andres, Del. Azcapotzalco, CP 02240,

Mexico, DF. Tel: 5318-2301, 1163-9734, 1163-9735.

Copyright: ©2013 EIR News Service. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement

#40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to EIR, P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

EIR

From the Managing Editor

With the gallimaufry of scandals swirling around the Obama Administration, the fundamental threats to our republic could become obscured. Therefore, in this issue, we begin to lift the fog, with “LaRouche: Oust Obama Now, or Face Overt Dictatorship” *Feature*. The unconstitutional spying on U.S. citizens, LaRouche declares, makes it clear that Obama “is seeking absolute, total dictatorship over almost everybody, and this fact has suddenly become conscious within leading circles.”

Among those leading circles is Sen. Ron Wyden, who, in a floor speech on May 26, compared the Obama Administration’s anti-Constitutional surveillance of innocent Americans to the British Empire’s crushing of liberties in the American colonies: “The Founding Fathers included strong protections for personal privacy in the Fourth Amendment.... This was a direct rejection of the authority that the British had claimed to have when they ruled the American colonies....” There is also a comprehensive Chronology, “How Obama Expanded and Consolidated the Bush-Cheney Domestic Spy Dagnet,” beginning in the 1940s, and up through Edward Snowden’s revelations of the past week about NSA spying.

The concept of the American Republic vs. the British Empire is picked up again in “In His Own Words: How FDR’s First 100 Days Set the Basis for Future Progress” (*National*) in which the President cites the “old, but somewhat forgotten ideals and values” set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution, as the basis for his successful anti-Depression program.

This theme is continued in *Economics*, with “What the American Revolution Overthrew: British Imperial Genocide in India.” The same section provides a shocking picture of the destruction of food production in the U.S., “Obama’s Pretense of 2013 ‘Good Crops’ Is Wiped Out,” and in Mexico, “Drought Demands ‘NAWAPA-Plus’ Infrastructure Projects.”

There is more on the *International* front: “Obama Appoints Warmongers as Syria Peace Efforts Falter,” scores the naming of radical interventionists Susan Rice and Samantha Power (followed by dossiers on each) to Obama’s national security team.

And in *Science*, “Solar System Flare-Up: An Interplanetary Imperative” looks at the implications of the current increase in Solar System activity.”



Cover This Week

Obama has crossed a bridge too far; his surveillance of Americans is provoking a revolt against his imperial Presidency.



White House/Pete Souza

4 LaRouche: Oust Obama Now, or Face Overt Dictatorship

President Obama—and his imperial controllers—are attempting a “de facto coup d’état,” Lyndon LaRouche declared in his June 7 webcast. “Either the American people get Congress to move to remove Obama from office, or they face “an actual, overt dictatorship over the American people.”

7 Obama Is Spying on Innocent Americans Right Now!

The *Guardian*’s revelations about a top-secret FISA Court order to Verizon to hand over customers’ private information to the hyper-secret NSA has caused a storm of outrage. And the spying on Americans is more extensive than anyone thought.

10 Wyden Makes the Case: NSA Spying Violates U.S. Constitution

13 A Chronology: How Obama Expanded and Consolidated the Bush-Cheney Domestic Spy Dragnet

International

19 Obama Appoints Warmongers as Syria Peace Efforts Falter

President Obama defiantly responded to scandals enveloping his Presidency, and to the military victories by the Syrian Army over the past week, by naming two dangerously militant interventionists to high posts in his Administration.

22 The Ugly Records of Susan Rice and Samantha Power

23 From Our Archives: Two British Witches Out To Smash National Sovereignty

27 Floods in Germany: No More ‘Eco,’ No More ‘Euro’

The devastating floods in Europe cannot be blamed on the fury of “Mother Nature,” but the failure of mankind to civilize her. Silence the greenies, and build infrastructure.

29 Putin Tells Conference: Destroy Drug Trade’s Financial Support

At an international drug enforcement conference in Moscow June 5, President Putin challenged NATO and the EU to work with Russia and its allies in Central Asia to eliminate the plague of illegal drugs, and condemned the legalization of so-called “soft” drugs, as “a very dangerous path.”

Economics

- 30 Biofuels Kill, as Intended: Obama's Pretense of 2013 'Good Crops' Is Wiped Out**
Obama's "Made in London" script is a pretense for continuing the diversion of food crops to biofuels. The *intent* is to undermine agriculture, create hunger, and kill.
- 34 Mexico's Drought Demands 'NAWAPA-Plus' Infrastructure Projects**
A catastrophic, three-year drought is now afflicting 21 of Mexico's 32 states and has created a life-or-death crisis which threatens to exterminate not only agriculture, but the Mexican people themselves.
- 37 Watering the Great American Desert**
Excerpts from an article by Dennis Small in *EIR*, Aug. 10, 2012.
- 40 What the American Revolution Overthrew: British Imperial Genocide in India**
The British East India Company's subjugation of Bengal in 1765, ushered in an age of genocide for the next 135 years, that was unparalleled in human history.

National

- 43 In His Own Words: How FDR's First 100 Days Set the Basis for Future Progress**
President Roosevelt outlined his view of what he termed "The Year of Crisis," 1933, in his *Public Papers and Addresses of 1938*: "We were determined to help all that needed help for recovery: We were equally determined to reform wherever reform was necessary to insure permanence in recovery."
- 45 Glass-Steagall on the Agenda**
- 46 Graham, 9/11 Families: Government Must 'Come Clean' on Saudi Links**
- 48 Solar System Flare-Up: An Interplanetary Imperative**
Mid-May featured a period of intense earthquakes and solar activity, bringing some long-standing questions into focus. "Did you feel the effects of these recent outbursts?" asks Benjamin Deniston of the LaRouche scientific research team.

Editorial

- 52 Calling on Citizens with Courage**

LaRouche: Oust Obama Now, Or Face Overt Dictatorship

by Nancy Spannaus

June 8—Speaking at his regular Friday night webcast on www.larouhepac.com on June 7, Lyndon LaRouche addressed the current revelations about the “de facto coup d’état” which the British puppet Barack Obama has set in motion, and warned: Either the American people get Congress to move to remove Obama from office, or they face “an actual, overt dictatorship over the American people.”

LaRouche laid out the parameters of the choice the American people face, now that the unprecedented, unconstitutional spying operation of the Obama Administration has been exposed. “The issue is that [Obama] has been allowed to go to the point that he is seeking absolute, total dictatorship over almost everybody, and this fact has suddenly become conscious within leading circles.” Comparing Obama to Richard Nixon, LaRouche noted, “The time has come for that lawful process that dealt with a President earlier, and threw him out of office, back in the early 1970s—the same treatment, with probably an extra kick or two, is coming to Obama.”

He continued: “What happened this week, of course, is the Congress has risen in revolt. And the pattern is that this spying operation that Obama has been running on behalf of the Queen of England, has brought them to the point that people are now—on that account, and several other related accounts which have

been piling up—ready to throw this bum out of the Presidency. And that’s where we stand now. We’re on the edge.

“Is Obama going to succeed in making himself an absolute dictator over the United States? No, he’s not going to succeed because the British Queen is the one who’s occupying the position; he’s just her dummy. But the threat is that if he succeeds, on her behalf, in what he has put through, then there will be an absolute dictatorship in the United States.”

In response to a question, LaRouche elaborated: “We’ve come to a point where this Obama has abused, brutally abused, the United States and its citizens and economy, in every imaginable way. We’re now in that kind of situation where people are saying—and you saw it in Congress this week—what happened was that there was a sudden revolt in the Senate against this operation. A sudden revolt! They were sitting there quietly listening to this crap, and then, suddenly, *boom!* Things changed. And the rioting began. ‘What? What are you doing to us? You’re doing this to us?’ That was what rang out in Congress.

“We also had a reflection of that from Britain, where voices in Britain of some significance made the same kind of observation.”

LaRouche noted: “What has happened, is that Obama was never really good. He was never really



Tony Blair functioned as the Queen's point man in the Bush-Cheney Administration; he continues that role today with Obama.

liked very much. But people were afraid of him. And when important people are terribly afraid of what some bum can do—and Obama did a lot of cruel things to intimidate people—and we've come to the point, yes, a few Senators did try to cover up for Obama, but most of them did not.

“So, we've come to a point of ripeness, where Obama is ready to be ushered from the exits, or thrown out of the exits. We've come to one of those times where either Obama is capable of imposing an actual overt dictatorship, over the American people, and the institutions, or he is going to be thrown out.”

Obama's Controllers Want Dictatorship

The recent disclosures of Obama's spying, in ways far beyond what was done under the Cheney-Bush Administration, underline the accuracy of LaRouche's April 11, 2009 portrait of Obama as a Nero-like dummy who could be manipulated to do anything on behalf of the policies of the British Queen. Already notorious for his unconstitutional launching of war and murder of U.S. citizens, themselves impeachable offenses, Obama is now consolidating what the Empire has wanted all along—a full-blown dictatorship.

The activities of LaRouche's political organizations, particularly LaRouchePAC, have been focused on halting this threat through two measures of equal urgency.

The first is the need to remove Obama from his position of political power, constitutionally, either through impeachment, or forced resignation, on the basis of his mental impairment or fear of impeachment. Such a shift would not solve all problems, but would remove the Queen's agent Obama from the ability to carry out her genocidal intentions, in the realms of both strategic and economic policy.

The second is the need to crush the power of the British financial empire itself, through the re-institution of the Glass-Steagall legislation in the precise form that Franklin Delano Roosevelt put through. Such

a re-institution would bankrupt Wall Street, the British Empire's main tool in the United States, and open up the pathway to re-establishing the Hamiltonian credit system and rebuilding the disintegrating physical economy of the nation and the world.

While support for both these measures has palpably grown over recent years, one of the major stumbling blocks has been the outright *cowardice* of people, even in high positions in Congress, in confronting the President, who has consistently moved toward consolidating unconstitutional rule by decree—from initiating wars, to murdering Americans on his personal say-so, to violating the separation of powers and due process of law.

That cowardice, as LaRouche indicated, is now beginning to wane, in the face of the outrageous revelations about Presidential overreach. But a deeper understanding of the problem is required, if it is to be solved.

The 9/11 Coup

The British Empire, a.k.a. the Anglo-Dutch Empire, as a continuation of the Roman Empire of yore, has never given up on its determination to destroy the only effective challenger it ever had, the American Republic.

After losing three wars against the United States, the British chose to carry out their aims through subversion and assassinations of those American political leaders who represented a threat to their power, the last one being President John F. Kennedy 50 years ago. Since that assassination, followed by the elimination of the Bretton Woods system of sovereignty over currencies in 1971, this global financial empire has been on a devastatingly effective offensive aimed at destroying the system of sovereign nation-states dedicated to technological progress which President Franklin Roosevelt had envisaged.

On Sept. 11, 2001 the Empire struck what it undoubtedly thought would be the decisive blow, toward eliminating constitutional government in the United States. Using networks which had been created by British intelligence, in collaboration with its Saudi cousins, the Empire carried out the terror attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon as a means of terrorizing Americans into accepting the imposition of de facto dictatorship. The laws and the wars were already on the shelf, waiting to be put in place. And British Prime Minister Tony Blair was there for the Queen to deploy

as needed, to make sure Bush and Cheney did what she wished.

Unfortunately for the Empire, Congress did not prove as compliant as they wished. Limitations were put on the original Administration demands for total war and police-state control, and despite persistent efforts by Administration officials to implement a total surveillance state through secret programs and methods, they kept running into resistance from both Democrats and Republicans.

Enter President Barack Obama, another buddy (read puppet) of Tony Blair! Candidate Obama had made noises of opposition to Guantanamo, the 2003 war in Iraq, and torture, but even before his election, in July 2008, then-Senator Obama voted to give the telecommunications companies immunity from civil suits for their cooperation with the National Security Agency (NSA) in their massive wiretapping operation. It has been reliably reported, and not disputed, that what changed Obama's vote was the advice of his campaign counterterrorism advisor John Brennan, who was speaking out publicly in favor of immunizing the telecoms who had been giving the NSA full access to their electronic traffic.

Once in office, Obama said *nothing* about the surveillance program he found in place. Indeed, he moved relentlessly ahead with virtually all of the Cheney-Bush programs, with notable expansions in the areas of secret drone strikes and prosecutions of whistleblowers. While these were basically done without fanfare, even when they were exposed, the Congress provided nary a peep of opposition.

It is that supine behavior which is just beginning to crack, as reflected in the scandals—many of them longstanding—being broken by the U.S. and British media, and some signs of life in the Congress.

But there should be no illusions. For Congress, and the population, to take on Obama means taking on the massive British imperial/Wall Street apparatus which put him in office, and helps him carry out the dirty work of threats, bribery, and the like to ensure that Congress complies with measures that are suppressing and murdering, their constituents.

As St. Paul put it so eloquently, we fight not against persons, but against “principalities and powers.” Against that evil, it is only the courage of human beings willing to fight for the principle of the good, without compromise. That is what the reassertion of the U.S. Constitution's own unique principles will mean, when our citizens take up the fight.



The Al-Qaeda Executive

Financed and deployed by the British-Saudi Empire, al-Qaeda has been protected by the Obama Administration to accomplish the Empire's global war. In this feature [video](#), LaRouchePAC documents President Obama's use of the al-Qaeda networks to overthrow Qaddafi in Libya, and to carry out bloody regime-change against Assad in Syria, by the same forces who attacked the U.S. consulate in Benghazi.

www.larouchepac.com

Obama Is Spying on Innocent Americans Right Now!


by Tony Papert and Nancy Spannaus

June 10—On Wednesday evening, June 5, the London *Guardian*'s Glenn Greenwald published a top-secret order of the U.S. Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) secret eavesdropping court, which ordered Verizon Business Communications to hand over to the National Security Agency (NSA), on a daily basis, the telephone numbers, times, and caller locations of every telephone call made in the United States, including local calls, for a period of 90 days, from April into July. What was rapidly revealed, was the obvious: that this was merely a 90-day rollover of spying that had been going on continuously for seven years (since before the Obama Administration), as Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) admitted in trying to defend the program Thursday—and that every U.S. telephone carrier had received the same order, while forbidden even to mention it, and was doing exactly the same thing, as the


Wall Street Journal reported the same day.

There was instant pandemonium in a Senate hearing on the morning of June 6, when Sen. Mark Kirk (R-Ill.), at an otherwise routine Appropriations Committee hearing, asked Attorney General Eric Holder whether the Administration was spying on Members of Congress and the Supreme Court. When Holder tried to maintain that Congressmen had been “fully briefed,” Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-Md.) interrupted, saying “We’re going to stop right here, because this ‘fully briefed’ is something that drives us up the wall,” and insisted that neither she nor any of the other Senators sitting with her knew what was going on.

Separately, Senators Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) and Mark Udall (D-Colo.) told press that this was exactly what they had




The publication on June 5 by the London *Guardian* of a top-secret order of the FISA court has touched off a storm of continuing revelations which is now engulfing the Obama Administration, as charges of “Watergate” fill the airwaves.



been publicly warning about for years: that the Obama Administration had a secret, radically overblown, legal interpretation of its rights under the Patriot Act, to spy on ordinary Americans, a judgment which would shock most Americans were they to learn about it. And indeed it has. And it's only beginning.

Veteran Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-Wisc.), the author of the Patriot Act, argued in a letter to Holder that the leaked order specifically contravened the Act. He demanded that Holder answer four questions by June 12, of which the fourth was, "Does the FBI believe that there are limits on what information it can obtain under [Patriot Act] section 215? If so, what are those limits?"



Patriot Act author Rep. James Sensenbrenner demanded of AG Holder: "Does the FBI believe that there are limits on what information it can obtain under [Patriot Act] section 215? If so, what are those limits?"

The Second Shoe

Then, Thursday afternoon, June 6, about 24 hours after the first leak, the *Guardian* and Greenwald obtained and selectively published another file held at the highest level of U.S. security clearance: an internal NSA slide-show instructing employees on how to use a data-mining apparatus called "PRISM." The slide-show was dated April 2013—i.e., very recently. The *Washington Post* obtained the same leak and published another story at the same time.

The slide-show said that the NSA had obtained direct access to the main servers of nine Internet service providers, including Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, YouTube, Skype, AOL, and Apple. NSA analysts were told that they could obtain any data, whether current or historical, including e-mail, video and voice chats, photos, voice-over-internet protocol, file transfers, videoconferencing, notifications of target activity ("logins, etc."), online social networking details, or "special requests."

Because of the word "foreign" in "Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act," the slide-show presentation instructed NSA staff, as a fig-leaf of compliance with the law, that they could only target such data if they believed there was a 51% chance that the target might be outside the United States, or in communication with someone outside the United States.

The *Guardian* accompanied its second revelation with an unsigned June 6 editorial which might have been titled "An Existential Challenge to American Freedom." After summarizing what the paper had reported over the two days, the editors wrote:

"Few Americans believe that they live in a police state; indeed many would be outraged at the suggestion. Yet the everyday fact that the police have the right to monitor the communications of all its citizens—in secret—is a classic hallmark of a state that fears freedom as well as championing it. Ironically, the *Guardian*'s revelations were published 69 years to the day since

U.S. and British soldiers launched the D-Day invasion of Europe. The young Americans who fought their way up the Normandy beaches rightly believed they were helping free the world from a tyranny. They did not think that they were making it safe for their own rulers to take such sweeping powers as these over their descendants."

After qualifying that Britishers should not minimize the dangers of terrorism, or the very real possibility that their own government might be spying on them in just the same way, they conclude:

"But it is American civil liberties that are primarily in the spotlight now. Ever since 9/11, the U.S. has allowed the war on terror to frame a new domestic authoritarianism that is strikingly at odds with America's passionate sense of its own freedom. This week's revelations have stunned millions of Americans whose justified outrage against 9/11 surely never led them to expect such routine and unrestrained surveillance on such a massive scale. U.S. politicians have a poor post-9/11 record of confronting such powers. Even now, it is possible that many will look the other way. But this is an existential challenge to American freedom. That it has been so relentlessly prosecuted by a leader who once promised to stand up against such authority, makes the challenge more pressing, not less."

Which is to say, accurately, that it is Obama who is the one responsible for these crimes. He cannot blame the Congress, as he attempted to do in numerous press appearances since.

The *New York Times* appeared Friday morning, June

The New York Times

President Obama's Dagnet

Scooping up all our phone records is an abuse of power that demands a real explanation

Within hours of the disclosure that federal authorities routinely collect data on phone calls Americans make, regardless of whether they have any bearing on a counterterrorism investigation, the Obama administration issued the same platitudes it has offered every time President Obama has been caught overreaching in the use of his powers: Terrorists are a real menace and you should just trust us to deal with them because we have internal mechanisms (that we are not going to tell you about) to make

mit this surveillance — with the American public having no idea that the executive branch is now exercising this power — fundamentally shifts power between the individual and the state, and it repudiates constitutional principles governing search, seizure and privacy.

The defense of this practice offered by Senator Dianne Feinstein of California, who as chairwoman of the Senate Intelligence Committee is supposed to be preventing this sort of overreaching, was absurd. She said on

7, with a bitter 1,100-word editorial entitled “President Obama’s Dagnet,” which signalled that newspaper’s divorce from the U.S. President, and appropriately ridiculed his apologists. Contorted and emotional, the editorial mirrored fights at high levels in the United States. Bloggers noted that one sentence was altered just two hours after the editorial was first posted on Thursday. In the original version, the lead sentence of the third paragraph read, “The administration has now lost all credibility.” Two hours later, someone had added the words, “on this issue.”

More Revelations To Come

The Obama Administration’s attempts at damage control are pathetic, but in full swing. Director of National Intelligence James Clapper denounced the leak as damaging, and the heads of the Senate and House Intelligence Committees, Senator Feinstein and Rep. Mike Rogers (R-Mich.), declared on ABC-TV’s “This Week” June 9 that the total information dragnet has stopped terror attacks, and is therefore justified. All three have indicated their approval of prosecution of the leaker.

Meanwhile, Greenwald, who is being interviewed far and wide, said that more revelations about the program should be expected from him. Indeed, on June 7, Greenwald released a top-secret Presidential Directive—from Obama himself—in which the President, in Greenwald’s words, orders “his senior national security and intelligence officials to draw up a list of potential overseas targets for U.S. cyber-attacks.” On June 8, he released a new NSA document which showed that the government had collected “97 billion pieces of data, almost all of it from outside the U.S.,” despite the fact that the NSA had repeatedly told Congress that it did not have the capabil-

ity of estimating the number of items they were intercepting.

On June 9, Greenwald’s source, whistleblower Edward Snowden, went public in an article coauthored by Greenwald. Snowden, a contract employee for the NSA who currently works at defense contractor Booz Allen Hamilton, declared that he had taken his action because he believed that what the NSA was doing posed “an existential threat to democracy.”

In a note accompanying the first set of documents he provided, he wrote: “I understand that I will be made to suffer for my actions,” but “I will be satisfied if the federation of secret law, unequal pardon, and irresistible executive powers that rule the world that I love are revealed even for an instant.”

And Congress?

No Congressional hearings have yet been set, but the Congressmen and Senators are lining up on the issue. Several have already called for a reopening of the Patriot Act. Many have blown the whistle on the outright lie by Obama that “every member” of Congress had been briefed on this program, and approved it—including Democrats such as Sen. Jeff Merkley (Ore.) and Rep. Keith Ellison (Minn.). Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W. Va.) has called for curbing such broad surveillance, and urged Attorney General Holder to consider resigning.

Watergate looms, for a President who has violated his oath of office to much worse effect than did President Richard Nixon. But clearly the U.S. population will have to force their Congress to act.



Edward Snowden, a 29-year-old NSA contract employee, is the source of the leak to the Guardian’s Greenwald. He said he believed that the NSA spying posed “an existential threat to democracy.”

NSA Spying Violates U.S. Constitution

United States Constitution, Amendment IV:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

The following excerpts from statements by Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) make the cogent case for how President Obama's surveillance policy is violating the U.S. Constitution.

Statement of Sen. Ron Wyden on Patriot Act Re-authorization; May 26, 2011:

Mr. President, the United States Senate is now preparing to pass another four-year extension of the USA Patriot Act. I have served on the Intelligence Committee for a decade, and I want to deliver a warning this afternoon: when the American people find out how their government has secretly interpreted the Patriot Act, they will be stunned and they will be angry. And they will be asking senators, "Did you know what this law actually permits?" "Why didn't you know before you voted on it?" The fact is that anyone can read the plain text of the Patriot Act, and yet many members

of Congress have no idea how the law is being secretly interpreted by the executive branch, because that interpretation is classified.

It's almost as if there are two Patriot Acts, and many members of Congress haven't even read the one that matters. Our constituents, of course, are totally in the dark. Members of the public have no access to the executive branch's secret legal interpretations, so they have no idea what their government thinks this law means. . . .

Statement of Sen. Ron Wyden on FISA Amendments Act of 2008; Dec. 27, 2012:

Today on the Senate floor we will be debating another extremely important matter: the extension of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008. This is a major surveillance law that was passed in 2008 as the successor to the warrantless wiretapping program that operated under the Bush Administration. This law gave the government new authorities to collect the communications of foreigners outside the United States, and the bill before the Senate today would extend this law for another five years. . . . This is likely to be the only floor debate that the Senate will have on this law during this nine-year period (2008-2017), which obviously makes today's discussion very important. . . .

This story really begins in early America, when the colonists were famously subjected to a lot of taxes by the British government. The American colonists thought this was unfair, because they were not represented in the British parliament, and they argued that if they weren't allowed to vote for their own government then they shouldn't have to pay taxes. . . . Because there were a lot of taxes on things like tea and sugar and paint and paper, and also because many colonists believed these taxes were unjust, there was a lot of smuggling going on in the American colonies. People would



wyden.senate.gov

In a speech on the Senate floor last December, Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) compared Obama's unconstitutional surveillance program to the suppression of rights in the American colonies by the British Empire.

import things like sugar and simply avoid paying the tax on them. Naturally the King of England didn't like this very much—he wanted the colonists to pay taxes whether they were allowed to vote or not.

So the English authorities began issuing general warrants, which were called “writs of assistance,” that authorized government officials to enter any house or building they wanted in order to search for smuggled goods. These officials weren't limited to only searching in certain houses, and they weren't required to show any evidence that the place they were searching had smuggled goods in it. Basically, government officials were allowed to say that they were looking for smuggled goods and then go searching through any house they wanted to see if they could find some.

The problem, of course, is that if you let government officials search any house they want, they're going to search through the houses of a lot of people who haven't broken any laws at all. And the American colonists had a huge problem with that. They said that it's not okay to just go around invading people's privacy unless you have some specific evidence that they've done something wrong.

The law said that these writs of assistance were good until the king died. So when King George the Second died and the authorities had to get new writs, many colonists tried to challenge them in court. In Boston, James Otis denounced this mass invasion of privacy, reminding the court that “A man's house is his castle.” Mr. Otis described the writs of assistance as “a power that places the liberty of every man in the hands of every petty officer.” Unfortunately, the court ruled that these general orders permitting mass searches without individual suspicion were legal, and English authorities continued to use them.

The fact that English officials went around invading people's privacy without any specific evidence against them was one of the fundamental complaints that the American colonists had against the British government. So naturally America's Founding Fathers made certain to address this complaint when they wrote the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights ensured that strong protections for individual liberties were included within our Constitution itself. And the Founding Fathers included strong protections for personal privacy in the Fourth Amendment. . . . This was a direct rejection of the authority that the British had claimed to have when they

ruled the American colonies. The Founding Fathers said that our government does not have the right to search any house that government officials want to search, even if it helps them do their job. Government officials may only search someone's house if they have evidence that someone is breaking the law and they show that evidence to a judge to get an individual warrant. . . .

As time passed and the United States entered the 20th century, advances in technology gave government officials the power to invade individual privacy in ways that the Founding Fathers never dreamed of, and Congress and the courts sometimes struggled to keep up. . . .

When the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, was written in 1978, Congress applied this same principle to intelligence gathering. The original FISA statute states that if the government wants to collect an American's communications for intelligence purposes, the government must go to a court, show evidence that the American is a terrorist or a spy, and get an individual warrant. This upheld the same principle that the Founding Fathers fought for in the Revolution and enshrined in the Bill of Rights—government officials are not allowed to invade Americans' privacy unless they have specific evidence and individual warrants. . . .

Congress passed the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, which replaced the warrantless wiretapping program with new authorities for the government to collect the phone calls and emails of people who are believed to be foreigners outside the United States. The centerpiece of the FISA Amendments Act is a provision that is now section 702 of the FISA statute. . . .

Unlike traditional FISA authorities, and unlike law enforcement wiretapping authorities, section 702 does not involve obtaining individual warrants. Instead, it allows the government to get programmatic warrants that last for an entire year and authorize the government to collect a potentially large number of phone calls and emails, with no requirement that the senders or recipients be connected to terrorism or espionage. If that sounds familiar, it should. General warrants that allowed government officials to decide whose privacy to invade were the exact sort of abuse that the American colonists protested, and that led the Founding Fathers to adopt the Fourth Amendment in the first place. For this reason, section 702 of FISA contains language that is specifically intended to limit the government's

ability to use these new authorities to spy on American citizens.

Let me emphasize that because it's very important: It is never okay for government officials to use general warrants to deliberately invade the privacy of law-abiding Americans. It wasn't okay for constables and customs officials to do it in colonial days, and it's not okay for the NSA to do it today [emphasis added]. So if the government is going to use general warrants to collect people's phone calls and emails, it is extremely important to ensure that this authority is only used against foreigners overseas, and not against Americans.

However, despite what you may have heard, this law doesn't actually prohibit the government from collecting Americans' phone calls and emails without a warrant. The FISA Amendments Act says that acquisitions made under section 702 may not "intentionally target" a specific American, and may not "intentionally acquire" communications that are "known at the time of acquisition" to be wholly domestic, but that still leaves room for a lot of circumstances under which Americans' phone calls and emails—including purely

domestic phone calls and emails—could be swept up and reviewed without a warrant. . . .

[T]here is nothing in the law that prevents government officials from going to that pile of communications and deliberately searching for the phone calls or emails of a specific American, even if they don't have any actual evidence that the American is involved in nefarious activity. Again, if that sounds familiar, it should. General warrants allowing government officials to deliberately intrude on the privacy of individual Americans at their own discretion were one of the abuses that led America's Founding Fathers to rise up against the British, and they are exactly what the Fourth Amendment was written to prevent. If government officials want to search an American's house, or read their emails, or listen to their phone calls, they are supposed to show evidence to a judge and get an individual warrant. But this loophole in the law allows government officials to make an end-run around traditional warrant requirements and conduct "back-door searches" for Americans' communications.

After discussing secret law and the FISA Court's secret rulings, Wyden continued:


If you think back to colonial times, when the British government was issuing writs of assistance and general warrants, the colonists were at least able to challenge these warrants in open court. So when the courts upheld those writs of assistance, ordinary people could read about that decision, and people like James Otis and John Adams could publicly debate whether the law was adequately protecting the privacy of law-abiding individuals. But if the FISA Court were to uphold something like that today, in the age of digital communications and electronic surveillance, it could conceivably pass entirely unnoticed by the public—even by those people whose privacy was being invaded.

I was encouraged in 2009, when the Obama Administration wrote to Senator Rockefeller and me to inform us that they would be setting up a process for redacting and releasing those FISA Court opinions that contain significant interpretations of law. Unfortunately, over three years later, this process has produced literally zero results. Not a single redacted opinion or summary of FISA court rulings has been released. I can't even tell if the Administration still intends to fulfill this promise or not. I often get the feeling that they're hoping that people will just go away and forget that the promise was made in the first place. . . .

America's Untold Story

How the trans-Atlantic republican movement waged a continuous fight for freedom, beginning with John Winthrop's Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1630.

\$19.95



ORDER FROM

EIR News Service, Inc.
P.O. Box 17590
Washington, D.C.
20041-0590

Order by phone, 1-800-278-3135

OR order online at www.larouchepub.com

Shipping and handling: Add \$5 for the first book and \$1.00 for each additional book. Virginia residents add 5% sales tax. We accept MasterCard and Visa

How Obama Expanded and Consolidated The Bush-Cheney Domestic Spy Dragnet

by Edward Spannaus

What follow are some of the known critical nodal points in the process of the consolidation of the dragnet surveillance and data-mining program over the post-Franklin Roosevelt years; much more is still unknown and hidden behind classification barriers.

1940s: The British-U.S. Arrangement

1943: The U.S. and Britain formalize wartime signals intelligence cooperation, with the **BRUSA** (Britain-USA) agreement, providing for sharing of information.

1945: **Operation SHAMROCK** is inaugurated, a program under which the three largest U.S. cable companies—Western Union, ITT World Communications, and RCA Global—provided to the **National Security Agency** (the U.S. military's signals intelligence agency), and its predecessors, copies of all cable traffic entering and leaving the United States. Western Union and ITT gave the NSA microfilms of cable messages; RCA provided NSA with complete copies of all cables, and later, magnetic tapes, when its operations were computerized.

1947: Britain and the United States signed the **U.K.-U.S.A. Security Agreement**, also known as “UKUSA,” or the “Secret Treaty.” This represented President Harry Truman’s treasonous policy of establishing an Anglo-American “special relationship”—a repudiation of FDR’s policy. With a year, the other signatories—Canada, Australia, and New Zealand—had joined. Subsequent agreements provided for standardized code-words, security agreements, and procedures for dissemination of information. The two principal agen-



cies involved are the U.S. NSA and Britain’s Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) at Cheltenham.

All of the above arrangements continued and expanded throughout the 1950s, and up to the present day.

1960s: NSA Operations Expand

In the early 1960s, the U.S. Justice Department and FBI started providing the NSA with names of Americans whom the

FBI believed to be involved in certain domestic criminal and political activities, so that NSA could expand its “watch list.” In 1967, **Maj. Gen. William Yarborough**, the Army’s Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, requested information pertaining to civil disturbances, and during the late 1960s into the mid-1970s, the Army, CIA, FBI, and DIA all were sending requests for intercept intelligence to the NSA, the subjects of which included domestic anti-war and civil rights activists, including Dr. Martin Luther King.

In 1969, the domestic surveillance program was formalized under the code name **MINARET**, pertaining to, *inter alia*, “individuals who may foment civil disturbance or otherwise undermine the national security of the United States.” British Intelligence’s GCHQ Cheltenham also provided intercepts to the NSA which were then passed on to other U.S. intelligence agencies.

1970s: Military Spying Exposed

1971: Congress began investigating military spying on U.S. citizens.

1972-74: the “**Watergate**” scandals exposed Nix-

on's use of domestic intelligence agencies and the IRS to surveil and target his political enemies.

In 1972, the U.S. Supreme Court, in the landmark case *U.S. v. U.S. District Court*, held that the President's Executive Powers cannot override the Fourth Amendment's requirement for a warrant, in a case involving domestic electronic surveillance.

In August 1975, the House Select Committee on Intelligence Activities, headed by **Rep. Otis Pike** (D-N.Y.), held hearings on NSA domestic surveillance, in the course of which CIA Director William Colby disclosed NSA's interception of international communications, and during which NSA Director Lt. Gen. Lew Allen testified in an open hearing for the first time.

In October 1975, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities—known as the “**Church Committee**” for its chairman, **Sen. Frank Church** (D-Id.)—publicly identified the SHAMROCK AND MINARET programs by name for the first time.

Church opened the hearing on Oct. 29, 1975 by stating that “Just as the NSA is one of the largest and least known of the intelligence agencies, it is also the most reticent. While it sweeps in messages from around the world, it gives out precious little information about itself. . . . Today, we will bring the agency from behind closed doors.” On Nov. 6, 1975, the Church Committee made public its report on SHAMROCK.

After the release of the Committee's Final Report in 1976, Senator Church warned that tyranny would result if the NSA “were to turn its awesome technology against domestic telecommunications.” Were this to happen, Church warned, “That is the abyss from which there is no return.”

1978: In response to the Church and Pike Committees' findings of abuse, including widespread violations of the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures, Congress passed the



U.S. Navy/Johnny Biverra

Dick Cheney's drive for dictatorship goes back to the 1980s when, as a Congressman, he commissioned a report stating that Congress may not infringe on Executive power, in matters of war and national security.

Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), which confirmed, once and for all, that the Fourth Amendment does apply to domestic electronic surveillance. FISA required a particularized showing of probable cause before an individual in the U.S. could be subject to electronic surveillance, or his records seized, in a foreign intelligence or national security case.

1980s: Cheney Rejects Controls

Rep. **Dick Cheney**, the senior Republican on the Joint Congressional **Iran-Contra Committee**, commissioned a “Minority Report,” written largely by his aide and future legal counsel **David Addington**, proclaiming that Congress has no power to infringe on Executive power in matters of war and national security. It was well-known that Cheney never

accepted the findings of the Church Committee, and looked for any and every opportunity to repudiate them.

When Cheney became Secretary of Defense (1989-93), and later Vice President (2001-09), he had his chance to put these views into action.

1990s: Emergence of Data-Mining

In the late 1990s, the U.S. Army's **Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM)**, in conjunction with the **Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)** and other agencies, developed a data-mining program using “link analysis” also known as “associational analysis,” for use in terrorism investigations and other matters, such as technology transfers and espionage related to China. This program became known generically as “**Able Danger**”—although Able Danger was reportedly a narrower program, feeding “actionable” intelligence into the military's **Special Operations Command (SOCOM)** for hunting down and killing terrorist suspects.

In early 2000, the data-mining program was shut down by the Pentagon, because it had been retaining

information on U.S. citizens. However, according to various reports, SOCOM simply relocated the program to a private contractor where it continued.

9/11 and Its Aftermath

2001: The Patriot Act-Plus. Shortly after the Bush-Cheney Administration took office in early 2001, it began approaching the top telecommunications companies, seeking NSA access to their customer records. Dick Cheney personally sought the participation of Qwest Communications in the program, but

Qwest refused, after finding out that the NSA had no warrant from the FISA Court or any other legal authority to obtain such records.

On Oct. 4, less than four weeks after the Sept. 11 attacks, President George W. Bush signed an order authorizing the NSA's domestic wiretapping program, which went operational on Oct. 6. Quickly, the NSA made new approaches to the telecommunications companies, seeking access to all their traffic. These included the three largest: **AT&T, Verizon, and BellSouth.** The legal justification was cooked up by Cheney's lawyer David Addington and second-rank Justice Department attorney **John Yoo**, bypassing normal channels. It is thought that these still-secret legal opinions reflected Cheney's longstanding dogma that the President's war powers, under Article II of the Constitution, override any legislative restrictions such as FISA.

On Oct. 23, **Rep. James Sensenbrenner** introduced the USA Patriot Act, junking a previous bi-partisan bill. The bill was rapidly passed by the House and Senate, over heavy Democratic opposition, and was signed into law by President Bush on Oct. 26. Among its most notorious provisions are those allowing the FBI to obtain records without a court order or a subpoena, through the use of National Security Letters, and its Section 215, which allows the FBI and others agencies to obtain records and other materials through secret warrants issued by the FISA Court.

2002: Secret Presidential Order

A secret Presidential order authorized the NSA to conduct domestic surveillance, overturning 25 years of



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

The Total Information Awareness (TIA) Office, created in 2002 by Adm. John Poindexter (of Iran-Contra infamy) established a massive data-mine, collecting bank, credit card, telephone, and travel records, etc.



law and regulations. Congressional leaders were summoned to Cheney's office for a secret briefing on the program. This was what is known as a "special access program," so sensitive that relatively few people even know about it. According to some sources, the program was code-named "**Stellar Wind.**"

In a parallel development, the Defense Department's **Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)** created the Information Awareness Office, also known as the **Total (or Terrorist) Information Awareness (TIA) Office**, a data-mining program run by **Adm. John Poindexter**, best known for his role in the Iran-Contra affair. The idea of TIA was to create a huge, centralized database consisting of government and commercial records, including bank records, credit card and telephone bills, travel records, and so on, and then to look for "suspicious" associations and patterns.

In the Summer of 2002, AT&T technician Mark Klein learned of secret rooms being constructed at two AT&T switching facilities in San Francisco, from which the NSA tapped into fiber-optic cables connecting AT&T's WorldNet service to other Internet providers. Klein thought the arrangement was part of TIA. Only persons with an NSA security clearance were allowed to enter the secret room. Similar NSA secret rooms were being built in other AT&T facilities around the country.

2003: Under Congressional Pressure, a Shift

After a public uproar, Congress pretended to shut down the TIA program, but in fact, the program was

shifted into the Pentagon’s classified (“black”) budget, and continued to operate within the NSA, and under the auspices of DOD contractors such as **SAIC** and **Booz Allen Hamilton**. In 2002, former NSA Director **Mike McConnell**, then heading Booz Allen’s intelligence division, wanted Poindexter to give the entire TIA program to Booz Allen, but Poindexter was reportedly reluctant to give one firm so much control over it, so Booz Allen got part of it, as did other private contractors, where the TIA program carried on—as it continues to do up to the present. The unprecedented amount of data which the NSA collects today, sweeping up all telephone and Internet traffic, is useless unless the agency has the means to mine through it and analyze it—and that’s what Poindexter’s TIA and its offshoots were designed to do.

(Former NSA Director Michael Hayden told the *National Journal* on June 10, 2013, that the NSA’s massive data-collection and surveillance system was developed by, and is almost entirely run by, private defense contractors. According to author and NSA expert **James Bamford**, these contractors include at least two Israeli firms: Narus, which processes the information obtained from AT&T for the NSA, and Verint, which does the same for Verizon data.)

On July 17, 2003, **Sen. Jay Rockefeller** (D-W.Va.) the senior Democrat on the Senate Intelligence Committee, was so alarmed by a secret White House briefing on the NSA program, that he sent a private, handwritten letter to Cheney, expressing his concerns over the surveillance program, and saying it reminded him of Poindexter’s TIA program. Neither Cheney nor anyone else ever answered Rockefeller’s letter.

2004: An Open Battle

By March 2004, Justice Department lawyers were becoming so concerned about the legality of the NSA surveillance program that they were considering refusing to re-certify it. The new Deputy Attorney General, **James Comey**, told Attorney General **John Ashcroft** that the program might be illegal. The Justice Department’s balking over recertification led to the dramatic



In March 2004, Attorney General John Ashcroft, then ill and sedated in hospital, was accosted by Cheney-directed White House lawyers demanding that Ashcroft recertify the NSA surveillance program.

DOJ

confrontation in Ashcroft’s hospital room on March 10, where White House lawyers, acting at the direction of Cheney, attempted to get an ill and sedated Ashcroft to reauthorize the program, but were blocked by Comey and FBI Director **Robert Mueller**. When the White House reauthorized the program the next day, without DOJ approval, Comey, Ashcroft, and all the top DOJ leadership threatened to resign *en masse* unless the program was changed.

Apparently overriding Cheney, Bush agreed to some modifications. There are many indications that Comey’s concern was not just with the publicly acknowledged Terrorist Surveillance Program, but with a much broader NSA program—probably Stellar Wind, the dragnet sweep of all telecommunications. Administration officials have said in public testimony that there are other, secret programs which they cannot discuss in open hearings.

2005: More Exposure

In a series of articles in December 2005, the *New York Times* exposed the Bush Administration’s surveillance and eavesdropping on U.S. citizens without a court order. The warrantless surveillance program, operating since 2002, represented a sharp break with the previous practice of obtaining FISA Court war-

rants for any domestic spying. The *Times* reported how the NSA had obtained access to the communications streams of the major telecommunications companies.

2006: More Uproar

As the uproar over the warrantless wiretap program continued, the *Washington Post* reported that the NSA was sharing this information with the FBI, CIA, the Department of Homeland Security, and other military agencies. *USA Today* named the private telecommunication companies involved.

In February, a long-time NSA employee, Russell Tice, told a House Government Reform subcommittee that he was concerned about the legality and constitutionality of another “special access” program being conducted by the NSA. Tice said this program was different and more far-reaching than the one disclosed by the *New York Times*, but he said he could not discuss it because of its highly classified nature.

2007: FISA Court Gets Right To Violate 4th Amendment

In January 2007, the Bush Administration announced that, henceforth, the FISA Court would authorize any surveillance previously conducted under the President’s Terrorist Surveillance Program. If this were true, it constituted a narrowing of the program.

But, in August, Congress passed the “**Protect America Act of 2007**,” which expanded Executive power to conduct international surveillance, and allowed the FISA Court, for the first time, to issue blanket authorizations rather than individualized warrants—thus completely obliterating the protections provided by the Fourth Amendment. It also eliminated the previous requirement to show that a target was an agent of a foreign power; now the collection simply had to be related to foreign intelligence gathering. It legalized the ongoing NSA tapping into telecommunication facilities.

TOP SECRET//SI//ORCON//NOFORN

(TS//SI//NF) **PRISM Collection Details**

Current Providers

- Microsoft (Hotmail, etc.)
- Google
- Yahoo!
- Facebook
- PaITalk
- YouTube
- Skype
- AOL
- Apple

What Will You Receive in Collection (Surveillance and Stored Comms)?
It varies by provider. In general:

- E-mail
- Chat – video, voice
- Videos
- Photos
- Stored data
- VoIP
- File transfers
- Video Conferencing
- Notifications of target activity – logins, etc.
- Online Social Networking details
- **Special Requests**

Complete list and details on PRISM web page:
Go PRISMFAA

TOP SECRET//SI//ORCON//NOFORN

The “Protect America Act of 2007” allowed the FISA Court to issue blanket authorizations, rather than individual warrants, for surveillance, thus overturning the 4th Amendment.

Within a month, the Bush Administration obtained access to **Microsoft’s** Internet traffic, under the newly launched **PRISM** program.

2008: Obama Weighs in for Spying

In July, then-Sen. Barack Obama reversed his previous stance, and voted for the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, which made most of the 2007 “Protect America Act” permanent, and which also gave retroactive immunity to the telecommunications companies which had been handing over customer records and data to the FBI and other agencies through the NSA.

2009: Obama Protects Warrantless Wiretapping

At the beginning of January, Federal courts started dismissing civil suits that had been brought against telecommunications companies, citing their immunity under the 2008 law.

In April 2009, the Obama Administration moved to have another civil suit thrown out of court, on the grounds that any litigation over the Bush Administration’s warrantless wiretapping program would require the government to disclose “state secrets.” The Administration aggressively invoked “state secrets” in other



Wikimedia Commons

The NSA's new \$2 billion data storage and analysis center in Bluffdale, Utah, shown here under construction in April 2013.

cases to defend the NSA surveillance program, and fought for the broadest immunity for telecommunications providers.

2010: Still Sharing with the British

By 2010, and probably before, the British GCHQ was given access to PRISM's sweep of Internet traffic, enabling British Intelligence to circumvent British law. Between June 2010 and May 2012, GCHQ generated 197 intelligence reports for MI5 and MI6, according to the June 7 *Guardian*. (It has been reliably reported that, for decades, U.S. and British intelligence used each other to spy on their own citizens, thus circumventing their own country's prohibitions against domestic surveillance.)

2011: Extending the Patriot Act

On Jan. 6, 2011, NSA officials and others broke ground for the construction of the NSA's new \$2 billion data storage and analysis center in Bluffdale, Utah.

In the Spring, with key parts of the Patriot Act up for renewal, President Obama demanded a longer extension of the law (until December 2013), than did the Republicans (who wanted it extended only to the end of 2011). Obama's White House claimed that this was needed to provide "certainty and predictability" to the intelligence agencies. In May, Obama signed the bill which extended key provisions of the Patriot Act—including Section 215—until 2015.

2012: Massive Expansion of Surveillance

In April, the *New York Times* reported that the NSA was still engaged in intercepting purely domestic communications, beyond the limits set by Congress.

That same month, NSA whistleblower William Binney said that surveillance had increased under Obama, and that the NSA's data-mining program has become so vast that the government has assembled 20

trillion transactions of U.S. citizens with other U.S. citizens, including phone calls, e-mails, credit card purchases, and Internet searches.

In June, at the insistence of Obama and the intelligence agencies, Congress passed a five-year extension of the 2008 FISA Amendments Act. Senators **Ron Wyden and Mark Udall** warned of "a loophole in the law that could allow the government to effectively conduct warrantless searches for Americans' communications" (see Wyden's remarks, previous article).

2013: The Latest Revelations

On June 5-6, the London *Guardian* revealed a secret FISA Court order requiring Verizon to turn over all customer records to the NSA on a daily basis. "The unlimited nature of the records being handed over to the NSA is extremely unusual," the *Guardian* reported, and also cited the "numerous cryptic public warnings" by Wyden and Udall, that the Obama Administration was relying on "secret legal interpretations" of its spying powers, so broad that the American public would be "stunned" to learn the scope of it.

On June 6-7, the *Guardian* and the *Washington Post* revealed the existence of the PRISM program involving the leading Internet firms and providers.

On June 7, the *Guardian* reported that the British GCHQ Cheltenham has had access to the NSA's PRISM system since at least June 2010.

On June 7, President Obama acknowledged the reported activities and fully defended them, in terms almost identical to those used by George W. Bush after the disclosure of the NSA spying program in 2005.

The London *Daily Telegraph* reported on June 8 that members of the British Parliament's Intelligence and Security Committee, which monitors the work of MI5, MI6, and GCHQ, would be coming to the U.S. to meet with senior figures from the NSA and the CIA.

Obama Appoints Warmongers As Syria Peace Efforts Falter

by Jeffrey Steinberg

June 9—President Barack Obama defiantly responded to the growing pile-up of scandals surrounding his Presidency and the military victories by the Syrian Army over the past week, by naming the discredited Susan Rice as his new National Security Advisor, and by appointing George Soros clone and radical humanitarian interventionist Samantha Power as Rice's replacement at the United Nations (see following article). Obama's flight-forward nominations, including the promotion of Victoria Nuland, a former advisor to both Bush-Cheney and Obama, as the new U.S. ambassador to the European Union, have caused growing alarm that the President could order an escalation of U.S. military involvement in Syria, at precisely the moment that many Washington strategic analysts are coming to the conclusion that President Bashar al-Assad may defeat the two-year, foreign-backed regime-change campaign. These analysts recognize that an Assad victory may be the best among a series of bad options for Syria.

The Syrian Army has won important military victories in the past week in Qusair, a crossroad city near the Lebanese border; in the suburbs of Damascus; and in the Aleppo area in the north of the country near the Turkish border.

In response to these military gains, Gen. Salim Idris, the titular head of the Free Syrian Army (FSA) rebels, demanded that the scheduled Geneva II peace conference be postponed, in the expectation that foreign gov-

ernments will beef up the flow of weapons to the FSA to reverse the recent military setbacks.

While fools like Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), recently returned from a mission to Syria, where he conferred with Idris—and had his photograph taken with two rebel jihadists who have kidnapped foreign nationals—continue to demand a no-fly zone and heavy arming of the Syrian rebels, regardless of their al-Qaeda ties, there is a growing determination in Washington to push back against any further U.S. involvement in the conflict there.

Air Force Gen. Philip Breedlove, who was installed as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander on May 13, in an interview with *Stars and Stripes* during a May 30 visit to the U.S. Naval headquarters in Naples, Italy, warned against the consequences of establishing a no-fly zone over Syria. "It is quite frankly an act of war, and it is not a trivial matter," he said.

No-Go to No-Fly Zone

On June 7, the National Council on U.S.-Arab Relations held a briefing on Capitol Hill, attended by some 200 Congressional staffers, diplomats, journalists, and Middle East experts. Two speakers from the National Defense University lambasted the idea of a no-fly zone, and noted that in the aftermath of the Libya NATO intervention to overthrow and execute Qaddafi, there is strong Russian and Chinese opposition to any repeat of



The Syrian Army's military victories in Qusair, near Damascus, and in Aleppo, have shifted the strategic situation in Assad's favor, while the rebels have acted to scuttle peace efforts. Shown: Syrian Army soldiers celebrate in Qusair June 5.

the Libya fiasco in Syria. Col. David DesRoches and Dr. Paul Sullivan both warned that the Syria situation could easily escalate into a regional or global war if the United States were to take any further action.

Another speaker, Mona Yacoubian of the Stimson Center, showed how the Syria conflict has already been turned into an out-of-control regional war, which threatens to become a permanent conflict between Sunni and Shi'ite Muslims.

Because of the continuing intransigence on the part of the Syrian rebels, the Russian-American-sponsored Geneva II meeting has been postponed to July, at the earliest. Britain and France remain opposed to including Iran in the conference, and continue to press for Western military aid, including more advanced systems, to the rebels. So far, the United States has balked at overt arming of the rebels—although there is mounting evidence that President Obama has authorized a covert arms flow to the rebels from Benghazi, Libya.

The View from Russia

While Russia is clearly pressing ahead with the Geneva II plan, on June 8, Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov chastized the new U.S. State Department spokeswoman, Jen Psaki, for telling reporters that the purpose of the conference would be to implement a post-Assad transition. Lavrov made it clear that regime-change was not what he had discussed with Secretary of State John Kerry, and was not on the agenda. With the recent military victories by the Assad forces, boosted by flows of Russian weapons, and allegedly, by Hezbollah fighters, the likelihood that Assad will remain in

power is greater than at any point since the eruption of the conflict over two years ago.

Given the new reality on the ground, it cannot be ruled out that the rebels will boycott the peace conference altogether, or fail to make any serious effort at a peace deal, even if they take part. A senior U.S. intelligence official, who has been working on the Syria issue for years, described any such Syrian rebel intransigence or boycott, as “the nightmare scenario that nobody has an answer to.”

Furthermore, on June 6, the press spokesman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff told reporters that JCS Chairman Gen. Martin Dempsey's scheduled visit to Moscow in mid-June had been postponed indefinitely. The announcement came shortly after President Obama's announcement of the Rice and Power appointments. While the

Pentagon spokesman tried to minimize the significance of the postponement, noting that Dempsey and his Russian counterpart, Gen. Valery Gerasimov, had conferred by videoconference on June 3, and maintain close and regular contacts, the delay was worrisome, given the pivotal role that Dempsey has played in the war-avoidance efforts in Washington.

In a related development, the Russian Defense Ministry announced that it had carried out a third successful test on June 6 of a new intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM). Deputy Prime Minister Dmitri Rogozin, in remarks to a conference of the United Russia Party, June 7, dubbed the new ICBM a “missile defense killer,” and said that “neither current nor future American missile defense systems will be able to prevent that missile from hitting a target dead-on.” At about the same time, the Defense Ministry announced that the Strategic Missile Forces will conduct a full schedule of 200 exercises over the next six months. And, in an interview with Rossiya 1 TV on May 25, Deputy Defense Minister Anatoly Antonov, stated, “If or when an American missile defense system is created, aimed at undermining Russia's nuclear deterrence forces, the Defense Ministry will take certain steps that will not allow the Americans to achieve this undesirable result.”

Regional Flashpoints

On June 7, the *New York Times* reported that Israel is increasingly worried about instability along its northern borders with Syria and Lebanon. Syrian rebels briefly seized control of a United Nations checkpoint on the Golan Heights, and the Syrian Army had to battle

to drive the rebels back and secure the safety of the UN peacekeepers. According to the *Times*, Israeli war planners have accelerated planning for a “shock and awe” campaign against Lebanon to wipe out Hezbollah’s stronghold there. At the Capitol Hill event, Dr. Paul Sullivan sharply attacked the idea of such an Israeli action, asking the audience: “Is there anyone here who thinks this is a good idea?”

Ironically, any Israeli action against Hezbollah in Lebanon would put Israel in an alliance with Saudi Arabia. Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the head of the Saudi General Intelligence Directorate (GID) is pouring money and weapons into northern Lebanon to back Sunni jihadist networks attacking Hezbollah. A prominent Sunni cleric based in Qatar has called for a holy war against Shi’ites, and several leading Saudi clerics have joined the call for jihad.

British policy towards the region has been to foment a permanent religious war within Islam to create the conditions for what they call “managed chaos,” but which is actually brutal population war, in which the objective is measured in body counts rather than military outcome. A recent study by the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) celebrated Britain’s return to “East of

Suez,” with plans for major expansion of British naval and air force presence in the Persian Gulf—underwritten by arms sales to the Gulf Cooperation Council, along with City of London management of all of the sovereign wealth funds of the oil-rich sheikhdoms.

Israel continues to threaten to take preemptive military action if Russia goes ahead with announced deliveries of S-300 advanced air defense systems to the Assad government.

The situation in the region has been further thrown into chaos by a week of rioting in Turkey. And May was the most deadly month in Iraq in several years, with sectarian violence reaching a new level. Sources have again pointed to Saudi Arabia and to Prince Bandar for bank-rolling and arming Sunni jihadists, including al-Qaeda in Iraq, the sister organization to Syria’s al-Nusra Front.

Iran will hold presidential elections June 14, the outcome of which is uncertain. Four years ago, the last time presidential elections took place, huge protests erupted, leading to a crackdown on reformist factions. No matter what the outcome of the vote, sometime over the Summer, talks between Iran and the P5+1 (UN Security Council Permanent Five plus Germany) will resume over Iran’s nuclear program.

EIR Special Report

Obama’s War on America: 9/11 Two

New Updated Edition

A new, updated edition of the EIR Special Report, “Obama’s War on America: 9/11 Two” is now available from larouche.pub.com. The expanded report is an urgent intervention into the ongoing strategic crisis brought on by the British/Saudi/Obama alliance behind the overthrow of Qaddafi, and the subsequent explosion of jihadist uprisings throughout Africa and the Arab world.

The Original Material:

- Obama’s 9/11
- The London-Saudi Role in International Terrorism
- 9/11 Take One

The Updates:

- LaRouchePAC’s Fact Sheet on Obama’s alliance with al-Qaeda
- LaRouchePAC’s draft questions for Congress
- A transcript of the pre-election press conference held by Lyndon LaRouche and Jeffrey Steinberg on the impeachable crimes of Barack Obama.

Price **\$100**

(Available in paperback and PDF. For paper, add shipping and handling; Va. residents add 5% sales tax.)



Order from EIR News Service **1-800-278-3135** Or online: www.larouche.pub.com

The Ugly Records Of Susan Rice And Samantha Power

June 10—Speaking at the Brookings Institution June 6, one of the chief warmongers of the U.S. Congress, Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), declared himself encouraged by President Obama’s appointments of Susan Rice and Samantha Power, at the top of his national security team. McCain particularly cited the fact that Power is credited with major responsibility for the (unconstitutional) U.S. action to overthrow Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi—an act which has thrown that nation into chaos, and lit a fuse for World War III.

In this case, McCain was right on the facts. As *EIR* has documented for more than a decade, Rice and Power have served as agents of the British-Blair doctrine of “humanitarian intervention,” better known as the Hitler doctrine of pre-emptive war. We provide some selections from our previous coverage, in the article immediately below.

The ‘Liberal Imperialists’

Obama could not have been unaware of the reaction that he would provoke in Russia, in particular, with these appointments. Rice is infamous for her diatribes against the Russians at the United Nations, as well as for her championing of U.S. military intervention in Syria. In an opinion column featured in *Russia Today* on June 6, Eric Draitser captured the situation when he identified Rice as “the embodiment of ‘liberal imperialism,’” and a driving force behind not only the Libya War, but the “continued destabilization and subversion of Syria.”

The other side of the coin was demonstrated by the *Economist*, house organ of the City of London, which praised the two “liberal interventionists,” who have been “credited by diplomats with dramatically shifting American policy over Libya in the direction of the NATO-led air strikes that helped topple the Qaddafi regime.” The *Economist* emphasized that the departure of current National Security Advisor Tom Donilon, in

its view, meant the removal of a “voice of caution,” in favor of the strident Rice.

Who Is Samantha Power?

While Obama can get away with bringing Rice into the White House as National Security Advisor without the need for confirmation by the Senate, Samantha Power will have to go through that process, and her history has raised fewer hackles. Her pedigree is less well-known to the public, but it is equally rooted in British liberal imperialism.

Power has built her career and reputation on the issue of human rights, British-style. Beginning as a reporter in Yugoslavia during the late 1990s, she moved on to write her signature book *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*, which was published in 2003. According to her own testimony, the funding for the book came from the Open Society and George Soros, the latter a British billionaire speculator in service of the British Empire, who, in true Empire fashion, *uses* the issue of human rights to break up nation-states, for its own benefit.

Power became a part of Obama’s presidential campaign in 2008, during which time she worked closely with Lord Mark Malloch Brown, the British Minister of State for Africa, Asia and the United Nations, whom Obama came to admire when His Lordship was deputy secretary-general of the United Nations. Malloch Brown was also a close collaborator of Soros, and a recipient of the latter’s ill-gotten gains. Upon Obama’s election, Power remained in his inner circle, being appointed a Special Assistant to the President, and head of the Office of Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights in the National Security Council.

Power is apparently still head of the Atrocities Prevention Board, whose formation Obama announced in Spring 2012.

It should not be overlooked that Power is married to Cass Sunstein,¹ a close buddy of Obama, and former Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. Sunstein, both a lawyer and behavioral economist, is an unabashed advocate of the “legal” doctrines of the Nazi Crown Jurist Carl Schmitt, which justified Hitler’s assertion of dictatorial executive powers, on the theory that the Führer had to act as the embodiment of the state to deal with “emergencies.”

1. See “Obama Aide Sunstein Outlines Plan To Suppress Opposition,” [EIR](#), May 11, 2012.

Two British Witches Out To Smash National Sovereignty

Editorial, “Susan Rice, and U.S. Sovereignty,” *EIR*, July 23, 1999

If anyone were to doubt the accuracy of *EIR*’s insistence that important areas of U.S. foreign policy are run by the British oligarchy, that person should take a long, hard look at what a senior official in the State Department has recently proclaimed to leading figures of that oligarchy.

The person in question is Susan Rice, U.S. Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. On May 13, Rice delivered the Bram Fischer Memorial Lecture at the Rhodes House in Oxford, England. In her speech, Rice declared her undying loyalty to the British establishment. “I am deeply honored to be the Bram Fischer lecturer this year,” she said. “It is gratifying to be back at Oxford representing President Clinton and Secretary Albright.... Almost nine years ago, I spent much of my time in this very house, buried in the library upstairs. To be at Rhodes House tonight with so many friends, benefactors, and mentors is a personal privilege. It is like a coming home for me—for much of what I know about Africa was discovered within these walls, refined at this great university, with the generous support of the Rhodes Trust.”...

Rice, like Henry Kissinger, comes out of the British school of geopolitics, but the branch connected to Kissinger’s Tweedledum counterpart, Zbigniew Brzezinski. Her mentor, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, is a graduate of Zbiggy’s school. Thus, Rice, over the past five years, has pursued every British policy aim in Africa: from supporting Ugandan dictator Yoweri Museveni and the Tutsi extremist Paul Kagame in Rwanda, to exacerbating confrontation with Sudan. Rice is now engaged in the renewed assault against Sudan, as the U.S. Congress announced in House

Resolution 75, passed in June, which calls for establishing “no-fly zones” in Sudan, along the Iraqi model. This means preparing the ground for armed conflict with Sudan. The policy, like most of U.S. policy on Sudan, originated in Britain, and was channelled into Congress by British intelligence agent Baroness Caroline Cox....

Lawrence Freeman, “Why Do We Call Susan Rice a Racist? Because She Is One,” *EIR*, Dec. 25, 2009

...The pretext for Obama’s and Rice’s threats against other nations are allegations of human rights violations and genocide, taken straight out of Tony Blair’s speech, presumptuously titled “Doctrine of the International Community,” at the Chicago Economic Club on April 24, 1999.

As the British-centered monetarist system continues its chaotic disintegration, we can expect Obama to override more moderate policies offered by the State Department, and give targeted nations hell. Rice played a particularly nasty role as a senior foreign policy advisor to then-candidate Barack Obama in the 2008 Democratic Presidential primaries, where she was used by his campaign to challenge Sen. Hillary Clinton’s foreign policy expertise....



UN Photo/Jenny Rocket

Susan Rice, as U.S. Ambassador to the UN in 2009, bangs the gavel to order the world's nations to toe the line.

Her British Pedigree

To understand Rice's startling display of racism towards Africa, it is useful to examine her training by, and affection for, those institutions that represent the inner core of British imperialist policy historically:

1990: A Rhodes Scholar, she received her PhD in International Relations from New College, Oxford.

1990: Awarded Royal Commonwealth Society's Walter Frewen Lord Prize for outstanding research in the field of Commonwealth History.

1992: Recipient of the first annual award given by the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) and the British International Studies Association for the most distinguished dissertation in the U.K. in the field of international studies. . . . Her dissertation, "The Commonwealth Initiative in Zimbabwe, 1979-1980: Implications for International Peacekeeping," praised the British peacekeeping transition, after the Empire engineered a 13-year war against the liberation of the people of Zimbabwe.

1993-95: Director for International Organizations and Peacekeeping at the National Security Council.

1995-97: Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for African Affairs.

1997-2001: Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. . . .

May 1999: Honored as the Bram Fischer Memorial Lecturer at Rhodes House, Oxford, while she was U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Rice said how happy she was to be there: "To be at Rhodes House tonight with so many friends, benefactors, and mentors is a personal privilege. It is like a coming home for me for much of what I know about Africa was discovered within these walls, refined at this great university, with generous support of the Rhodes Trust." (Cecil Rhodes was a leading Fabian-imperialist racist who, in the second half of the 19th Century, was determined to bring all Africa under the control of the British Empire.) Rice also lied that Sudan was seeking a chemical weapons capability.

2002: Brookings Institution, Senior Fellow in the Foreign Policy and Global Economy Development program.

Rice's Anti-African Racism

While serving at the NSC and State Department, Rice became part of the team that opposed the Islamic leadership of Sudanese President Omar-al Bashir, which team is still operating today to derail Gen. Scott



Cecil Rhodes (1853-1902), cartoon by Edward Linley Sambourne. Rhodes's view of Africa: "I contend that we are the finest race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race. Just fancy those parts that are at present inhabited by the most despicable specimens of human beings—what an alteration there would be if they were brought under Anglo-Saxon influence; look again at the extra employment a new country added to our dominions gives."

Gration's diplomacy. . . . Rice's blind rage against Sudan was so intense, that she refused to ever meet with the then Sudanese ambassador to Washington, Mahdi Ibrahim Mohammed, which was part of her job, since diplomatic relations between the United States and Sudan had not yet been terminated. Quite an attitude for a U.S. diplomat responsible for African policy.

While many diplomats from the U.S. and Africa recognized Rice's lack of qualifications to assume the top post in the State Department for Africa, they miss the essential point about her mentality: Rice was then, and continues to be today, anti-African, as the following chronology shows.

- Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at her confirmation hearing on Sept. 2,

1997, Rice said: “In concert with concerned members of Congress, we have also recast our policy towards Sudan to apply additional pressure aimed at isolating the Khartoum regime in order to contain the threat it poses to U.S. interests and to compel it to halt its support for terrorism and its grave human rights abuses. We have also provided for the first time defensive military assistance to Sudan’s neighbors, which face a direct threat from Sudanese-sponsored insurgencies.”

Rice lied about Sudan being engaged in state-sponsored terrorism that threatened the United States, but admits that the U.S. sent arms to be used against Sudan, including arming the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) of Southern Sudan. Despite Rice’s repeated lie that Sudan is the only state in sub-Saharan Africa that poses a direct threat to U.S. national security interests, no evidence has ever been made public, even to this day, to corroborate that allegation. In fact, the U.S. intelligence community has admitted that it *has no such evidence*, and has collaborated with its counterparts in Sudan in fighting terrorism.

- In the second term of the Clinton Presidency, Rice protected the interests of pharmaceutical industries from the demands of Africans suffering from AIDS. Rice joined fellow racist, and now-exposed population-reduction advocate Vice President Al Gore, in pressuring the newly elected South African President, Thabo Mbeki, not to produce less expensive generic drugs to combat the spread of AIDS. To achieve this reversal of Section 15C of the South African Medicines Act, Rice threatened the newly liberated nation with sanctions and tariffs.

- For years, there was more than speculation that a rogue operation in the U.S. government was supporting the 1996 invasion of the Democratic Republic of Congo (D.R.C.) by rebel movements sponsored by Rwanda and Uganda. This was while Rice was serving as Special Assistant to the President, and Senior Director for African Affairs at the NSC. Howard French, writing in the *New York Review of Books* (Sept. 24, 2009), confirms Rice’s involvement in violating the D.R.C.’s sovereignty, quoting her saying that, “Museveni [of Uganda] and Kagame [of Rwanda] agree that the basic problem in the Great Lakes is the danger of a resurgence of genocide [referring to the Hutus who fled to the D.R.C. after Kagame took over Rwanda—LKF], and they know how to deal with that. The only thing we have to do is look the other way.” Rice’s “looking the other way”

was followed by a decade of killing in the D.R.C., and the looting of its natural resources by Rwanda and Uganda. . . .

- In 1998, Rice was instrumental in orchestrating the bombing of the al-Shifa pharmaceutical plant in Omdurman, Sudan, just outside of Khartoum, allegedly for producing chemical weapons that could be used in terrorist attacks on the United States. Not a shred of evidence was ever found to justify the al-Shifa attack, and the U.S. subsequently apologized and offered compensation.

- For five years, from 1996, until weeks before the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the United States, *the Sudanese government had tried repeatedly, but without success, to share with U.S. intelligence services its own intelligence files on Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda*. Even when the FBI and others wished to accept these offers, they were overruled by Secretary of State Albright and Assistant Secretary for Africa Rice. Rice had politicized the intelligence by her hostility to any collaboration with the Sudanese government. Various back-channel efforts were also stymied by Rice. When the U.S. intelligence community finally succeeded in getting the Clinton Administration to send a joint FBI-CIA team to Sudan in May 2000, despite resistance from Rice, they found no terrorist training camps or sanctuaries, and gave Sudan a clean bill of health.

- In March 1998, Rice threatened Nigeria that if Gen. Sani Abacha were elected as President, “Let me state clearly and unequivocally to you today that an electoral victory by any military candidate in the forthcoming Presidential election would be unacceptable.” This undiplomatic enunciation was contrary to the views of President Clinton, who, two weeks later, while in South Africa, expressed hope that Abacha would move Nigeria towards democracy. . . .

Samantha Power and R2P

Michelle Steinberg, “R2P, ‘Atrocities Prevention’: Obama’s Road to Nuclear War,” *EIR*, May 4, 2012

... In May 2011, months before the murder of the already captured and wounded Libyan President Muammar Qaddafi, *EIR* warned that President Barack Obama would use the British Empire-created doctrine, “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P), to launch a series of

imperialist wars disguised as “humanitarian interventions”—wars that are not in the national interest of the United States, but that of the British Empire’s financier oligarchy, to destroy the sovereignty of nation-states, and preserve its own power structure. . . .

On April 23, 2012, . . . Obama launched a full-scale plan for preventive war against national sovereignty—starting with Iran and Syria. Obama didn’t just deliver a speech: He outlined several measures by unilateral executive action that go beyond rhetoric, including:

- convening the first meeting of the Atrocities Prevention Board (APB), under its chairperson **Samantha Power**, a framer of the R2P doctrine, working for billionaire hedge-fund operator George Soros;
- ordering the 16 U.S. intelligence agencies to prepare a National Intelligence Estimate on the risks of mass atrocities that require U.S. intervention;
- imposing new sanctions against companies doing technology business with Iran and Syria, because these countries have supposedly used technology to deny their populations their “human rights” to use the Internet;
- hosting a hypocritical White House Facebook/Twitter/podcast event on the theme of fighting human-rights violations, in which Samantha Power, Obama advisor Valerie Jarrett, and some dozen other “humanitarian interventionists” could rant against Syria, Iran, Sudan, or any other nation that is dubbed a human rights violator. . . .

The Roots of R2P and the Atrocities Prevention Board

The twisted doctrine known as the “Responsibility To Protect” goes back more than a decade to a concerted British Commonwealth campaign at the United Nations. But it was self-confessed Nazi-collaborator and British agent George Soros who most explicitly defined it as the end of the recognition of national sovereignty. “*Sovereignty is an anachronistic concept originating in bygone times when society consisted of rulers and subjects, not citizens,*” Soros wrote in a 2004 article in *Foreign Policy* (emphasis added). “It



U.S. Mission/Eric Bridiers
Samantha Power in Geneva, June 1, 2010

became the cornerstone of international relations with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. . . . The rulers of a sovereign state have a responsibility to protect the state’s citizens. When they fail to do so, the responsibility is transferred to the international community.”

The R2P doctrine has been the British Empire’s drumbeat since Tony Blair’s 1999 Chicago speech calling for a ground invasion of Kosovo, but it has been kept alive through the foundations and operatives of Soros, including the Soros-owned Samantha Power, since the mid-1990s, when Soros was creating the International Criminal Court,

and trying to take over the nearly failed states of the former Soviet Union through his Open Society Foundation.

But despite decades-long efforts of the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and the myriad media empires they control, R2P has *never* been accepted by the UN General Assembly. In fact, at the lengthy debate covering several General Assembly sessions in July 2009, only a weak resolution to continue to consider R2P was passed. The Non-Aligned Movement, which has 118 members and 18 observer nations, opposed the R2P concept as a danger to national sovereignty, and a tool of selective punishment. . . .

The UN and its Charter are exactly what the R2P imperialists—the British monarchy and its lackeys like Blair—are out to destroy. Despite being rejected by member nations of the UN, the R2P cause did not lack sponsors; it was being built up through a score of organizations led by the International Coalition for the Responsibility To Protect, headquartered at the World Federalist Society offices in Washington, D.C., and funded by the Soros operations. It has affiliates in about 20 countries. . . .

In January 2009, the book *Responsibility To Protect: The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century*, was published as the blueprint for R2P interventions. Its principal author, Richard Cooper, is the Convenor of the Responsibility to Protect Coalition, and the Forward to the book was written by Samantha Power.

No More ‘Eco,’ No More ‘Euro’

by Alexander Hartmann and
Elke Fimmen

Editor’s note: *We publish here the opening section of Alexander Hartmann’s editorial in the German weekly Neue Solidarität of June 12; the documentation is supplied by Elke Fimmen of our Wiesbaden Bureau.*

June 8—What is an “ecological catastrophe”? A catastrophe for which the “ecologists” are to blame.

Do you doubt it? From the beginning of human civilization, man has always interfered with nature, to protect himself against its dangerous forces, and to improve his living conditions by continuously inventing new technologies to turn these forces to his advantage. Whenever a civilization has refused to do that, its demise was not long in coming, because, as the flooding in Europe of recent days shows, “Mother Nature” is brutal, and only if mankind civilizes her can we live with her.

This is true not only in far-off Africa, but also here in Central Europe, but we mostly do not notice it here, because our forebears already worked for centuries to tame nature before we came along. But things change as time goes by, so this is a task that must be passed down from each generation to the next. If that does not happen, the society will perish.

Those to blame for such a downfall are always those who stand in the way of progress. Thus the recent flood disaster demonstrates the truth of the statement made at the beginning of this article. Even more than the European Union’s austerity policy, there have been many cases in which the resistance of self-proclaimed “environmentalists” and similar opponents of progress has delayed or completely blocked the

measures that would have protected towns and cities from the floods. Thus the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* reported on June 4, that of the 351 mitigation measures that were adopted in the state of Saxony after the terrible floods of 2002, only 80 have so far been implemented, while 216 (about two thirds) are still stuck in the planning and licensing process. Only 143 kilometers of the 450 km of levees that were supposed to be constructed were actually realized.

Wherever these new mitigation measures were completed, they served their purpose. Where they were not, disaster struck. In the town of Grimma the mitigation measures are under construction, with completion expected in 2017, because complaints by residents delayed them for years. In Dresden-Laubegast, such protests even led to the plans being abandoned; perhaps the renewed flooding will revive the debate about the need for mitigation. Hopefully, that will happen soon. Otherwise, the levee will be too late for the next flood (or, as one commentator wrote about Grimma, the flood will occur “four years too soon”).

Documentation: Why Didn’t the Infrastructure Hold?

June 4—The east and south of Germany, along with Austria, Slovakia, and Hungary, are suffering badly from the huge floods. A consistent low-pressure area associated with the stationary warm front over parts of Europe had triggered extreme amounts of rainfall (a so-called Vb weather situation) in these areas. The German



Flooding in Passau, Bavaria, June 3, 2013.

Creative Commons/Stefan Penninger

states of Bavaria, Thuringia, and Saxony declared emergency alerts in many regions, with 28,000 firemen and 1,760 soldiers deployed, nationally, as of yesterday.

All municipalities along the Elbe River, including Dresden, expect a similar, if not worse, situation than in the “century flood” of 2002. In several places, such as the county around Leipzig, efforts to shore up dams had to be abandoned. In the small city of Grimma, south of Leipzig, 2,000 people had to leave their homes, with parts of the city destroyed again; residents had just completed their renovations from the catastrophe of 2002. This case also shows how far behind the building of dams and other mitigation measures is—despite nominal programs in place: In Saxony, which worked out a long-term mitigation concept after the flood of 2002 (EU1 billion was allocated up through 2020), only 80 of 351 projects were completed, with 55 more under construction. There are 216 projects still to be planned or approved. Of a projected 450 km of dams, only 120 km were expanded, and 23 km were newly built.

In the case of Jessnitz, a small town in Sachsen-Anhalt, the mayor reportedly tried for ten years to secure promises to rebuild the dam, including a petition campaign to the state governor, but nothing happened. Now, the old dam has broken, and the entire “old town” area

had to be abandoned. The state of Sachsen-Anhalt is one of those in the East which was worst hit by the deindustrialization of the last 20 years after reunification, and has major fiscal problems.

Streets and bridges have been hit heavily, with damage already in the millions of euros. Agriculture has suffered similarly, with up to 60% crop loss of seasonal produce, such as strawberries and asparagus, and large areas of farmland under water. As far as damage to the harvest is concerned, insurance pays for hail damage but not for other weather-caused problems. About 40% of the population in Saxony and Thuringia, where floods are more common than elsewhere in Germany, have special insurance for these cases, which is, however, hard to get in the high-risk areas.

So far, apart from an announced EU150 million emergency program in Bavaria, government representatives are only uttering generalized statements about “help,” like that of Interior Minister Friedrich Zimmermann, who said that “the population can be assured that we will do everything to alleviate damage to them.”

While the flooding has not ended, and complete damage cannot be assessed yet, one thing is clear: Without Glass-Steagall and an overall credit-fueled economic reconstruction policy, there is no future.

REVIVE GLASS-STEAGALL NOW!



“The point is, we need Glass-Steagall immediately. We need it because that’s our only insurance to save the nation... Get Glass-Steagall in, and we can work our way to solve the other things that need to be cleaned up. If we don’t get Glass-Steagall in first, we’re in a mess!”

—Lyndon LaRouche, Feb. 11, 2013



LaRouchePAC is now leading a nationwide effort to push through legislation for Glass-Steagall (www.larouchepac.com).

WATCH the [LaRouchePAC video](#):

‘Glass-Steagall: Signing a Revolution’

SUBSCRIBE to EIR Online

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

toll-free: **1-800-278-3135** e-mail: fulfullment@larouchepub.com

Destroy Drug Trade's Financial Support

by Roger Moore

June 6—Speaking at the International Drug Enforcement Conference (IDEC-2013) in Moscow June 5, President Vladimir Putin challenged NATO and the EU to work with Russia and its allies in Central Asia, the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), to eliminate the plague of illegal drugs. “The drug trade is a breeding ground for organized crime, smuggling, and illegal migration” Putin said. “Even sadder and more dangerous, it is also a breeding ground for terrorism. We therefore believe it essential to fight all types of drugs, and we are worried by the more ‘relaxed laws’ that some countries have passed, and that lead to legalization of so-called ‘soft’ drugs. This is a very dangerous path.”

After referencing Afghanistan, a major source of opium/heroin, where CSTO/NATO cooperation is needed, Putin added: “Another key area for action is to destroy the drug trade’s financial base.” He called for a “step-up of efforts to identify, arrest, and confiscate money and assets obtained through illegal trade of narcotics and precursors.”

Conference co-host and Russian Federal Drug Control Service (FSKN) director Viktor Ivanov stated at the opening of the conference, “When drug money comes to banks, competition is disrupted and the economy sustains significant damage.” His written text further stated: “Specifics of the current situation are that drug money and transcontinental drug trafficking, acting as donors of scarce liquidity for the global banking system, are in fact a vital and integral segment of the whole monetary system today; they are accelerating the global financial and economic crisis, which in turn is a kind of a driver, a moving spring of the financial and economic order for the continuation of drug production.”

Ivanov identified Wachovia Bank, Bank of America, and HSBC as case studies for this. “That is why a drug police, destroying the financial basis of drug crime, contributes to securing of prosperity of our countries and to return of the global financial system to

normal economics, which works not to enrich clubby elites at any cost, but for the whole population.”

Glass-Steagall Needed in Fight vs. Money-Laundering

Speaking before the Argentine Center for International Relations (CARI) on June 27, 2012, Ivanov said that a Glass-Steagall-style banking separation is fundamental to ending the marriage between international finance and the global drug trade.¹

Yuri Chikhanchin, the Russian head of the Eurasian Group on Combating Money-Laundering and Terrorism, stated at the 2013 Moscow conference, “There is information that some banks attracted such funds during the crisis to stabilize their position and to solve the liquidity problems.” Unlike the U.S. Department of Justice, which refused to prosecute HSBC’s narcotics money-laundering because it might bring down this system, or the “see-no-evil” head of the German Criminal Agency (BKA) Financial Intelligence Unit, Dr. Michael Dewald, who publicly told *EIR* that he and the OECD’s Financial Actions Task Force had found no evidence that banks were expanding criminal money-laundering at the outset of the financial crisis, Ivanov and Chikhanchin, who also heads Russia’s Financial Monitoring Service (Rosfinmonitoring), are pulling no punches.

A bipartisan U.S. Congressional delegation led by Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.) was in Moscow just prior to the IDEC-2013, where the lawmakers put emphasis on increasing U.S.-Russian collaboration against jihadi terrorism, particularly after April’s Boston Marathon bombing. Rohrabacher visited Beslan, where Chechen jihadis occupied a school in 2004, taking hostage more than 1,200 schoolchildren and adults. Over 300 died during the rescue attempt, after the terrorists had begun killing hostages.

Ivanov has charged that money from the heroin trade is financing jihadi mercenaries in Syria. As stated in his written text: “It should be emphasized that an integral consequence, or actually an attribute of long-distance trafficking of heroin and cocaine, is highly rapid expansion of extremist and terroristic activities in drug transit countries.”

It is long overdue that the necessary changes in the United States be undertaken; there are many in the U.S. military and law enforcement who know that. Some were at that conference in Moscow.

1. *EIR*, July 13, 2013.

BIOFUELS KILL, AS INTENDED

Obama's Pretense of 2013 'Good Crops' Is Wiped Out

by Marcia Merry Baker

June 11—In the United States, June is the end of the crop year for Winter wheat (75% of U.S. production types), and the beginning of the growing season for corn. This year, the problematic condition of both crops refutes the Obama Administration's official assertion that 2013 harvests will be great, that all is well. Just the opposite, as summarized below. The Dust Bowl has reappeared in the heart of the High Plains wheat belt; U.S. corn bins are all but empty, with the new crop off to a late, cold, wet start. The United States, the legendary world's granary, is now importing corn at unheard-of rates! Dairy, cattle, and poultry operations are stricken with feed shortages and soaring prices.

So, why the lies? The Obama script is "Made in London," as a pretense for continuing the diversion of food crops to biofuels. *The intent* is to undermine agriculture, create hunger, and kill. We are well along that path, with drastic food shocks in the making. There are no food reserves. We are losing *capacity to produce*, not merely one season's supply.

The Administration has rejected every appeal to reduce corn-for-ethanol, to relieve the shortages. A waiver of the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS) was requested in Summer 2012, in the face of the farm-belt drought, by a grouping of livestock, food-processing, restaurant, and grocery associations. It was rejected. Last October, a report was issued by Tufts University on "The Cost to Developing Countries of U.S. Corn Ethanol Expansion," showing terrible harm and

hunger hitting poor nations. No relief was even considered.

But from February to May of this year, Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack, USDA Chief Economist Joe Glauber, and official USDA reports presented rosy forecasts of a record acreage of corn planted in 2013, good yields, and refilling of empty bins. On Feb. 21, at the yearly USDA Agriculture Outlook Forum, Dr. Glauber said, "High prices [for crops] ahead of planting should encourage large corn and soybean acreages, and, assuming normal yields, stock levels should rebuild and prices should moderate."

Who knows what lies they will say this week, when on June 12, the new monthly USDA report "World Agriculture Supply and Demand Report," is released. However, reality is reality.

The Inventory

Wheat harvest down. Winter wheat yields in some fields are down to zero—a total loss—in many counties of the Four-Corners High Plains wheat belt—southwestern Kansas, western Oklahoma, southwestern Colorado, and northwestern Texas. This results from the combined impact of a multi-year drought, late Spring freezes, on top of decades of drawdown of groundwater, without the benefit of "new" water had the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA) been built, as planned in the 1960s. It is expected that the U.S. wheat crop this year will be 10% lower than 2012.



EIRNS/Bob Baker

Aftermath of late-May flooding, June 1, in Keokuk County, Iowa. The retreating water left a sheet of sand over a corn field.

Corn harvest iffy. A deluge of rain, along with cold temperatures, hit the heart of the corn belt in late May. More than 10 inches of rain fell in less than two days in Cherokee County, for example. Sheet erosion, soil saturation, and ponding were widespread (see photo from Iowa).

On June 3, Iowa Gov. Terry Branstad and state farm leaders made a helicopter tour of the rain-soaked corn counties to view the extent of the damage. Their grim evaluations were carried in the June 4 *Des Moines Register* (“Late Planting = Shaky Yield Forecast; The State’s Farmers Are Still Struggling To Get in the Fields”).

While the pelting rains and flooding ended the “agronomic drought” of dried-out soils, the problem now is the impact of cool weather and soaked fields. “The bad news is, we are continuing into the growing season extremely cool. We have a crop that was planted late and is lagging behind,” said Dave Miller, Iowa Farm Bureau economist. Late planting means that there can be pollination problems in high Summer, and potential damage if the plants aren’t fully developed before frost hits, come Fall.

More than half of Iowa’s corn was planted after May 15—the date considered as the deadline for ideal crop potential. Then cold weather set in. “This will

probably be the second-latest average planting date in the last 25 years, maybe 40,” Miller said.

The corn area planted nationwide, instead of what the U.S. Department of Agriculture projected as a record 97 million acres, will be more like 90 million, he estimated.

The harvest volume, instead of what the USDA has projected as a bumper 14.3 million bushel corn crop, will be more like 12.7 million bushels, if everything goes right.

Iowa Agriculture Secretary Bill Northey noted that it was so wet, that 2 million acres of the state’s usual 14 million acres of

corn weren’t planted as of June 1; this is an area equal to the entire state corn production of North Dakota or Texas.

Meantime, corn imports—negligible in the past—have shot up. As of about 2005, the volume of U.S. corn imports was under 9 million bushels; over the last year, 125 million bushels. Corn exports have plunged.

Emergency Measures

What is required, is simply a sane food policy, which means emergency agriculture measures. Immediately ban food for biofuels—corn ethanol, soy biodiesel, sorghum ethanol, and all the rest. Immediately put in place commodity floor prices for farmers producing these food and feed crops, as a percent of parity to stabilize their income. Declare orderly debt moratoria wherever necessary for basic farm operations—dairy, cattle operations, poultry processing facilities, and other key links in the food chain. Ban the infamous non-commodity user speculation on the exchanges.

All these, and other emergency measures are one and the same with the mobilization underway to restore Glass-Steagall banking, for a sound credit regime to build up agro-industrial production potential again. The Glass-Steagall reinstatement process is laid out in the House bill H.R. 129 and Senate bill S. 985, which have



FEMA/Steve Zumwalt

Flooding of the Mississippi River at Portage Des Sioux, Mo., June 6, 2013.

the backing of hundreds of state-level lawmakers, especially in the farm belt.

This urgent shift in U.S. domestic policy is part of the international paradigm shift required now, for survival of civilization on the planet. This is made clear by the report that follows this article, on the food and production crisis in Mexico, in contrast to the high productivity possible there with the necessary infrastructure-build up.

Biofuels Kill

Who and what is behind the insanity of continuing biofuels in the United States—now consuming corn at the rate of over 40% of the annual harvest—is made clear in the history of British Empire famines—from India to Ireland, from the continent of Africa to Haiti. (See article in this section, “British Imperial Genocide in India.”)

The Obama name for death-by-biofuels, another name for British imperial genocide, is a “Bio-Based Products” economy. Agriculture Secretary Vilsack repeats this regularly, citing how hundreds of products, from paint and glue to furniture, are now bio-based—from corn, soy, and other foods. At the world Ethanol Summit in Brazil at the end of June, Obama’s Energy Secretary, Edmond Moniz, will speak at the opening

ceremony, backing still more food-for-biofuels.

In Rome June 7-9, Obama’s envoy to the UN food summit, Ed Schafer, castigated attendees for questioning food-for-biofuels, asserting that any food price increase due to corn ethanol was only 3% or less.

At a Congressional hearing June 5, an official of the Environmental Protection Agency, when questioned by lawmakers about the food shortage resulting from biofuels, said there were no “standards” that meant that the ethanol yearly quota had to be lifted. This occurred

at the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Energy Policy hearing on the role the EPA plays in the RFS.

Livestock Producers Appeal to Congress

Livestock producers have turned to Congress to appeal for relief, since the Obama Administration is intransigent. Seven top livestock and meat-processing groups recently submitted comments against biofuels to the House Energy and Commerce Committee, asking for a curb on the RFS, under which U.S. corn supplies are scarce and expensive, with big swings in price. Among them are the National Pork Producers Council, National Cattlemen’s Beef Association, Milk Producers Council, National Turkey Federation.


The situation is impossible. Last year, 104 high-producing dairy herds in California were shut down. Next month, House of Raeford Farms will shut its turkey slaughterhouse in Raeford, N.C., ending 1,060 jobs. The U.S. cattle herd has declined to the same number as in 1952.

The livestock group submitted a report to Congress, which concluded:

“Despite overwhelming evidence that the inflexible RFS is causing significant economic harm, and few benefits, the EPA refused to grant an RFS waiver

FIGURE 1

Decline in U.S. Per-Capita Meat Consumption (Retail Weight), 1990-2012



Source: “The RFS, Fuel and Food Prices, and the Need for Reform,” Dr. Thomas E. Elam, FarmEcon LLC, Indiana, April 18, 2013

“An inflexible RFS has caused high and volatile corn prices. Extremely small carryover stocks in 2010-2011 to 2012-2013 caused corn prices to increase to new record levels. Those higher prices severely rationed feed use, resulting meat consumption, and exports.”—Dr. Thomas E. Elam

in the wake of the 2012 corn crop disaster. The current waiver system that relies on the judgment of a single political appointee, is broken. . . .” (“The RFS, Fuel and Food Prices, and the Need for Reform,” April 18, 2013, Dr. Thomas E. Elam, FarmEcon LLC, Indiana).

The report also documented the dramatic fall in meat consumption in the United States (Figure 1): “The post-2007 decline in U.S. meat and poultry consumption is unprecedented. But, so is the current RFS that reduces this industry’s access to its basic feedstock, corn. By encouraging the diversion of corn to ethanol production, even in times when corn production and stocks were dangerously low, the RFS has forced all other users to reduce production to accommodate higher costs. It is no accident that the decline in meat and poultry consumption started in 2008, the first year of the current RFS.”


In April, a bill to curb the RFS and

the use of corn for ethanol, called a reform bill, was introduced by a bipartisan foursome of Representatives from big meat and milk regions: Jim Costa (D-Calif.), Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), Steve Womack (R-Ark.), and Peter Welch (D-Vt.).

The scarcity of corn for feed and soaring prices are at the emergency stage. “Lock in prices and supplies of animal feed now,” warn all the livestock experts. For example, *The National Hog Farmer*, on May 13, carried an article, concluding: “Get your feed supplies secured for the summer! While you may have them priced, get the physical supply secured somewhere. Obviously, it doesn’t have to be in your [on farm] bins yet, but own it soon.”

The prices are wild. The *Baltimore Sun* blog in May reported that for Delmarva (the Delaware-Maryland-Virginia peninsula) poultrymen, corn-rations prices have gone up 275% since 2007, when the RFS kicked in.

marciabaker@larouchepub.com



Timothy A. Wise, “The Cost to Developing Countries of U.S. Corn Ethanol Expansion,” October 2012

Mexico's Drought Demands 'NAWAPA-Plus' Infrastructure Projects

by Cynthia R. Rush

June 10—Gov. Jorge Herrera of the Mexican state of Durango warned on May 29 of the “catastrophic” nature of the drought now afflicting 21 of Mexico’s 32 states. He spoke at a meeting of the Water Commission of the Mexican Governors Conference (Conago) and the Potable Water and Sanitation Committee of the Chamber of Deputies.

Herrera, president of Conago’s Water Commission, warned that the three-year-long drought is the longest-lasting in 100 years and has created a life-or-death crisis which threatens to exterminate, not only agriculture, but the Mexican people themselves, for whom food and potable water in the drought-stricken regions of the country have become increasingly inaccessible.

The situation could be described as “traumatic,” Herrera said. “In terms of water conflicts, fate is overtaking us. We must now think of how to finance hydraulic projects which, although expensive, must become reality.” Federico Arroyo, president of the Chamber of Deputies, added that “there is no water project more expensive than the one that doesn’t exist.” The consequences of *not building these projects* is what must be taken into account, he argued.

The outlook for 2013 is grim, the meeting’s attendees explained: 80% of cultivated land is dependent entirely on rainfall, and on the irrigated land that remains, dams are almost completely empty. In some states, such as Chihuahua, which borders the United States, there are dams only 23% full, but most are at 10-15% of capacity! Much of both rural and urban water infrastructure is dilapidated and needs to be rebuilt.

A dramatic change in public policy, with aggressive involvement by the federal government, creation of new credit mechanisms, as well as vastly increased emergency assistance to drought-stricken areas, is immediately called for, said the governors and legislators attending the meeting. Failure to find solutions, they warned, could result in “water conflicts” among communities, cities, states, and even countries—not to

mention the toll in human lives.

All true enough; but viewed from the optic of the breakdown and bankruptcy of the global financial system, the threat of thermonuclear war, and the British Queen’s drive to kill off what she considers to be 6 billion “useless eaters” on the planet, the governors’ and congressmen’s proposals in themselves cannot begin to reverse the catastrophe that Herrera described.

NAWAPA-Plus the Only Option

This is especially the case since the government of President Enrique Peña Nieto has shown little inclination to break with the neoliberal economic framework that has dominated Mexico since the 1982 crushing of the nationalist development perspective of Lyndon LaRouche’s close ally, President José López Portillo (1976-82). Despite some efforts to increase palliative measures, the government has done little to dump the “green” policies championed in the previous Felipe Calderón Administration by then-head of the National Water Commission (Conagua), José Luis Luege Tamargo, an agent of the British monarchy’s fascist World-wide Fund for Nature (WWF). The emphasis is still largely on “managing” and “adjusting to” scarce resources.

In an interview with the daily *El Universal* published May 4, current Conagua director David Korenfeld reported that plans for water rationing are already in place, slated to begin first in rural areas and then, “if the emergency persists, move to urban areas.”

The only viable programmatic approach to addressing the existential crisis facing the Great American Desert, of which north-central Mexico is a part, to be achieved through a series of sovereign treaty arrangements, is the project known as “NAWAPA-Plus”—the North American Water and Power Alliance, combined with Mexico’s long-planned North West Hydraulic Plan (PLHINO) and the Northern Gulf Hydraulic Plan (PLHIGON)—which would create a single, integrated



Drought in Sonora and elsewhere in Mexico is devastating livestock and crops. Below, wheat under drought stress near Ciudad Obregón, Jan. 26, 2013.



Creative Commons/U. Kumar/CIMMYT

North American water project.

LaRouche and his associates have elaborated this project in great detail over a period of years (see following article). Complemented inside Mexico with other major infrastructure projects, including the construction of dozens of nuclear plants for electricity generation and desalination, PLHINO and PLHIGON would transport water from Mexico's south to the water-starved north, and through the hookup with NAWAPA, transform these parched lands into areas capable of producing bountiful quantities of food.

These projects are not unknown to some of Mexico's elected leaders. In fact, in a July 27, 2012 press conference, the same Governor Herrera who described Mexico's current crisis in such stark terms threw down the gauntlet to then-President-elect Peña Nieto and, without naming it, called for building the PLHIGON.

"We have to bring water from [the southern states of] Chiapas and Tabasco," he said, "where, unfortunately, a large number of cubic meters of water are wasted because of its abundance, to the states of the center-north. . . . If these droughts are recurrent, we have to think of a solution that goes to the root of the problem. . . . These are long-term projects, but it will be a challenge facing the new federal government and the new Chamber of Deputies, to carry out studies and make investments. . . . We have to get going; although they are long-term projects, they can be the solution. Their cost is nothing compared to the lack of water and the dramatic consequences."

Herrera explained at that time that his proposal was

to build "aqueducts, which would help to fundamentally mitigate the grave problem of drought which the region is suffering, and which is leaving millions of people defenseless." He added that this project would be a "bridge" to unite Mexico's regions, and bring greater economic growth, employment, and welfare to families, and that five regional meetings would be held in different states during August.

During the May 29 gathering, Congressman Oscar Cantón Zetina of the southeastern state of Tabasco offered his state's water supply for the nation's development, given that Tabasco possesses 30% of Mexico's surface water and experiences annual floods. If we build pipelines for gas, oil, and their derivatives, he asked, why can't we do the same for water? We must invest in transporting the water and making it potable, he said. Tabasco can provide much of this water to the entire nation.

In March of this year, Energy Minister Joaquín

Coldwell, called for a full discussion of nuclear power as a viable, “clean” answer for Mexico. “It’s a discussion we have to have in the energy sector,” he said. “We should move towards a stronger nuclear program.”

Mexicans Are Starving

But as organizers of the LaRouche Citizens’ Movement (Mocila) told those attending the May 29 meeting, the fight to build these projects and secure the nation’s future cannot be won internally. Just as López Portillo did, nationalist forces and institutions must seek out and coordinate with international allies, especially with LaRouche in the United States, with a principled policy outlook that will overturn the murderous Anglo-Dutch financial dictatorship that has devastated both nations’—and the world’s—economies and populations.

This means reinstating Franklin Roosevelt’s Glass-Steagall law in the United States and passing similar legislation internationally, including in Mexico. It also means creating a Hamiltonian credit and national banking system (a tradition with strong historical roots in Mexico) that can finance great water and related infrastructure projects such as NAWAPA-Plus.

The urgency of immediate action can’t be overstated. It is estimated that 1.280 million square kilometers out of Mexico’s total national territory of 1.973 million km²—almost 65%—is affected by the drought. In several states, especially among poorer Mexicans, hunger and malnutrition are rampant.

A number of peasant organizations reported in late May that the high rates of desertification in the north have caused the loss of at least 5 million hectares that used to produce food, resulting in the importation of 34 million tons of grain that otherwise would have been produced in the country.

Food shortages affect an estimated 28 million people, or one in five Mexicans; 1.2 million children suffer from malnutrition, and 3.6 million children under the age of five do not have enough food to eat. Carlos Ramos Alba, a member of the executive council of the peasant organization National Council of the Plan de Ayala National Coordinator warned at a May 20 press conference that the food crisis is so severe that “trying to eat three meals a day becomes a punishment, when there is nothing to put in your mouth.”

Add to this the ruling PRI party’s criminal decision to remove from its national political platform the clause that opposes any application of a Value Added Tax

(VAT) to food or medicine. With that last defense of Mexicans’ welfare gone, what are poor Mexicans to do? asked Leopoldo González, Vice president of the National Chamber of the Bread-Producing Industry, speaking with Entornointelligence.com in early May. “They are forbidden to eat or get sick!”

Over the past 18 years, he said, the cost of the basic market basket has increased by 582.4%; a 16% VAT tax will place the most basic food staples and medicines out of reach. Several Mexican dailies reported on June 4 that in the month of April, Mexico had the highest rate of food price inflation—9.5%—of all members of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

A National Security Threat

The drought has hit Mexico’s northern region the hardest, followed by the central region. According to the national Forestry Commission (Conafor), of the country’s 22 cities considered to be most important in size and economic activity, 17 are in arid zones, with a combined population of 48 million, or 42% of the nation’s 115 million people.

“Our country is now suffering the consequences of desertification, at the same time that drought and water scarcity are affecting worrisome [land] extensions due to over-exploitation of aquifers,” Conafor said in a late-May statement. “The North of the Country Is Dying of Thirst,” read a May 21 *Televisa* headline.

According to Arturo Osornio Sánchez, Undersecretary of Rural Development at Mexico’s Agriculture Ministry, 18 of Mexico’s 32 states are “collapsed” due to both drought and frosts. The National Meteorological Service had forecast that rainfall for May would be only half the average rainfall as measured for that month over the past 40 years.

Looming food shortages pose a national security threat, warned Benjamín Grayeb, president of the National Agricultural Council on May 3. Agricultural production could drop by as much as 20% this year, he added, with a particularly dangerous decline in grain production.

Mexico currently imports more than 40% of its food, while *exporting* massive amounts at the same time! It is sixth in the world in the production of beef, yet many of its small farmers and cattle ranchers are in dire straits, forced to slaughter animals prematurely or sell them off because they cannot feed them. In 2012,

Mexico produced 1,800 tons of beef and became one of the major suppliers to the U.S. market. Yet it had to import 25% of its corn consumption, 51% of its wheat, and 75% of its rice, as drought wiped out those crops in key states.

Sonora: a Test Case

The fight that has erupted in Sonora, one of Mexico's most important agricultural states affected by the drought, is instructive. The LaRouche movement has been present in this important northwestern state for years, educating and mobilizing the citizenry about the urgency of solving the worsening water shortage through a combination of building the PLHINO in conjunction with NAWAPA, and nuclear desalination plants. Now, a Citizens Movement for Water, the Yaqui Indian tribe, and broader political layers in the state are demanding a sane and competent water policy, and have taken that fight to Mexico's Presidency, to force a national decision.

The current governor of the state, Guillermo Padrés, and the financial and WWF interests behind him, instead, are intent on taking water out of the already parched agricultural region in the south of Sonora, transferring water from the Yaqui River via a new aqueduct to the state capital, Hermosillo—until that water, too, runs out.

The confrontation between these forces is coming to a head. On May 8, the Supreme Court of the Nation upheld a lower court injunction against construction of the aqueduct, until the concerns of the Yaqui Tribe are taken into consideration. On May 21, the Yaqui Tribe published a letter to President Peña Nieto, as a full-page ad in the national daily *Reforma*, calling upon him to force the state government to obey the court ruling.

There is full consensus among the Yaqui people against the idea of overexploiting a water basin which is already overexploited and forecast to have a greater deficit, the letter read. "The aqueduct is emblematic of the abuse of power and disregard for the law of those persisting in carrying out to an extreme an economic policy which prevents the steps for more water, such as desalination and the PLHINO, at the same time that they try to impose speculative criteria upon a strategic resource for the development and well-being of the people."

Six days later, at a May 28 rally of over 20,000 people in Ciudad Obregón, Sonora, opposing construction of the aqueduct, attended by the mayor and other

political figures, a call by the Citizen's Movement for Water was approved for an indefinite blockade of three key tollroads in the area, until the federal government steps in on this fight.

Watering the Great American Desert

Here are excerpts from an article by Dennis Small in [EIR](#), Aug. 10, 2012.

The Northern Gulf Hydraulic Plan, or PLHIGON, will control the historic flooding problem in the Mexican Isthmus region, produce significant amounts of hydroelectric power, and move vast quantities of fresh water northwest along Mexico's Gulf Coast, part of which will then require complementary projects that will pump it up to Mexico's north-central plateau, which is part of the Great American Desert.

The total amount of water runoff to be controlled and withdrawn for use is enormous, and dwarfs the North West Hydraulic Plan's (PLHINO's), scope of 7 km³ of water withdrawn, out of a total runoff of 9.5 km³. The Southeast's four big rivers (Grijalva-Usumacinta, Papaloapan, Coatzacoalcos, and Tonalá—the first, second, third, and sixth biggest in the country, respectively) jointly produce some 204 km³ of runoff, of which only 15%, or 30 km³, will be withdrawn for use in the PLHIGON. This is almost one-fifth the amount of water that will be transferred by the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA XXI)—some 165 km³ per year.

In the detailed design for the PLHIGON drawn up by the respected Mexican engineer Manuel Frías Alcaraz, six major dams will be constructed on the Usumacinta River and its tributaries, some of which will involve binational projects with Guatemala. These will create hydroelectric installed capacity in the range of 9.5 gigawatts, nearly doubling Mexico's current hydroelectric installed capacity of 11 GW, out of a national total of 50 GW from all sources. It will also be necessary to increase the capabilities of the existing Malpaso and Peñitas dams on the Grijalva.

Besides producing electricity, these dams will be designed to control the rivers' runoff, and prevent future

flooding. That will allow the rich lands, in what is now a vast coastal flood plain stretching across Tabasco and the neighboring state of Campeche, to be put into agricultural production, both for crops and pastureland. Frías estimates that more than 1.5 million hectares of land can be recovered, transforming the region into the country's number-one agricultural zone. As a rule of thumb, 1 km³/year of water will irrigate some 100,000 hectares of land. That means that about 15 km³ of the 204 km³ of runoff from the four mentioned rivers, will be needed for the 1.5 million new hectares of agricultural land.

Nuclear Energy Also a Must

In a second stage, an additional 15 km³ of water will be transported northwestward along the Gulf coast, with dams, canals, and pumping stations built for that purpose. There are technical difficulties involved in transferring such vast amounts of water either over (or under, with tunnels) the neovolcanic knot in the center of Mexico, but these can be solved with the significant increase in power production that will come as Mexico fully develops its nuclear industry.


Substantial power will also be needed to pump water over the Eastern Sierra Madre into the Great American Desert region in north-central Mexico, the epicenter of today's drought.

It should be noted that neither the PLHINO nor the PLHIGON per se would carry water to that area. They would have to be complemented by other projects that would bring water up from the coasts to the central highlands. From the western side, this is not very feasible in physical-economic terms, since the Western

Sierra Madre is quite high—it reaches heights of 3,000 meters above sea level. But on the Gulf side, it is much more feasible, given that the Eastern Sierra Madre ranges between 2,000 and 2,500 meters above sea level.

One project that would be especially important for carrying water in that direction, at least as far as the city of Monterrey (which is just before you have to cross over the Eastern Sierra Madre into the highlands), is a proposal developed by Frías, which he has dubbed the

FIGURE 1
North America: 'NAWAPA-Plus'



Sources: Parsons Company, *North American Water and Power Alliance Conceptual Study*, Dec. 7, 1964; Hal Cooper; Manuel Frías Alcaraz; *EIR*.

TzenValle System. The idea is to divert about one-third of the water from the Pánuco River (the fifth in the country, in terms of run-off) and its tributaries, where these originate in the Eastern Sierra Madre in the state of San Luis Potosí. By means of a series of dams, tunnels, and canals, located some 250-300 meters above sea level, water would be carried north, and then pumped up as far as Monterrey, which is 540 meters above sea level.

The TzenValle System would carry an additional 6.8 km³ of water per year to this arid zone.

As **Figure 1** indicates, the eastern branch of NAWAPA would connect with the tributaries of the Rio Grande (Río Bravo), which forms the border between the United States and Mexico at that point. This would enable the transfer of large quantities of fresh water—some 6.8 km³—to the arid Center-North of Mexico. Here, at the Rio Grande, is where NAWAPA and the PLHIGON meet.


The western branch of NAWAPA would feed water across the border to the Yaqui River in Sonora, which would receive nearly 12 km³ of water a year. This is where NAWAPA and the PLHINO meet.

The western stretch of NAWAPA would also supply

water to the north and center of California, and to the Colorado River, which, in turn, would carry more than 5 km³ of water a year to northern Baja California, in Mexico.

Figure 1 presents the full impact of the NAWAPA-Plus projects on water availability in Mexico. For the country as a whole, there will be 68 km³ of new water available. Since Mexico currently gets 36% of its total water withdrawals from aquifers, and over-exploits more than 20% of them—i.e., withdrawing more water than the amount of annual recharge—it will be necessary to use some 10 km³ of the newly available water to recharge the aquifers and reverse their depletion. That will leave net new water availability of some 58 km³, a 75% increase over today's 77 km³.

This increase in water availability will allow Mexico to irrigate some 5 million hectares of new land, a 75% increase over its current 6.5 million hectares of irrigated land. Of this newly irrigated land, 0.8 million hectares will be in Sinaloa and Sonora; 1.5 million will be in the Tabasco/Campeche flood plain; and about 2.7 million will be opened up in the upper reaches of the PLHIGON, including in the currently dry central highlands.



INSIDE THE SPRING 2013 ISSUE

150 Years of Vernadsky

- V.I. Vernadsky and the Contemporary World
- The Science of the Biosphere and Astrobiology
- The Vernadsky Strategy
- Biospheric Energy-Flux Density
- A.P. Oparin: Fraud, Fallacy, or Both?

ALSO FEATURED

Getting the Dose Response Wrong:
A Costly Environmental Problem

Online Subscription

single issue	US\$10
4 issues	US\$35
8 issues	US\$60
12 issues	US\$80

www.21stCenturyScienceTech.com

21st Century, P.O. Box 16285, Washington, D.C. 20041

British Imperial Genocide in India

by Steve Douglas

The contrast between the course of developments that unfolded between 1765 and 1945 in the United States, which conducted a successful revolution against the British Empire, and in India, which was unable to do so, could not be more striking.

The British East India Company's subjugation of Bengal in 1765, ushered in an age of genocide for the next 135 years, that was unparalleled in human history. The British Empire's murderous policies unleashed a famine in 1770 that killed 10 million in Bengal, fully one-third of the population at that time! In subsequent years famines claimed 11 million lives in 1783; 11 million more in 1791; 1 million more in 1837; 2 million in 1860; 1 million in 1865; 1.5 million in 1868; 5.5 million in 1876; 5 million in 1896; and 1 million more in 1899. By 1900, British Empire policies had claimed over 49 million lives in India, while the United States remained famine free, as it developed into the greatest agro-industrial giant in the world.

The first famine (1770) and the last famine (1943) under British rule are perhaps the most instructive and revealing. In the 1765 Treaty of Allahabad, the East India Company (Company) was granted the right to collect the *diwani* (peasants' tribute), formerly held by the Mughal Emperor of the region, Shah Alam II. The area from which the Company was extracting tribute was enormous—roughly 650,000 square kilometers, or an area roughly eight times the size of Great Britain. Nor was this just any area—it was “the Paradise of the Earth,” according to its conqueror, Gen. Robert Clive.

Whereas, prior to 1764, the tribute paid to the Mughal Emperor had been approximately 10-15% of the agricultural output of the peasantry, the Company raised the rate to 40-50%! Moreover, it insisted that this increased levy continued to be termed tribute, rather than a tax, because they wanted the peasants to believe that the “tribute” was still going to the Mughal Emperor, which, of course, it was not.

As Baron Clive, the top Company representative in

India, said in a letter to the Board of Directors, upon his departure in 1767:

“We are sensible that, since the acquisition of the *diwani*, the power formerly belonging to the [Mughal Emperor] of those provinces is totally, in fact, vested in the East India Company. Nothing remains to him but the name and shadow of authority. This name, however, this shadow, it is indispensably necessary we should seem to venerate.”

So, in order to foster the illusion of a power-sharing arrangement with the Emperor Shah Alam, the East India Company kept him living in the lap of luxury, under virtual house arrest at his lavish palace.

What, one might ask, is the difference between this arrangement of 1765, and today's accommodations between the allegedly sovereign governments of Europe, and the dictates of the Global Systemically Important Financial Institutions (G-SIFI) that we have already witnessed in Cyprus and elsewhere?

Not only did the Company increase the tribute rate fivefold, it also insisted that the tribute be paid in cash, not produce or other farm products. The Company also had edicts issued that outlawed the hoarding of rice and other staples. This meant that the peasants had to dump their goods on a British-controlled market, and that they had no staple reserves, in the event of a crop failure or bad weather.

Furthermore, the East India Company made the growth of cash crops, such as indigo and cotton, compulsory, wherever possible.


Thus, the combination of a partial crop failure in 1768, and the abrupt halt to September rains in 1769, produced famine conditions that ravaged a population that had been robbed of its reserves by the British East India Company. Genocide—10 million dead—was the obvious (foreseeable), genocidal result.

The response of the Company? It raised the tribute (tax) rate on agricultural land to 60%!

The Indian Roots of the Boston Tea Party

As these horrific events unfolded in 1770, the American colonial press reported on them, and they became part of the discussion and debate process that led to the Declaration of Independence. In fact, the British Empire's genocidal conduct in India played a central causal role in the events leading into the December 1773 Boston Tea Party. The British Crown had granted the East India Company certain financial privileges with regard to the importation of tea into America, in order to aid it in recovering some of the revenue it had lost during

FIGURE 1



This map shows India in 1760, when it was under the rule of the East India Company's Baron Clive. Ten years later, 10 million Indians in Bengal (highlighted), perished of famine.

the period of the Indian famine that it had created.

American patriots of that era were well aware of the murderous character of the British Empire and its East India Company. This statement from Rusticus¹, in *The Alarm*, a colonial American broadside published in 1773, is unambiguous on the genocidal nature of the threat:

“Are we in like Manner to be given up to the Disposal of the East India Company, who have now the Assurance, to step forth in Aid of the Minister, to execute his Plan, of enslaving America? Their Conduct in Asia for some Years past, has given simple Proof, how little they regard the Laws of Nations, the Rights, Liberties or Lives of Men. They have levied War, excited Rebellions,

1. A pseudonym, from the Latin, meaning (ironically) rustic, rural, simple.

dethroned lawful Princes, and sacrificed Millions for the Sake of Gain. The Revenue of Mighty Kingdoms have centered in their Coffers. And these not being sufficient to glut their Avarice, they have, by the most unparalleled Barbarities, Extortions, and Monopolies, stripped the miserable Inhabitants of their Property, and reduced whole Provinces to Indigence and Ruin. Fifteen hundred Thousands, it is said, perished by Famine in one Year, not because the Earth denied its Fruits; but [because] this Company and their Servants engulfed all the Necessaries of Life, and set them so high at a Rate that the poor could not purchase them. Thus having drained the Sources of the immense Wealth ... they now, it seems, cast their Eyes on America, as a new Theatre, whereon to exercise their Talents.”

Rusticus ended one of his 1773 pamphlets with the following admonition:

“I shall therefore conclude with a proposal that your watchmen be instructed as they go on their rounds, to call out every night at half-past twelve, “Beware of the East India Company.”

Today’s Americans, let alone “Tea Party” activists, should be so well-informed.

It is otherwise noteworthy and lawful that General Cornwallis, the British commander defeated by George Washington at Yorktown in 1781, was dispatched by the crown to become Governor-General of India in 1786.

Churchill and Genocide

In 1943, three million Indians were killed in Bengal, as famine ravaged the region once again. The trigger, on this occasion, was the Japanese occupation of Burma. The Japanese cut off all shipments of rice from Burma to Bengal, which had been the key to Bengal’s food-supply stability before World War II.

Winston Churchill, prime minister of Britain at the time, did everything in his power to prevent food relief from reaching Bengal. His only response to a telegram from the government in Delhi about people dying in the famine, was to inquire why Mahatma Gandhi hadn’t died yet. “I hate Indians,” he said to Leopold Avery, Secretary of State for India. “They are a beastly people with a beastly religion.” He told a war-cabinet meeting, that the famine was the fault of the Indians themselves, “for breeding like rabbits.”



In the 1943 famine, 3 million people starved to death. Prime Minister Churchill prevented food relief from reaching them; he blamed the Indians, whom he called “beastly,” for the famine. Shown: Some of Churchill’s victims.

Churchill refused to accept offers of Canadian and American food aid to India. India was not permitted to use its own sterling reserves, or its own ships to import food. As a true leader of the British Empire, he was

aiding and abetting the mass murder of millions of people.

That same year at the World War II Tehran Conference, President Franklin Roosevelt told Churchill in no uncertain terms, that the U.S. intended to work to dismantle the British Empire after the war, and that the war had not been waged for the sake of its perpetuation.

The fact that he personally contributed mightily to the deaths of 3 million Indians in the famine of 1943, did not stop Churchill from proclaiming, in his 1950 six-volume book *The Second World War: the Hinge of Fate*, that:

“No great portion of the world population was so effectively protected from the horrors and perils of the World War as were the peoples of Hindustan (India). . . . [T]hey were carried through the struggle on the shoulders of our small island.”(!)

Churchill no doubt felt that the magnitude of his crime, matched only by the dimension of his lies, qualified him for membership in the British or Dutch royal families, or both.

EIR Special Report

The British Empire’s Global Showdown, And How To Overcome It


In the face of a potential thermonuclear World War III, a confrontation being engineered from London by a desperate British-centered financial oligarchy operating through the vast—yet often underestimated—powers of the British monarchy, EIR has produced a 104-page Special Report, documenting both the drive for war, and the war-avoidance efforts of patriotic military/intelligence circles in the U.S., and the Russian and Chinese leaderships. The British hand behind the warmongers, and the concrete economic and strategic programs which can defuse the threat, are elaborated in depth. These include the Russian proposal for collaboration on the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), based on Lyndon LaRouche’s original Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The Global Showdown report is available in hard copy for \$250, and in pdf form for \$150, from the [EIR store](#).

Call **1-800-278-3135** for more information.

EIR
Special Report

The British Empire’s Global Showdown, and How To Overcome It



June 2012

IN HIS OWN WORDS

How FDR's First 100 Days Set The Basis for Future Progress

by Nancy Spannaus

June 11—On the eve of the 80th anniversary of the June 16 signing of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall Act, which occurred on the last day of his famous 100 Days, the U.S. Congress desperately needs to recall, and act on, the principles that Roosevelt re-established in those days of crisis. Despite the bold initiatives of a relative few, who have initiated and supported bills to restore Glass-Steagall (H.R. 129 and S. 985), the majority remains caught up in brawls over stop-gap, ludicrous, or even criminal measures to deal with what is clearly a systemic economic crisis threatening the survival of the nation.

What FDR understood, and acted on, was the fundamental commitment of the U.S. Constitution, as expressed in its unique Preamble, namely, that the immediate measures required to bring people out of the misery of the Depression, had to simultaneously lay the basis for long-term progress. He put it this way:

“From the first day of my Administration permanent security was just as much in the front of our minds as the temporary bolstering of banks, the furnishing of immediate jobs and the increase of direct purchasing power. Recovery has come far and with reasonable speed; reform has come less far in the same period of time. But reform is just as important to permanent security in the spring of 1938 as it was in the spring of 1933.”

That evaluation by President Roosevelt was uttered in his introduction to the second volume of his *Public*

Papers and Addresses, edited by his longtime speechwriter Samuel Rosenman, and published in 1938. That volume was dedicated to the events of 1933, which it called “The Year of Crisis,” and he used the introductory essay to provide an overview of his thinking about what had been accomplished.

FDR's words address one of the fundamental problems our lawmakers face today: how a specific emergency financial measure, Glass-Steagall, is part of a coherent program for returning the United States to its traditional credit system—not the British monetarist system of usury—as the only basis for durable and constant economic progress. While destroying Wall Street's power, Glass-Steagall opens the door to massive investment in the physical economy, whose collapse is otherwise in the process of killing millions. It meets an immediate need, and builds the foundation for the future.

Listen now to FDR:

“We were determined to help all that needed help for recovery: We were equally determined to reform wherever reform was necessary to insure permanence in recovery.

“That determination was expressed during those ‘Hundred Days’ by our efforts in the Banking Acts of 1933 [those include Glass-Steagall—ed.] to restore confidence in our banks, and to make our entire banking system sounder and more honest; in the Securities



President Franklin Roosevelt at the signing of the Glass-Steagall Act, June 16, 1933. On the far left is Sen. Carter Glass, and on the far right, Rep. Henry Steagall.

Act of 1933, to safeguard legitimate investors from questionable promotions; in the various laws and Executive actions with respect to gold, silver and foreign exchange, to insure a sound and adequate currency; in the reinvigoration of the Federal Power Commission, to protect investors in public utility stocks and consumers of public utility services; in the Deposit Liquidation Board, to make loans to closed banks throughout the Nation to help the depositors obtain a substantial portion of their frozen deposits; in the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, to help American holders of defaulted foreign bonds; and in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to insure future deposits in case of bank failures.

“That same determination was expressed during those ‘Hundred Days’ by our efforts in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to restore and stabilize agricultural income; in the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, to save the farms of the Nation from wholesale foreclosure; in the promotion of a good-neighbor policy and in our conferences with representatives of foreign powers, to bring about closer international understanding and relationships and promote our foreign trade; in the Home Owners Loan Act, to save city and village homes from foreclosure; in the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, to help the great railroad systems of the country; in our action to restore the oil and petroleum industry of the Nation from a

state of almost complete collapse; in the National Industrial Recovery Act and in the establishment of the National Labor Board and other special labor boards, to help the cause of labor and industrial peace by encouraging collective bargaining, mediation, and arbitration between employers and employees; in the establishment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to help the farmers of the Nation by lending them money on their surplus crops so that they might continue to hold them instead of dumping them on already saturated markets.

“And in the same way, that determination was expressed during those ‘Hundred Days’ by our efforts in establishing the Civilian Conser-

vation Corps, to give several hundred thousand boys and veterans a chance to get off the streets and tramp-trains and out of hobo jungles, into useful outdoor work in the forests of the Nation; in the establishment of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, to furnish food and clothing for those who were hungry and destitute through lack of jobs which they sought in vain to find; in setting up the Tennessee Valley Authority, to provide an example of proper planning and use of natural resources of soil and water for the benefit of the average men and women in the Tennessee River Valley; in the National Industrial Recovery Act, to provide jobs for the unemployed, to improve wage income and working conditions, and to eliminate unfair competition and trade practices in business; in the creation of the Public Works Administration, to provide work relief on large projects of public works; in setting up the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, to help the farmers as well as the hungry unemployed by purchasing surplus foodstuffs and distributing them to those who might otherwise not have had food; and in setting up the Civil Works Administration, to inaugurate a widespread program of work relief for those who could not find jobs in private industry. . . .

“All of these examples of the use of the authority of Government, as an organized form of self-help for all classes and groups and sections of our country, were

adopted during those first famous ‘Hundred Days,’ or during the balance of that year of crisis as a result of legislation of the first hundred days. Many other instances came in the succeeding years. These of 1933 form the nucleus of the new activities; they are all included in discussion in this volume.

“They were the New Deal in action—Government acting to bring about not only immediate recovery, but its long-range objectives in reform. For underlying all of the immediately effective provisions of these laws and all the activities of the agencies under them, was the ever-directing purpose of permanence of objectives.

“We knew that a leadership system of economy had produced and would again produce economic and social disaster. Private leadership had been non-existent from the point of view of seeking the objectives of national welfare; Government leadership was the only method left.

“Briefly, the objectives were, have always been, and still are:

“A chance for men and women to work in industry at decent wages and reasonable hours; or to engage in farming at a decent return.

“A chance to keep savings in *banks safe from speculative use of other people’s money* [cf. Glass-Steagall—

ed.]; and to make investments without danger of deception or fraud by greedy promoters and speculators.

“A chance for adequate recreation, better housing and sounder health.

“A change to make a reasonable profit in business protected against monopolies and unfair competition, but organized so as to provide fair prices for the consuming public.

“Planning and use of natural resources for the benefit of the average men and women.

“Security against the hardships of old age.

“Security against unexpected or seasonal unemployment.

“Security against new as well as old types of criminals.

“Security against war.”

“The task of reconstruction which we undertook in 1933 did not call for the creation of strange values. It was rather finding the way again to old, but somewhat forgotten, ideals and values. . . .”

And those ways, as FDR had said at the outset, are what are enshrined in the Preamble to our Constitution: a more perfect union, justice, domestic tranquillity, the common defense, the general welfare and the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Glass-Steagall On the Agenda

June 11—There are presently two bills to reinstate FDR’s Glass-Steagall regulations before Congress, one in the House (H.R. 129), and one in the Senate (S. 985). The House bill, introduced Jan. 3, 2013, has 64 sponsors in all, including the initiating sponsors Marcy Kaptur (D-Ohio) and Walter Jones (R-N.C.). The Senate bill, introduced May 16, still only has its initiating sponsor, Sen. Tom Harkin (D-Iowa).

Memorials in support of Congressional action have been passed in four state legislatures (South Dakota-both houses; Maine-both houses; Indiana-House; and Alabama-House), and are pending in five others (Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, North Carolina,

Delaware, New Jersey, and New York). Intensive efforts are still underway in several other states where Memorials have not been yet introduced.

The House and Senate bills have nearly identical language, and match the key provisions of FDR’s Glass-Steagall. These are: 1) Commercial bank holding companies must divest themselves of all non-commercial banking units; 2) The remaining commercial banks could not use more than 2% of their capital for the creation, sale, or distribution of securities; 3) Commercial banks cannot make loans into vehicles, such as hedge funds, that would create securities; and 4) No securities of low, or potentially low value—like derivatives—can be placed by a bank in its insured commercial bank units.

In sum, banking units devoted to speculation are *cut off* from government support—and the way open for reestablishing a sound banking system based on credit for *production of real wealth*.

Graham, 9/11 Families: Government Must ‘Come Clean’ on Saudi Links

by Edward Spannaus

June 10—“I am deeply troubled by what appears to me to be a persistent effort by the FBI to conceal from the American people information concerning possible Saudi support of the 9/11 attacks,” wrote former Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fla.), who was co-chairman of the Congressional Joint Inquiry into the 9/11 attacks, in a declaration filed in Federal court in Florida the last week of May.

Graham was joined in his call for full disclosure, by the organization representing 6,600 survivors and relatives of those injured and killed in the 9/11 attacks, who are also demanding that the FBI reveal all its information about the investigation of a Saudi family in Sarasota, Fla., which has been linked to the 9/11 hijackers.

FBI’s Contradictory Claims

Graham’s and the 9/11 Families’ new demands were triggered by FBI statements made in a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuit pending in Federal court in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. After the FBI at first had denied that there was any connection between a Saudi family whose home had been visited by some of the 9/11 hijackers, and which then fled Sarasota shortly before the 9/11 attacks, the FBI now claims that disclosure of certain classified information about the Saudi family “would reveal current specific targets of the FBI’s national security investigations.”

In other words: “We never found anything, and there’s nothing there, but we can’t tell you about it, because it would endanger national security.”

The FBI’s preposterous claims come in a sworn declaration as part of a Justice Department motion to dismiss the FOIA suit brought by the *Broward Bulldog*, which, along with journalist Anthony Summers, discovered and published, in 2011, an account of the Sarasota links of the 9/11 hijackers (see [EIR](#), Sept. 23, 2011).

The *Bulldog* story showed that two weeks before the 9/11 hijackings, a wealthy Saudi family which

had been in contact with 9/11 hijackers Mohamed Atta and others, abruptly fled from their luxury home near Sarasota, leaving all their possessions—from fresh food to expensive automobiles. The house was owned by Saudi financier Esam Ghazzawi, and was occupied by his daughter and her husband, Abdulazzi al-Hijjii. (Al-Hijjii then went to London, where he worked for the Saudi Aramco state oil company.)

According to the *Bulldog* story, also published in the *Miami Herald*, law enforcement agents had found records of telephone calls with a number of the hijackers, including Atta. Security records of the gated community showed visits by vehicles owned by Atta and by another hijacker, Zaid Jarrah. Atta, Jarrah, and a third hijacker, Marwan al-Shehhi, were all living within 10 miles of Ghazzawi’s house, and were taking flying lessons in nearby Venice. Analysis of phone records from Ghazzawi’s house showed contact with 11 other terrorism suspects, including Walid al-Shehhi, who was with Atta on the first plane to hit the World Trade Center on Sept. 11, 2001.

As the *Miami Herald* put it: “The government’s latest court filings, thick with veiled references to foreign counterintelligence operations and targets, deepen the mystery about [the FBI’s] once-secret investigation.”

After at first claiming that it had no documents relevant to the FOIA request, the FBI then “found” 35 pages of records, and has released 31 of them, with many deletions. One of the documents, first disclosed a few months ago, directly contradicted the Bureau’s earlier claims, by stating that the investigation had “revealed many connections” between the al-Hijjii family and individuals associated with 9/11. When the *Bulldog/Herald* story was first published, the FBI had issued a formal statement denying any connection between the Ghazzawi-Hijjii family and 9/11.



pibillwarner.wordpress.com

Former Sen. Bob Graham, co-chairman of the Congressional Joint Inquiry into the 9/11 attacks.

Graham Charges FBI Interference

In a declaration filed in Federal court in Florida on May 31, Graham charged that the FBI's failure to provide the Joint Inquiry with documents concerning its investigation into the Saudi family living in Sarasota, and that family's documented connections to some of the 9/11 hijackers, had impeded and interfered with the Joint Inquiry's investigation, and also with the probe conducted by the 9/11 Commission appointed by President George W. Bush and Congress. According to Graham, the fact that the 9/11 Commission stated that it had "found no evidence that the Saudi government as an institution or senior Saudi officials individually funded al Qaeda," shows that the Commission was not provided with the information about the FBI's investigation in Sarasota.

Graham also recounts how, in 2011, he had asked President Obama's counterterrorism chief, John Brennan, to look into the FBI's Sarasota investigation. Graham says that he received an e-mail from an assistant to Brennan, "indicating that Mr. Brennan was well aware of the Sarasota house/occupants and chose not to include it in the final 9/11 Commission report because it didn't stick to the wall." (!) Graham says that he was told that the Commission's files did not contain any records regarding the FBI's Sarasota investigation.

In his court declaration, Graham also points out that the section of the Joint Inquiry's report that reportedly

deals with Saudi support for the hijackers is still being withheld from the public. "The 28-page section of the Inquiry's Final Report dealing with 'sources of foreign support for some of the Sept. 11 hijackers,' remains classified to this day even though declassification would not, in my opinion, endanger national security."

'Stop Protecting Saudi Potentates'

Almost immediately, the group representing survivors and relatives of those injured and killed in the 9/11 attacks issued its own statement.

"The Steering Committee of the 9/11 Families United To Bankrupt Terrorism endorses the efforts of investigative reporters Dan Christensen and Anthony Summers and calls on the FBI to come clean

regarding an investigation involving a Saudi family, former residents of Sarasota, Fla., who may have provided aid to the 9/11 hijackers," says a statement issued on June 7.

Sharon Premoli of Dorset, Vt., who was pulled from the rubble of the World Trade Center, said: "After almost 12 years, the time has come for the Department of Justice, the FBI and this administration to give the American people access to the truth about who financed the murder of 3,000 people on 9/11. It is simply implausible that release of this information would interfere with any current national security investigation. Rather, the FBI's obstruction creates at least the perception of a cover-up to protect Saudi potentates."

Although there is some question as to who has the power to declassify and release the 28 pages dealing with the Saudis—Congress or the Administration—the families put the onus directly on Obama:

"First President Obama promises me personally to release the 28 pages removed from the Congressional committees' report and doesn't, and now the FBI is pulling this stunt," said Bill Doyle, father of Joseph M. Doyle, who died in the World Trade Center. "The FBI keeps contradicting itself. On one hand, they say they found no evidence connecting the Sarasota Saudis to 9/11. On the other hand, they say releasing the information would threaten national security. But they can't have it both ways. And the Courts should not let them get away with it."

SOLAR SYSTEM FLARE-UP

An Interplanetary Imperative

by Benjamin Deniston

June 1—Mid-May featured a period of intense earthquakes and solar activity, bringing some long-standing questions into focus. The largest earthquake in over a year occurred on the morning of Friday, May 24—an 8.3 magnitude quake off the Pacific coast of Russia, in the Sea of Okhotsk. Just over a week earlier, the Sun unleashed two of the largest solar flares of the current solar cycle, an X2.8 on the 13th, and an X3.2 on the 14th. However, these were only the most intense outbursts (**Figure 1**).

As of this writing, these appear to have been part of a broader two-week period of increased Solar System activity, underscoring the need to move beyond simple Earth-based views, and situate processes on Earth within the larger context of our subsuming stellar system.

For example, did you feel the effects of these recent outbursts?


A Magnetic Personality?

As a result of the Sun's flaring up, the Earth experienced two geomagnetic storms, one on May 18, and a

second on May 25. A geomagnetic storm occurs when the Earth's magnetic field enters a period of intense fluctuation, due to the impact of jets or clouds of plasma thrown off by the Sun. Did these events perhaps correspond to any strange moods you were unable to explain at the time?

Some might dismiss such a question as silly, but a 2003 research paper noted that "A large body of psychological research has shown that geomagnetic storms have a profound effect on people's moods."

FIGURE 1



Images of the Sun during and after an X-Class solar flare on May 14, 2013. Taken with NASA's Solar Dynamics Observatory space telescope, using the Atmospheric Imaging Assembly instrument, at a wavelength of 131 Ångströms (ultraviolet).

Was this an obscure scientific study from some students in need of a graduate thesis? Hardly. It turns out that this is a working paper for the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, entitled, “Playing the Field: Geomagnetic Storms and the Stock Market.”¹ There are already so many decades of studies showing the effects of geomagnetic storms on human moods and behavior (many are in Russian) that these authors decided to look for the effects of these geomagnetic-induced mood shifts on the markets.

The paper concludes, “The authors find strong empirical support in favor of a geomagnetic-storm effect in stock returns after controlling for market seasonals and other environmental and behavioral factors. Unusually high levels of geomagnetic activity have a negative, statistically and economically significant effect on the following week’s stock returns for all U.S. stock market indices. Finally, this paper provides evidence of substantially higher returns around the world during periods of quiet geomagnetic activity.”

Obviously there are other factors that have larger effects of the markets (such as the looming collapse of the quadrillion-plus dollars in the derivatives bubble), and more importantly, while people may be biologically affected by such activity, the human species uniquely expresses a creative principle absent from all other forms of animal life. When being truly human, mankind is not controlled by such cosmic forces, but is destined to control them. The slender fingers of a solar-induced aurora point upward, the direction that must be pursued to expand that control.

Earthquake Forecasts

For example, starting the week before the 8.3M temblor in the Sea of Okhotsk on May 24, the Russian press was filled with warnings of the possibility of a large earthquake in that region. A series of smaller quakes was catching the attention of local scientists and officials, and although nothing conclusive was declared, some, such as Victor Chebrov (the Director of the Kamchatka branch of the Russian Academy of Science’s Geophysical Service) were noting that these could be signs of a larger event to come, as reported by RIA Novosti.

Chebrov said that this activity came in the context

of longer-term forecasts for the region. In 2010, Sergei Fedotov and a small team with the Institute of Volcanology and Seismology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, issued a forecast that a large earthquake (magnitude 7.7+) would strike the Kamchatka region some time between September 2011 and August 2016. This was based on a method developed and successfully utilized by Fedotov beginning in the 1960s, analyzing cycles and gaps in seismic activity of a particular region.²

Alexey Lyubushin, with the Institute of Physics of the Earth, has issued a separate long-term forecast for the Pacific Ocean near Tokyo. Based on examining patterns in smaller quakes, Lyubushin is warning that the next Japan mega-quake could occur off the coast of Tokyo in the 2013-14 period.³

These longer-term forecasts have made the Kamchatka-Japan region a focus for short-term forecasting, using “non-seismic” methods, such as monitoring infrared emissions, irregularities in the ionosphere, earthquake clouds, etc., which can serve as precursor signals, warning of a coming temblor, days or weeks away. For example, the Moscow-based Research Center for Earth Operative Monitoring recently completed a year-long, short-term forecasting trial program for the Kamchatka-Japan region (eng.ntsomz.ru/projects/earthquake). They were testing a system that could become part of the proposed International Global Monitoring Aerospace Systems (IGMASS) program.⁴

However, it is not clear that the 8.3M earthquake on May 24 has satisfied the forecast for the Kamchatka region, and some are warning of a still-upcoming large quake. Yevgeni Rogozhin, the deputy director of the Institute of Physics of the Earth, Russian Academy of Sciences, noted that this was one of the deepest earthquakes ever recorded (over 600 kilometers), and cited


2. S.A. Fedotov et al., “A long-term earthquake forecast for the Kuril-Kamchatka arc for the period from September 2011 to August 2016: The likely location, time, and evolution of the next great earthquake with M=7.7 in Kamchatka,” *Journal of Volcanology and Seismology*, April 2012, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 65-88.

3. [Alexey Lyubushin](#), Institute of Physics of the Earth, Moscow; “Spots of Seismic Danger Extracted by Properties of Low-Frequency Seismic Noise,” presented at the European Geosciences Union General Assembly in Vienna, April 2013.

4. For more, see Benjamin Deniston, Pavel Penev, and Jason Ross, “International Global Monitoring Aerospace Systems: Toward Collaboration in the Defense of Mankind,” *21st Century Science & Technology*, Fall/Winter 2012-2013.

1. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta [Working Paper](#), October 2003, by Anna Krivelyova, Boston College; and Cesare Robotti, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

FIGURE 2



Top: weekly earthquake totals from early March through the end of May, divided by magnitude range. Bottom: weekly solar flare totals from early March through the end of May. Solar flares are measured by the intensity of the x-ray flux produced, classified on a logarithmic scale as, A, B, C, M, or X-class (going from smaller to larger), so an X-class flare is ten times more energetic than an M-class, and 100 times more than a C-class. Each class divided into 9 levels.

the work of Kiyoo Mogi (a Japanese authority on earthquake prediction), who has said that very deep quakes can be a sign that shallower quakes are to follow in the same region.

Sergey Pulinets, a Principal Scientific Researcher with Space Research Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, told Russian Chanel 1 television that the concern for future earthquakes in the Kamchatka region has not been eliminated, and that generally, earthquakes that used to occur once every 100 years, are now occur-

ring every 40 years: “The Earth is evolving ... the processes are ongoing.”

A Solar System

So the areas around Kamchatka and Japan will continue to be watched, but the action is not limited to this region of the Pacific. During the same week (May 19-25), there was a spike in the number of earthquakes globally, with 56 being registered with magnitude 5.0 or higher—an increase over the previous weeks (Figure 2).

Starting one week prior to the earthquake spike, there was an intense flare-up of solar activity. The Sun released 10 significant sized flares between May 12 and 25, with four of them being the larger X-class flares. These four were the first X-class flares since October 2012, and the X2.8 and X3.2 flares on the 13th and 14th were the largest since March 2012—the third- and fourth-largest of the current solar cycle so far (which started in January 2008). Some of these flares released high-speed clouds of plasma toward the Earth, called coronal mass ejections, which can generate disturbances in the Earth’s magnetic field, affecting all kinds of Earth systems, biological and otherwise. Over this period, two geomagnetic storms shook the electromagnetic systems of the Earth, one on May 18, and a second on the 24th, the same day as the large 8.3M temblor cited above.


A direct, one-to-one, relationship between solar activity and earthquake activity is notoriously hard to predict. However, stepping back and viewing the larger picture, the evidence certainly points to a relationship. For example, recent studies have shown that the period of the descending half and minimum of the 11-year solar cycle appears to bring significantly more earthquakes than the ascending half and maximum (Figure 3). The discrepancy is greatest for large earthquakes.⁵

Toward Controlling the Solar System

This is a practical matter, as we are currently rounding the peak of the present solar cycle (number 24), and soon entering the descending phase. What will the coming years bring in the way of large earthquakes? This is the time to put serious support into non-seismic

5. J. Huzaimy and K. Yumoto, “Possible Correlation between Solar Activity and Global Seismicity,” in *Proc. 2011 IEEE Int. Conf. Space Sci. Comm.*, Penang, Malaysia, pp. 138-141.

FIGURE 3



The division of earthquakes occurring in the maximum and ascending half of the solar cycle vs. those occurring in the minimum and descending half for solar cycles 20 to 23, along with an illustration of solar cycles 20 to 23, and the current status of solar cycle 24.

earthquake forecasting programs, which hold promise for saving countless lives by providing days or weeks of warning time that a quake may occur in a given area.⁶ Unfortunately, the development of such systems have been slowed or blocked for political and ideological reasons.

The proposed IGMASS system mentioned above would be an excellent step in international collaboration to develop natural disaster forecasting systems, giving mankind a leg up on these threats before they strike. For threats we cannot yet avert, forecasting allows us to control our pre-response, and the consequences—e.g., defensive measures, such as moving people out of a region threatened with an imminent earthquake—before we have the means to control the processes themselves.

There are also catastrophes that can be completely prevented. Asteroid and comet impacts can conceivably be prevented, given the proper level of development of the inner Solar System (although the February asteroid impact over Chelyabinsk, Russia warns us that we are not prepared yet). The Russian proposal

for cooperation with the United States in a Strategic Defense of Earth is an offer we would be insane to ignore.

The challenge for the present and coming generations of mankind is to control the inner Solar System. It will be small and slow at first, but the principle of humanity as an interplanetary creative force will be undeniable. As we used to understand the greatness of vast landscapes of Earth changing under the guidance of man’s hand, we will come to view the conscious reshaping of the inner Solar System as the next evolutionary step in humanity’s destiny in continuously generating endless progress.

In the United States this defines an imperative to rid ourselves of Obama and his anti-science policies—the President who responds to natural disasters by saying “We can’t control them,” or “We couldn’t have known,” while presiding over the destruction of the capabilities of NASA and NOAA to defend us from exactly these threats.

The future will leave behind these backward views as ancient relics of an adolescent phase of humanity, and expand mankind’s control of the inner Solar System. So, as we fight for mankind’s maturation, keep an eye toward the Sun as we round the solar maximum and begin the declining phase of the cycle. You may want to watch for a jittery mood, and a shaky ground!

6. For more, see “Science Can Predict Earthquakes,” *21st Century Science & Technology*, Winter 2011-2012; and the interview with [Dr. Sergey Pulintsev, “A Multi-Parameter Approach to Earthquake Forecasting.”]

Calling on Citizens with Courage

All Americans owe Edward Snowden a debt of gratitude for his courageous action in exposing the current massive NSA spying operations against the citizens of the United States. Knowing that he risked his life by going public with secret documents that prove the ongoing ubiquitous spying, Snowden went ahead, found brave collaborators, and set off a political explosion aimed at provoking his fellow citizens to wake up, and fight for their Constitutional rights before it's too late.

The question is, will enough courageous patriots step forward to join him, in order to bring the U.S. back from the brink of a full-blown dictatorship?

“Those who surrender freedom for security will not have, nor do they deserve, either one,” said Benjamin Franklin. That idea is resonating around the world, as international leaders look with shock at the revelations about a government which secretly collects data on the Internet and phone traffic of its citizens, ranging into the millions of data bits daily, and decides in secret how it will be used. In particular, it was cited by German Justice Minister Sabine Leutheusser-Schnarrenberger June 11 in an op-ed in *Spiegel* Online, who found the revelations “deeply disconcerting.” Coming from Germany, where recollection of the Stasi surveillance system of control in East Germany is still very alive, this comment is especially significant.

Indeed, the famous leaker of the Pentagon Papers of 1971, which exposed previously hidden involvement of the U.S. military in Vietnam, Daniel Ellsberg, headlined an op-ed in the June 11 London *Guardian*, “Edward Snowden: Saving Us from the United Stasi of America.” “The NSA, FBI and CIA have, with the new digital technology,

surveillance powers over our own citizens that the Stasi—the secret police in the former ‘democratic republic’ of East Germany—could scarcely have dreamed of,” Ellsberg wrote.

As additional revelations appear, this assertion will become even clearer, as Snowden himself has hinted. As a member of the vast apparatus serving the NSA “security” apparatus, Snowden said, he had enormous power. “At my level, I could have wiretapped the President,” he told the *Guardian*'s Glenn Greenwald.

Are there enough patriots in Congress with the courage to draw the consequences of these revelations? To do so, would mean to take some very specific measures to reassert the Constitution of the United States in its most essential features. To wit:

- Articles of impeachment of the President of the United States, Barack Obama, must be immediately filed, adding to his already extensive list of offenses against the Constitution, the wholesale violation of the Fourth Amendment, and the rights of due process guaranteed to all American citizens. You can't reverse such behavior by passing new laws while you have a President in place who has regularly flouted the law.


- Congress must simultaneously assert its Constitutional powers over the economy and finances of the United States, which are currently being subverted and looted by the foreign-run financial powers whom Obama's actions also serve. This begins with the reassertion of the Glass-Steagall principle, which has been presented in H.R. 129 and S. 985 before both Houses of Congress.

The further consolidation of these powers means fascism, and likely thermonuclear war. The courageous war to stop them must go into high gear now.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

EIR Online

EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.



I would like to subscribe to **EIR Online**

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- \$360 for one year
 - \$180 for six months
 - \$120 for four months
 - \$90 for three months
 - \$60 for two months
- Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: **fulfillment@larouchepub.com**

Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my MasterCard Visa
 Discover Am Ex

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____