

Who Has the Guts To Throw Obama Out of Office Now?

by Nancy Spannaus and Carl Osgood

Jan. 4—Over the year-end holidays, while the Obama Administration was contributing to the buildup for a war confrontation with Russia over the crisis in Ukraine—a confrontation which could become a full-blown thermonuclear showdown in short order—a number of significant voices in the United States’ political institutions have taken new initiatives to spotlight his unconstitutional abuse of power within the U.S. Important as they are, they fall far short of what’s required to save the United States, and the planet, from British puppet and would-be dictator Obama. For that, removal of the President from power is imperative, immediately.

“If we don’t have the guts to throw a crooked, evil President out of office to save the United States, *that’s* the problem,” said Lyndon LaRouche in his Jan. 3 webcast. People who hate Obama, and who recognize how he is destroying the nation, are *giving in* to him out of fear, just the way many Germans gave in to Hitler. And unless this capitulation stops—to both Obama and Wall Street—“we can do nothing,” LaRouche continued.

“I know what the American people could do *if they would throw Obama out of office*, and that’s the only way that I see that the world can survive, avoid a thermonuclear war: If the American people were to throw Obama out of office, given his lack of popularity, estimated to maybe be running to 60% of our citizens, voting citizens, we could stop this. We would not allow the war to start!

And if the United States would not start the war, it couldn’t be pulled off!”

Court Rules To Stop NSA Abuse

The first of the unexpected institutional actions to slam President Obama’s violation of his Constitutional powers, came Dec. 16, when Federal Judge Richard Leon, of the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia, issued a preliminary injunction against the National Security Agency (NSA) for violations of the Fourth Amendment’s prohibitions against unlawful search and seizure. Judge Leon immediately stayed the injunction’s implementation, in order to allow a government appeal.



White House/Pete Souza

The Obama-NSA mass surveillance apparatus, exposed by whistleblower Edward Snowden, has taken the previous Bush-Cheney police-state measures to a new, and even more menacing level. Obama and Bush shown on Air Force One Dec. 9, 2013.

Leon's rulings—in two cases brought by Larry Klayman, founder and former president of Judicial Watch—are the first of a number of cases pending before various courts concerning programs revealed by patriotic NSA contractor (and now fugitive) Edward Snowden, and could likely set the tone for future rulings. Indicating the extreme sensitivity of the case, the court only offered a cautionary “narrow” ruling (on this specific case only), prohibiting the NSA and Verizon Communications from engaging in further activity against Judicial Watch. Leon also refused to rule on the constitutionality of the secret FISA courts, claiming he “lacks jurisdiction.”

Leon, a George W. Bush appointee, nonetheless condemned “the almost-Orwellian technology that enables the Government to store and analyze the phone metadata of every telephone user in the United States,” adding that it “is unlike anything that could have been conceived in 1979,” when the Supreme Court first allowed the government to collect such data.

The President's Own Review Panel

Judge Leon's ruling was followed almost immediately by a wave of publicity about the unexpected criticism against the President's NSA abuses coming from the review panel that Obama himself had appointed in August, in hopes of deflecting action to dismantle the vast police-state apparatus which he oversees. The “President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies” was comprised of five individuals, three of whom—including long-time crony of the President, Harvard Law School Professor Cass Sunstein; former National Security Council staffer (under G.W. Bush) Richard Clarke; and former CIA deputy director Michael Morrell—have functioned for years within the institution of the Presidency.

The Review Panel's report, a 308-page document entitled “Liberty and Security in a Changing World,” is dated Dec. 12, but did not begin to hit the press until several days later. It contains 46 recommendations, based on what the panel described as its “major conclusion” in a *New York Times* op-ed printed Dec. 19.

“Our major conclusion is that the nation needs a package of reforms that will allow the intelligence community to continue to protect Americans, as well as our friends and allies, while at the same time affirming enduring values, involving both privacy and liberty, that

have made the United States a beacon of freedom to so much of the world,” it states.

Formally, the review panel defends Obama's police-state apparatus. They claim they “found no evidence of illegality or other abuse of authority for the purpose of targeting domestic political activity.” And later, “in our review, we have not uncovered any official efforts to suppress dissent or any intent to intrude into people's private lives without legal justification.” (Did they really look?)

But these defenses of the unprecedented police-state powers being exercised by this President are followed, and overshadowed, by a ream of recommendations demanding the curtailment of some of the NSA's programs, including, most prominently in Recommendation 4, the “bulk collection and storage program.” Such bulk collection of telephone metadata has done little or nothing to contribute to the nation's security, they said—and could readily be obtained through other, court-sanctioned means. To quote: “Our review suggests that the information contributed to terrorist investigations by the use of section 215 telephony meta-data was not essential to preventing attacks and could readily have been obtained in a timely manner using conventional section 215 orders.”

This statement is mild indeed compared to reality. As Senators privy to classified information from the intelligence community, such as Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.), have insisted repeatedly, there is not a *single instance* in which the massive data collection program—first shopped to Congress under the Bush Administration's post-9/11 Total Information Awareness program, at which time it was shot down—played a decisive necessary role in identifying and stopping a terrorist attack.

Equally mild is the rationale for scaling back the measures, which is put forward as a matter of reducing the “risks” of overreaching. The report notes: “Knowing that the government has ready access to one's phone call records can seriously chill ‘associational and expressive freedoms’ and knowing that the government is one flick of a switch away from such information can profoundly ‘alter the relationship between citizen and government in a way that is inimical to society.’” It also questions whether the measures taken in the wake of 9/11 might not now be inappropriate. To wit: “we conclude that some of the authorities that were expanded or created in the aftermath of Sept. 11 unduly sacrifice

fundamental interests in individual liberty, personal privacy and democratic governance.”

All told, the impact of the report has been to do anything but create confidence in the President, as he hoped, but to stoke the fires of resistance to his dictatorial measures.

The Snowden Case

The symbol for that resistance, of course, is former NSA contractor Edward Snowden, whose courageous action to reveal the extent of the NSA surveillance program last June changed the political landscape dramatically. The exposure of the unprecedented, and clearly unlawful, spying has severely shaken politics at home and abroad, with foreign leaders forced to distance themselves from the U.S., and public hatred of the President’s policies reaching new heights.

Snowden remains, internationally, a rallying point for resistance. One of the most forceful examples of that was his Christmas Day speech to the British people, aired by British Channel 4 as a “response” to Queen Elizabeth’s yearly message. There he urged the Britons—and implicitly everyone else—not to succumb to the Orwellian program of surveillance run by the U.K.’s Government Communications Headquarters/GCHQ (in partnership with the NSA). He emphasized the crucial role of privacy for the development of the human personality—growing up without fear that your thoughts are being monitored.

The day before, he had provided his message to the American people in an interview with the *Washington Post*’s Barton Gellman, emphasizing that he was maintaining his oath to defend the U.S. Constitution against such violations as the NSA “general warrants,” which the American colonies had identified as one of the markers for British imperialism more than two centuries ago.

The Obama Administration, which has brought two felony charges against Snowden for alleged violation of the Espionage Act of 1917, and still seeks his extradition, has remained unyielding on his case, and Congress has been generally passive, despite loud complaining from both sides of the aisle, and some significant legislation being introduced, such as that by Patriot Act writer Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-Wisc.), H.R. 3361, now with 117 co-sponsors from both parties, which would sharply curb the surveillance.

But on Jan. 1, Obama’s police-state apparatus began to face some significant, high-profile resistance.

The New York Times Editorial

“Edward Snowden, Whistle-Blower” is the title of the *Times*’ extensive editorial of that date, which is, unusually, signed by the entire Editorial Board. Noting two recent Federal judicial rulings saying Obama had violated the Constitution with his NSA surveillance, and citing the President’s panel’s finding, the *Times* came to the following conclusion:

“Considering the enormous value of the information he has revealed, and the abuses he has exposed, Mr. Snowden deserves better than a life of permanent exile, fear and flight. He may have committed a crime to do so, but *he has done his country a great service*. It is time for the United States to offer Mr. Snowden a plea bargain or some form of clemency that would allow him to return home, face at least substantially reduced punishment in light of his role as a whistle-blower, and have the hope of a life advocating for greater privacy and far stronger oversight of the runaway intelligence community” (emphasis added).

The *Times* then argued that Snowden was “clearly justified in believing that the only way to blow the whistle on this kind of intelligence-gathering was to expose it to the public.” The editors then take Obama to task for lying that he had issued an executive order that would protect such revelations. The government has broken the law, and Snowden revealed it, the *Times* concluded. Thus: “That’s why Rick Ledgett, who leads the N.S.A.’s task force on the Snowden leaks, recently told CBS News that he would consider amnesty if Snowden would stop any additional leaks. And it’s why President Obama should tell his aides to begin finding a way to end Mr. Snowden’s vilification and give him an incentive to return home.”

The *Times* piece has touched off a burst of commentary, with people taking sides. Some, like former Obama Administration official Anne-Marie Slaughter, have come out strongly in favor of the *Times*’ approach.

Fully Impeachable

It is more than foolhardy, of course, to believe that Obama—who relishes the same kind of Executive Power as Dick Cheney (or Adolf Hitler)—will be constrained by legalistic measures. What’s required is his removal from power, through the immediate institution of impeachment proceedings, the application of the 25th Amendment, or both. LaRouchePAC and this magazine have laid out the case in full. It only takes guts to get it done.