



May 2013

They Are Killing American Citizens

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

“For the son dishonors the father, the daughter rises up against her mother, the daughter-in-law rises against her mother-in-law; a man’s enemies are the men of his own house.”

Micah 7:6

Just weeks before Barack Obama ordered the extra-judicial killing of a U.S. citizen, Anwar al-Awlaki, a CIA operative calling himself “Chris” approached Awlaki’s brother, Ammar, in the lobby of a Vienna hotel. Ammar, an oil company executive, didn’t share his older brother’s political or religious views and hadn’t seen in him several years. He had been lured to a meeting with “Chris” through a phone call in which the CIA operative, posing as a family friend, claimed to have a gift for his wife.

Once in the lobby, Ammar was told that the U.S. government had created a task force for the purpose of either capturing or killing Anwar, and that the people hunting the radical cleric preferred to bring him in alive. This was a lie, of course. By this time, Anwar had already survived several attempts to kill him. He had been detained by the FBI for questioning on several occasions, and had been imprisoned by the government of Yemen on orders from Washington.

There was no reason to believe that it was impossible for the U.S. government to find Anwar and take him into custody for questioning – or to stand trial on criminal charges, which were never filed against him. Nevertheless, Anwar was on a well-publicized but officially disavowed presidential “kill list.” (1) The only reason why “Chris” accosted Ammar in the lobby of a Vienna hotel was to see whether he would be able to sell out his older brother to the CIA.

“He’s going to be killed,” “Chris” informed Ammar, according to the account in Jeremy Scahill’s new book “Dirty Wars: The World is a Battlefield.” **“So why don’t you help in saving his life by helping us capture him?... You know, there’s a \$5 million bounty on your brother’s head. You won’t be helping us for free.... That \$5 million would help raise [Anwar’s] kids.”** (2)

Ammar quite properly instructed “Chris” as to the bodily orifice into which he could insert his offer. But the CIA operative persisted.

“We can meet when you go to Dubai in two weeks,” he told Ammar, revealing that the U.S. government had advance knowledge of the oil executive’s travel plans.

This chilling vignette is instructive in many ways – not only in terms of what it says regarding the extent to which the surveillance state can track the movements of any of us, and the utter ruthlessness of the people employed by the Regime’s killing apparatus, but also for what it says about the way those who presume to rule us view any loyalties that conflict with the power of the State.

Those who carry out the killing errands of our rulers believe that there is no bond of kinship or conviction that cannot be disrupted – through fear, through bribery, through blackmail – in the interest of the State and the semi-covert Brotherhood that controls it. They will use whatever psychological leverage they can – including perversely inverted appeals to filial loyalty and children’s welfare – to manipulate us into betraying each other. Should this tactic fail, they will make an appeal to simple greed, or other base motives.

And when the targets of their efforts resist manipulation and bribery, the imperial killing apparatus will not hesitate to extract a blood penalty by way of retaliating against those who defied them, and as an object lesson to anyone else who refuses to submit. This, in all likelihood, was why the murder of Anwar al-Awlaki was followed by the murder of his entirely innocent 16-year-old son, Abdel. (3) It will be recalled that when former White House Press Spokesman Robert Gibbs was asked shortly before the 2012 election about the killing of Abdel al-Awlaki, Gibbs smugly replied that the blame for that act of child murder rested with the teenager’s “irresponsible” father. (4)

The Obama administration has never offered any other justification for the killing, via drone strike, of an unarmed 16-year-old American-born U.S. citizen as he sat down to dinner with his teenage friends. Nor has any administration official described that killing as a mistake. The default explanation is the one implicitly offered by Robert Gibbs: Abdel was killed to teach a lesson to “irresponsible” people – like his father Anwar and uncle Amman – who defy the will of the Regime in Washington. Anwar al-Awlaki’s son was killed as an act of collective punishment directed at the entire Awlaki family.

Article III, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution refers to the idea of collective punishment as “corruption of blood,” and expressly forbids the imposition of criminal penalties on that basis. Collective punishment of entire families for the supposed crimes or transgressions of an individual was a time-honored tactic of tyrants throughout recorded history. The Framers of the Constitution intended to put an end to that despotic practice. Over the past century, however, the principle of “corruption of blood” has insinuated itself into U.S. law and administrative policy, often in very subtle ways. One example is the policy of affirmative action, which tacitly assumes that Americans of European ancestry bear, to some extent, the supposed guilt of their presumably bigoted ancestors, and can therefore be subject to discriminatory treatment in the present.

Granted, the practice of affirmative action – which is an unconscionable violation of individual rights — is a relatively venial application of the concept called corruption of blood. With the Obama administration’s murder of Abdel al-Awlaki, we’ve entered a new and terrifying realm in which the people who rule us have made it clear that the families and children of their enemies are fair game. This is underscored by a perfectly insane piece of legislation introduced by Republican Congressman Tom Cotton of Arkansas.

On May 22, the Senate approved a measure that expands sanctions against Iran. This in itself is very troubling, since sanctions are an act of war, and can only be legally imposed subsequent to a formal declaration of war by Congress.

This new sanction measure represents a significant enhancement of the existing anti-Iran sanctions. First of all, it claims that Iran is in violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty by pursuing nuclear “capability,” rather than by diverting nuclear material to a weapons program. This is significant, since the NPT doesn’t forbid any nation to develop a “capability” to build a nuclear weapon. If applied even-handedly, this provision would justify sanctions and pre-emptive military action against dozens of countries. Secondly, the sanctions bill explicitly commits the United States to support an Israeli military attack against Iran. Taken together, these elements of the sanctions bill are designed to eliminate any possibility of a peaceful resolution of disputes with Iran, since that country would be considered an “aggressor” merely for having the technical ability to manufacture a nuclear weapon.

Rep. Cotton’s amendment is an unprecedented effort to enshrine collective punishment – without trial or even a criminal investigation – on the basis of family relationship. The amendment would make it possible to sentence family members of people who violate anti-Iran sanctions with prison sentences of up to 20 years. (5)

“There would be no investigation,” Cotton explained during a congressional hearing. **“If the prime malefactor of the family is identified on the list for sanctions, then**

everyone within their family would automatically come within the sanctions regime as well.” (6)

Prior to beginning his congressional career, Cotton graduated from Harvard Law School and served as a clerk to a federal appellate judge. He also served in the U.S. Army. (7) What that means is that he studied the U.S. Constitution and took at least two oaths to uphold and defend it – and yet he somehow missed the fact that the Constitution explicitly forbids the practice of collective punishment through corruption of blood.

Rep. Cotton is representative of that element within the Republican Party that condemns Barack Obama as an incipient dictator, while criticizing him for being insufficiently ruthless in dealing with people accused of being terrorists. That Republican faction reacted to Obama’s May 23 speech on counter-terrorism policy by condemning the President’s vague and qualified assurances that he would exercise restraint in ordering summary executions through drone strikes.

In the days leading up to that address, the air was thick with Republican denunciations of Obama’s use of the IRS to harass conservative organizations. Several prominent congressional Republicans dropped pregnant hints that impeachment proceedings were a possibility. One of the loudest voices in that chorus of outrage, interestingly, was the same Rep. Tom Cotton. (8) But many of the same GOP figures somehow managed to embrace the idea that the same president who has used the IRS to target his political opponents – and to suppress conservative political activism in the key swing state of Ohio during the 2012 election – was delinquent in his duties as dictator because he suggested there might be limits on his power of discretionary killing.

It’s also worth pointing out that many of the same Republican activists who are rending the air with cries of outrage over the Obama administration’s misuse of the IRS saw nothing at all improper when the GOP establishment engaged in criminal behavior, and employed police state tactics, in dealing with the insurgent presidential campaign of Rep. Ron Paul. (9) One self-described conservative media watchdog who bewails Obama’s misuse of the IRS to target conservative groups proudly filed a complaint against the Ron Paul campaign, which he accused of being involved in a covert Marxist plot to undermine the Republican Party. (10)

In the cynical dialectic that characterizes our controlled partisan political system, the faction in power expands arbitrary power, while the one out of power theatrically protests the abuses of the incumbents. Within a short time, those roles are reversed – and the current process of building the Total State continues unimpeded.

During the Bush presidency, a conservative filmmaker produced a documentary entitled “Michael Moore hates America,” which accused the left-leaning director of undermining

the national interest. Now that Barack Obama is facing political turmoil in his second term, Moore has redirected that accusation at critics of the incumbent president.

Moore was among the guests in a recent installment of Bill Maher's HBO program Real Time, in which Maher – one of Obama's most slavishly devoted followers – denounced Congressional Republicans as "traitors."

"At some point, obstruction becomes treason," Maher smugly declared, insisting that Republicans were driven by hatred of Obama rather than principled opposition to his policies. Moore was eager to elaborate on Maher's charge, insisting that **"these conservatives and right-wingers ... for as much as they say they love this country, they hate it."** (11)

Maher and Moore were purblind in their partisanship, and tone-deaf to the obvious echoes of identical accusations flung at Democrats during the reign of Bush the Younger. They also either never learned, or chose to ignore, the fact that the constitutional definition of treason has nothing whatsoever to do with dedicated obstructionism. Frustrating the will of the Democratic Party's Dear Leader – or the Republican equivalent, as under Bush – is not in any sense the same thing as making war on the United States, or adhering to their enemies.

The cult-like partisanship of loathsome public figures on the left is routinely matched by similar figures on the right.

Today, GOP-aligned conservatives are properly condemning such abuses as IRS demands that pro-life activists **"detail the content of members' prayers."** (12) Six years ago, many of the same conservatives applauded the Bush administration for sending informants into mosques to collect similar intelligence on the worship habits of Muslims. (13) Today, Glenn Beck justifiably denounces the Obama-controlled IRS for demanding that pro-life leaders sign a sworn declaration promising not to stage protests outside Planned Parenthood killing centers. A decade ago, he was demanding that American Muslims offer public affirmations that they would be willing to shoot fellow Muslims in the head on the orders of the U.S. government – and warning that those not willing to do so might wind up in detention camps. (14)

Every despotic government maintains and expands its power by encouraging its subjects to view each other with incurable suspicion, to police each other for perceived violations of the "common will," and to take delight in the suffering of those who are seen as enemies of the "community." In Communist Cuba, Nazi Germany, and other unambiguously totalitarian states, "block committees" were established through which the ruling Party controlled networks of citizen informants as a way of identifying dissidents. It's difficult not to see a variation of that approach in Florida's new iWATCH program, a 13-county pilot program for a surveillance network through which citizens would report anybody they regard as "suspicious." The iWATCH program was created with the help of a \$150,000 state grant and builds on an existing information-sharing

system used by law enforcement. Online reports will be collated in a central database accessible to law enforcement and homeland security agencies. The program's website lists a number of red flags, such as people who seem too interested in building plans or who are purchasing materials that would be used to manufacture bombs. (15)

The wisest men of the Founding generation were suspicious of political parties, having studied how factions of that kind were exploited by ambitious rulers to keep their subjects at odds with each other while they consolidate power. For decades or longer, Americans have been encouraged to hate their political opponents more than they love liberty. From that perspective, the most acute danger to our freedom and well-being is the prospect of power falling into the "wrong" hands – rather than the existence and exercise of power itself. This is why people who foolishly adhere to one of the retail factions of the Ruling Party covet the exercise of power, rather than the exercise of individual freedom. This is why millions of otherwise sensible Americans find themselves fixated on carefully orchestrated partisan distractions while the Permanent Establishment (**Brotherhood of Darkness**) quietly consummates its designs on total power.

REFERENCES

1. "How a US Citizen Came to be in America's Cross Hairs," New York Times, March 9, 2013.
2. "Inside America's Dirty Wars," by Jeremy Scahill, The Nation, May 13, 2013.
3. Ibid.
4. "Robert Gibbs says Anwar al-Awlaki's son, killed by drone strike, needs 'Far more responsible father,'" Huffington Post, October 24, 2012.
5. "Tom Cotton Would Punish Families of Sanction Violators," UPI, May 23, 2013.
6. For a video of Rep. Cotton's remarks, see –
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/22/tom-cotton-corruption-of-blood_n_3322251.html
7. See — <http://cotton.house.gov/>
8. See — <http://cotton.house.gov/>
9. For one example, see "Ron Paul Wins Delegate Majority in Louisiana – Despite 'Nazi'-style Police State Tactics," Republic magazine, June 4, 2012.
(<http://www.republicmagazine.com/news/ron-paul-wins-delegate-majority-in-louisiana-despite-nazi-style-police-state-tactics.html>)
10. See the FEC complaint against the Paul campaign at –
<http://www.usasurvival.org/docs/fec-complaint.pdf>
11. See — <http://dailycaller.com/2013/05/18/bill-maher-gop-guilty-of-treason-michael-moore-they-hate-america/>
12. "Congressman: IRS asked pro-life group about 'the content of their prayers,'" Washington Examiner, May 17, 2013.
13. "Lawyers seek to limit New York police surveillance of Muslims," CNN, February 4, 2013; "With CIA Help, New York Police Secretly Monitored Mosques, Muslim Communities Post-911," Democracy Now!, August 25, 2011.
14. "Beck has a warning for Muslims 'who have sat on [their] frickn' hands' and have contained in this article, not 'lin[ed] up to shoot the bad Muslims in the head' – see <http://mediamatters.org/research/2006/08/10/beck-has-a-warning-for-muslims-who-have-sat-on/136375>. Be advised this is archived by Media Matters, a Soros-run front for the Democratic Party; there is an audio file of Beck's remarks included at the site.
15. "Tipping law enforcement to possible terrorist activity is purpose of 13-county program," Florida Times-Union, May 16, 2013.

Written by William Grigg

I am disturbed by the information presented in this article, but I am far more disturbed by the fact that, as far as I can determine, Christian leaders haven't condemned the brutal murder of a defenseless, sixteen-year-old American citizen.

If you would like to verify that fact, access your Search Engine, (preferably "StartPage.com"), and type in "**Christian leader condemns drone killing Anwar al-Awlaki's son.**" What will you find? You will find a reference to the fact that President Obama was "surprised and upset" when he learned about the murder, but there is no reference to a religious leader who has spoken out against the killing.

On April 23, 2013, the Huffington Post reported:

"President Barack Obama has never commented publicly on the targeted drone strike that accidentally killed Abdulrahman al-Awlaki, a 16-year-old American boy and the son of al Qaeda leader Anwar al-Awlaki. But a new book released Tuesday reveals Obama was 'surprised and upset and wanted an explanation' when he learned of Abdulrahman al-Awlaki's October 2011 death, which one former White House official calls 'a mistake, a bad mistake.'

...Anwar al-Awlaki was killed on Sept. 30, 2011 in a CIA drone strike in Yemen, the first known time a U.S. controlled drone strike deliberately targeted and killed an American citizen. The killing prompted praise from Obama, who called it a major blow to al Qaeda's most active operational affiliate.

But when a separate attack killed Abdulrahman al-Awlaki just two weeks later...the Obama administration found itself scrambling to determine what went wrong."

The Huffington Post article suggests the drone attack that killed Abdulrahman was an accident, but that isn't true. I believe CIA officials intentionally killed a helpless boy because they want to anger Muslims, and they succeeded.

Why is the brutal murder of a defenseless 16-year-old American boy important? I believe the religious leaders of the U.S. should have condemned the atrocity, but they didn't because most of them fear the wrath of the U.S. government more than they fear the wrath of God.

What lies ahead? I believe the U.S. monetary system is on the verge of collapse, and I believe either a massive solar flare or a nuclear EMP incident will devastate the U.S.

What can you do? You can continue your effort to inform others, and try to lead them into a personal relationship with our Lord. In preparation for the possibility of the above-mentioned catastrophes, we recommend purchasing extra food, water, and medicines, etc. for you and your family as it better to have them and not need them, than to need them and not have them.

Barbara and I appreciate your generous support and faithful prayers since my last newsletter, and pray they will continue.

Yours in Christ,

Stanley Monteith