

LAROUCHE'S SEVEN NECESSARY STEPS

Step One: Remove Obama, Implement Glass-Steagall

by Nancy Spannaus and Charles Notley

On Aug. 24, Lyndon LaRouche outlined a seven-point program as the only possible solution for the present threat of a global breakdown crisis. Having presented the overview of the program in our last issue, we now give in-depth attention to each of the necessary steps, beginning with the one which most people find the most "impractical": the removal of President Barack Obama from the U.S. Presidency.

*As LaRouche explained: "So, no more time for fools playing games. Obama must be thrown out of office, because, unless he is thrown out of office, then, the system will crash. And there will be nothing for the nations of the trans-Atlantic community to look forward to, except Hell. Therefore, he must be removed **first**, so that he's not able to jam up the passage of a Glass-Steagall reenactment on the basis of the same principles as Franklin Delano Roosevelt's action in signing the original Glass-Steagall Act.*

"That's number one: the crash. The elimination of Obama, and the Glass-Steagall Act, in that succession, must be done."

We elaborate the essential supporting evidence for LaRouche's assertion.



White House Photo/Pete Souza

As long as President Obama is in office, there is no solution to any of the devastating crises that face the United States and the world. Here Obama poses at his vacation spot in Martha's Vineyard, on a telephone conference with the officials responsible for dealing with Hurricane Irene.

I. Removal by the 25th Amendment

Obama's Nero Complex

On April 11, 2009, Lyndon LaRouche shocked the world by delivering a webcast in which he declared that the fundamental problem with the recently sworn-in President of the United States, Barack Obama, was that he had the personality of a Nero. This is how he put it:


“The situation we face, in the United States and worldwide, is comparable in many respects to Rome under the dictatorship of the Emperor Nero. The character of the President under these conditions *is* of that form. He is not really aware of what he’s doing. He has no comprehension of many of the technical issues, such as economic issues, which he’s treating—none whatsoever. He has no clear understanding of strategic interest. He’s an intelligent person, in other respects. But he has *no competence* in these areas, for which he is largely responsible as President. . . .

“You see, his instincts are *wrong!* And his self-adulation, his manic, euphoric self-adulation, is the mentality of the worst kind of dictator. Don’t let him get in a position where he has that kind of power. Keep him under constraint, the legal constraint within the American Presidential system, as it works. Keep him in that constraint. If you don’t, you’re creating a monster. You don’t want a Frankenstein monster. You don’t want a Narcissus in the Presidency, and he’s a case of Narcissus, just like Nero. And the program is basically like that of Nero.

“*He’s a danger to all humanity if you don’t keep him under control.* He’s a danger to himself, as well as everybody else. So, you ain’t persecuting him, when you’re protecting him from himself. . . .”

Within weeks of LaRouche’s statement, it became clear that Obama’s Nero problem could not, and would not, be contained. In fact, as the President laid out his Hitler-modelled health-care policy—which called for reducing costs by abandoning what the Nazis called the “useless eaters” among the aged and the incurably sick—the profile of Obama’s mental illness became more and more pronounced. He would have to be removed.

In all of LaRouche’s webcasts of 2010 (see <http://www.larouchepac.com>), he emphasized that necessity. Not only was the President carrying out Nazi policies on behalf of the British empire, but he was also demonstrating a character of criminal insanity—as the grouping around him in the Administration found increasingly obvious. He was increasingly dangerous to the country, and to himself.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

LaRouche first diagnosed President Obama’s narcissistic personality disorder on April 11, 2009. Here he is shown speaking at that webcast.

In his Sept. 24, 2010 webcast, LaRouche put it this way:

“There is no hope that Obama would ever reform for the better. Absolutely not. He has no personality, not a real identity. It’s only a fake personality. And there’s much evidence as to what may have contributed to this, but what I saw in terms of his policy, then, in April of last year, this guy: no change, only for the worse. The plunger goes down, the explosion goes off. What we have to worry about is the effect of an assassination or a suicide of this President. That should be our biggest concern, as far as he’s concerned. Any other diagnosis, forget it! I’ve seen this thing. I know exactly what he is. I’ve seen a lot of this in my life, my experiences, and so forth. Personality problems. He’s not going to change for the better. The only way he’s going to change for the better is by being safely out of office. And then under management, he might make it, personally. But as long as he’s involved with the Presidency, there’s no chance. He’s a typical echo of the Emperor Nero and Hitler.

“And there’s a lot of other cases like that, but these are the two most conspicuous ones, the ones I referred to. And he has never deviated from the estimate of him and his behavior which I gave publicly on the 11th of April last year. Not a chance.

“The problem is, we’ve got to get him out. And the



Matthew Ehret

Obama, like Nero, plays for the crowds.

problem is politicians are trying to act like politicians, trying to negotiate something. And some things are not negotiable. There are lots of things that can be negotiated, but some things can not. This is not a negotiable situation. Either we get this guy out now, or kiss the United States goodbye while you still can.”

The 25th Amendment

On Oct. 5, 2010, LaRouche, who was already campaigning for the President’s impeachment based on his unconstitutional policies, decided to act upon his psychiatric insight. He issued a call for the application of Section 4 of the 25th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which specifies how the President can be legally removed, and replaced by the Vice President, for reason of his inability to fulfill his duties as President. Speaking on the LPAC Weekly Report Oct. 6,¹ LaRouche said:

“Last night, on the basis of information received, I moved for the 25th Amendment for the ouster of the President, on those grounds. The reason of the timing was the general situation, the manifest state of the President’s mind, or at least behavior: that he is actually in the kind of mental condition, which warrants his ouster on this. Which means that there should be an initiative by certain people, in the White House itself, including the Vice President, who should motivate this. And, once

1. <http://www.larouchepac.com/node/16019>

he does that, then the Congress is called back from recess, immediately, to consider an impeachment, in this form of impeachment.

“It requires no offense, other than the fact that he has got the problems, and the problems that are diagnosed in the act, as by Jerrold Post [director of the Political Psychology Department at George Washington University] and company who composed the study on which the amendment is based, all the conditions are there: This guy is cracking up, he’s gone. He’s not qualified to be President. He must be removed for the sake of the nation, and we have the Constitutional Amendment, which prepares, exactly this. And he is exactly the mental type, described in detail, the narcissist syndrome, and there’s no

question about it. I diagnosed this, of course, on April 11th of last year; and I was right then, and I’m more right than ever today. So, this man has to go.”

In the 10 months since LaRouche issued this call, the public evidence that President Obama is suffering from a severe personality disorder, which impels him to assert increasingly dictatorial powers, and totally block out the emotional and physical reality in which most ordinary Americans live, has become the subject of innumerable blogs, articles, and discussions. As his popularity declines dramatically, as a result of the manifest failure of his Presidency to improve conditions of life for the population, Obama has also become increasingly nuts. He reads everything about himself, and drowns himself in sports for many hours of the day. He’s obsessed with his image, and winning re-election—by any means necessary.

Unfortunately, those insiders who see this reality up close have, so far, either been compromised by their sharing in the perks of his Presidential power, or lack the moral courage to take the necessary action to remove him by declaring him to be the incompetent mental case which he is.

Thus the nation, and the world, remain in mortal danger—threatened by having a narcissistic Nero in charge of the only government in the world which has the capability—historically and constitutionally—to bring the world out of crisis.

II. The Glass-Steagall Issue

There are those cowards in the nation's leading political institutions who still argue that it might be possible to avoid removing Obama from office by simply overwhelming him with political pressure in favor of the policies that must be implemented in order to prevent the onrushing disaster—particularly the institution of the Glass-Steagall legislation. This is simply an act of self-delusion, or worse.

We explain why.

What is Glass-Steagall, Really?

When President Franklin Delano Roosevelt rammed through his banking reforms in 1933—both the initial Emergency Banking Act and the Glass-Steagall Banking Act itself—he understood that he was launching a war in defense of the sovereignty and General Welfare of the people of the United States. British control of U.S. banking through Wall Street had led to the ruin of the country, and only institutional measures that would cut off that control could possibly lead to a recovery.

What was wrong, FDR understood, was the imposition of a *money* system on the country, whereby the decisions being made that would determine the future of the nation were being based on money and profits, not the conditions of life of human beings. To contain the power of the “monied interests,” it would be necessary to segregate the speculating, money-centered banks from those banks which handled the funds for the physical functioning of the economy, so as to protect the latter, and the people who depended upon them.

Technically, this is what the Glass-Steagall law accomplished—after, of course, the first Emergency Banking Act had carried out an audit of the entire banking system, and separated many of the unpayable, illegitimate debts, from those that were intimately tied with the physical economy. Politically, FDR went beyond this defensive measure to issue massive amounts of *credit*, most of it tied to major power and water management projects (such as the Tennessee

Valley Authority, TVA), or to the construction of vital smaller projects, such as bridges, roads, parks, hospitals, schools, and sewer systems.

Wall Street was not happy with FDR's credit program, nor with Glass-Steagall. The bankers correctly saw both as infringements upon their freedom to control people's lives through their control of money, and they roundly condemned the President as a “traitor to his class.” FDR proudly revelled in their hatred, because his allegiance was to the American people, and to the historical tradition of the U.S. credit system which his ancestor Isaac Roosevelt had collaborated with Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton to create.



U.S. Sen. Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.) fought long and hard against opposition in her own party in 2010, in an attempt to pass her amendment, co-sponsored by John McCain (R-Ariz.), to restore Glass-Steagall. Ultimately, Obama doublecrossed her.

Obama, Wall Street, and the British

Obama, on the other hand, *loves* Wall Street and the British upper classes, including the monarchy. They were the major financial powers who put him into office; and his entire record in the Presidency has been to give them almost anything they want. Just as British financial powers manipulate Obama by feeding his narcissism, they maintain his desperate dependence upon them for satisfying

his monstrous ego, and sense of entitlement to do whatever *he* thinks he should do.

One crucial test of this evaluation occurred precisely on the Glass-Steagall issue, in the Spring of 2010. During the debate on “financial reform” that spring, Sens. Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.) had revived their 2009 bill to reinstate the Glass-Steagall law—which the Wall Street-British crowd, through their toadies like Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan, had thrown out in 1999—into an amendment to the financial reform bill, known as Dodd-Frank. That amendment, S. 2886, was consciously crafted to *destroy* the speculative derivatives bubble and other gambling practices which had destroyed the banking system and the economy, and brought on the

financial breakdown of 2008. If it had passed, it would have radically changed the nature of Dodd-Frank, *against* Wall Street.

Cantwell, in her press release on the bill, put it this way: “Behemoth banks are putting their money into risky, get-rich-quick Wall Street schemes instead of investing in Main Street.

“So much U.S. taxpayer-backed money is going into speculation in dark markets that it has diverted lending capital from our community banks and small businesses that depend on loans to expand and create jobs. This is stifling America and it is why there is bipartisan support for restoring the important safeguards that protected Americans for decades after the Great Depression. It’s time to go back to separating commercial banking from Wall Street investment banking.”

She was joined by co-sponsor McCain, who said: “I want to ensure that we never stick the American taxpayer with another \$700 billion—or even larger—tab to bail out the financial industry. If big Wall Street institutions want to take part in risky transactions—fine. But we should not allow them to do so with federally insured deposits. It is time to put a stop to the taxpayer financed excesses of Wall Street. No single financial institution should be so big that its failure would bring ruin to our economy and destroy millions of American jobs. This country would be better served if we limit the activities of these financial institutions.”

According to Cantwell, the Senate leadership had agreed that S. 2886, which had bipartisan support, would be among the few amendments brought to the Senate floor for debate and vote. But, at the last moment, she was doublecrossed, with Administration spokesmen specifically renegeing on their promise to give the bill a hearing.

The reason is not hard to find. First, Wall Street desperately opposed and opposes Glass-Steagall. On top of that, according to a leading economist who reported to LaRouche’s May 8 webcast, the British Foreign Office itself had declared that Britain would consider the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall a “hostile act,” and was intending to inform the Obama Administration of that fact.

Would Obama cross the British? Not on your life.

The bottom line is this: Regardless of what he might say, Obama’s personality disorder will not allow him to go against the will of those who have built him up. To get Glass-Steagall in place, Obama must be removed from office.

III. Obama’s Impeachable Crimes


Which brings us to impeachment, the other option for removing Obama from office.

No American patriot contemplates the prospect of removing the President of the United States lightly. In late July 2009, Lyndon LaRouche declared that Barack Obama was impeachable for his Nazi health-care “reform.” Obama, and those with the potential to bring him under control, failed to listen, or changed course. Instead, in the Patient Protection & Affordable Care Act (a.k.a. Obamacare), this President and his criminal cronies succeeded in ramming through the same Nazi euthanasia plan made infamous by Adolf Hitler—a giant step toward a genocidal dictatorship. Impeachment for this and many other acts, is now an emergency.

Under our constitutional system, the purpose of impeachment is the protection of the nation, by removing from high office a Federal official who is causing grave injury to the nation, its people, and the Constitution. Impeachment is not a criminal proceeding; its purpose is not to punish a wrongdoer, but to prevent him or her from doing further, irreparable harm to the country. The question of prosecution, or imprisonment, comes later.

The Constitution sets a high standard for bringing a bill of impeachment against a high public official. The grounds are restricted to “treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.” The clear intent, as a review of the discussions by the Founders at the Constitutional Convention indicates, was to target crimes against the constitutional order. The bills of impeachment against President Richard Nixon put it well, when they declared, in each count, “In all of this, Richard M. Nixon has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.”

Obama’s crimes dwarf those of Richard Nixon. Public evidence alone demonstrates that he is leading a conspiracy to subvert constitutional government, and to impose measures that will result in mass death of Americans, and the destruction of the nation. His high crimes and misdemeanors, as elaborated below, include actions that amount to a conspiracy to commit Crimes Against Humanity, which have already resulted in murder and other atrocities, offenses or inhumane acts against the civilian population of the United States; actions that are leading to genocide against civilian popu-



Article II, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution lays out the restricted basis for impeachment of the U.S. President. In his mere two and a half years in office, President Obama has more than qualified for this action.

lations in other parts of the world; and actions that are leading to the elimination of the sovereignty of the United States, by submitting control over its economic policy to supranational powers that are committed to reducing the world's population by billions.

Obama's remaining in the Presidency represents a clear and present danger to the United States, its citizens, and our Constitution. Constitutional means must be used to prevent him from continuing with these crimes. One means is invoking Section 4 of the 25th Amendment, by which he could be declared unable to carry out the duties of President, due to his mental impairment (see above). The other means is impeachment.

Below are a series of counts, which could serve as an outline for a formal Bill of Impeachment. Provided also is some of the evidence available, and some crucial precedents. Although incomplete, and not in legal form, each count demonstrates the urgency of acting on LaRouche's initiative.

Count I. Conspiracy To Commit Crimes Against Humanity

President Obama has conspired and acted to carry out Crimes Against Humanity, through his Hitler-modeled health-care legislation, by denial of medical care, and outright murder thereby of large segments of the U.S. population.

As a convener of the 1945-46 International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, and the international legal standards established thereby for the trials of Nazi leaders after the conclusion of World War II, the United States

has subscribed, by treaty as well as by law, to the definition of Crimes Against Humanity used by that Tribunal. Article 6 of the Charter of the Tribunal defines Crimes Against Humanity as follows:

“...murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population ... whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated.”

This standard was applied in Count Four of the Nuremberg indictment of Nazi war criminals, the count of Crimes Against Hu-

manity, under which ten of the defendants were found guilty and sentenced to death, as follows:

“The murder and ill-treatment were carried out by divers means, including shooting, hanging, gassing, starvation, gross over-crowding, systematic under-nutrition, systematic imposition of labor tasks beyond the strength of those ordered to carry them out, *inadequate provision of surgical and medical services...*” (emphasis added)

A. That the health “reform” legislation passed on order by the President has led to denial of medical care is incontestable by anyone who is honest, and knowledgeable of the Act, the chief, stated purpose of which is to cut costs. The fundamental premise is that the American public is “overutilizing” medical services that allegedly do not contribute to improving their health, and this “overutilization” should be eliminated in order to save money. The standard for determining “overutilization” is not specified, but implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, depends upon two parameters:

1. Experience shows that the percentage of people actually cured, or prolonged in life, by the medical treatment, does not reach a certain threshold. This thinking, sold under the fancy name of Cost Effectiveness Research, was shockingly revealed in the infamous mammogram decision taken in 2009 by the Preventive Services Taskforce—which is specifically cited in the Senate bill as the agency to rate the need for coverage. While acknowledging that the decision to recommend against regular mammograms for women under 50, and for only biannual mammograms for



Bigstock

Among the first victims of Obama's Hitler health policy will be the elderly. Hitler's Nazi doctors were convicted of crimes against humanity for denying medical treatment to those considered "useless eaters," such as the mentally ill and those unable to work, like the elderly.

others, would lead to more deaths, the taskforce decided it was "not enough deaths" to be worth the cost.

Such thinking precisely mimics that of the Nazi doctors, who were following out Hitler's prescription that there are people who have "lives not worthy of life," and they should be granted a "mercy death."

2. The legislation presumes that if you are over a certain age, your health care simply costs too much. Provisions exist, however, for you to "choose" a painless death. While no explicit age limits are set, various measures are included that permit, if not encourage, elderly people to refuse treatment, and die.

That the mandated reductions in the cost of medical care are to occur within Medicare and Medicaid (to start)—the programs for the elderly and the poor and disabled—marks those populations as the chief targets for the genocide.

In addition to denying care to certain categories of the population, Obamacare contains numerous measures that will reduce the availability of medical and surgical facilities—by reducing reimbursements to those who cannot provide treatment cheaply enough, or at high enough "efficiency." This method, applied through Medicare and for-profit Health Maintenance Organizations (which are implementers of the plan as well), has resulted in the dramatic reduction in hospital facilities through the United States, as well as labora-

tory facilities that perform services such as imaging. The rate of reduction has increased under Obamacare, especially in the number of nursing homes that serve the aged; and application of the same method to doctors, has resulted in a drastic decline in doctor availability as well.

Under Obamacare, Americans are now subject to denial of medical and surgical care, and death by starvation and malnutrition—all in the name of saving money. Tens of thousands are slated for death.

B. Obama has blocked prosecution of those who authorized and continued the Bush/Cheney policy of illegal detentions and maltreatment of prisoners from the war in Iraq, the war in Afghanistan, and the so-called War on Terror.

For his actions to commit these Crimes Against Humanity, President Obama must be impeached.

Count II. Conspiracy To Violate the Separation of Powers Provisions of the U.S. Constitution

President Obama has conspired and acted to carry out measures that are destroying the powers of the U.S. Congress, in favor of the Executive, thus overturning the lawful separation of powers provided for in the U.S. Constitution.

A. Obama has taken unilateral actions, under the Hitlerian doctrine of the Unitary Executive, in several areas of policy. The most recent and flagrant is that carried out in the Budget Control Act, which sets up a Super-Congress, to preempt the powers of the Congress on behalf of imposing fascist austerity measures. The parallel is to Hitler's Enabling Act of March 1933, in which the German parliament voted to hand over power to the Chancellor "temporarily," and ended up confirming his dictatorship for the 12 years that followed.

Economist James Galbraith, in an Aug. 10 interview with the Italian daily *Il Messaggero*, correctly characterized the Super-Committee as follows: "For God's sake! It will be a Junta, a body without legitimacy." He could have added that the powers given by the Constitution to the House of Representatives over economic policy, are literally being usurped, while Congress is being denied



White House Photo/Pete Souza

Obama's solution to quarrels with the Congressional leadership, such as those shown in this meeting on deficit reduction? Violate the Constitution by eliminating the powers of Congress to set economic and financial policy, to declare war, and to determine other vital national policies.

its ability to even amend decisions made by a committee of 12 (along with Obama).

B. Obama has explicitly violated the Constitution by committing U.S. troops to war in Libya, without Congress having declared war, as the Constitution prescribes. There is no question at all, contrary to Administration claims, that the role of U.S. military forces amounts to waging war, both through NATO and by U.S. forces themselves.

Obama is also explicitly violating the War Powers Act, which sets out various conditions and deadlines under which the President can act unilaterally before going to the Congress for authorization. Obama failed to meet those conditions, and has still not received approval for what he claims is a “limited war,” but which is likely to be a long-term British-style conflict, *à la* Afghanistan and Vietnam.

C. Obama’s first moves toward such anti-Constitutional unilateral actions, occurred in his health care policy, as indicated by his personal insistence on the inclusion of an Independent Payment Advisory Board (or Commission) (IPAB) in his health-care bill, which dictates the terms for what medical procedures are to be covered, and how much for whom; and his insertion of language into the bill specifying that no Congress, present or future, be permitted to make changes in the decisions of the IPAB. The clear intent was to “remove decisions from politics”—i.e., remove Congress from

decisions on health-care spending altogether. Congress will be unable to make policy, and even a majority vote can’t overturn the diktat.

Obama has obsessively pressed for the IPAB provision since the Summer of 2009, making it clear that its mandate is to cut medical spending. Described by Obama and his aides as a “panel of experts,” the IPAB’s method echoes that of Hitler’s “panel of experts” at Tiergarten-4, the center of the 1939-41 Nazi euthanasia program, which panel reviewed paperwork on thousands of patients to one end: who should live, and who should die. There was no reprieve from the decision of the top doctors who supervised the “experts” under Hitler—nor is there one for those turned down by the expert

(death) panels set up by Obamacare. Mass murder by the stroke of a pen. Preventing Congress from overturning the broad IPAB decisions, through the “in perpetuity” clause, further shows the murderous, dictatorial intent.

The result is to be massive reductions in medical care, starting with Medicare and Medicaid. It was precisely to prevent such dictatorial action that the Founders of the United States, in their drafting of the Constitution, made the Congress, not the President, responsible for measures on spending, taxation, and the provision for the General Welfare.

D. Columbia University Law School professor Scott Horton has been warning about the drive to impose a British-style Official Secrets Act on the United States since 2005, when the effort was launched by President George W. Bush’s Attorney General, Alberto Gonzales. Obama has acted to impose such an Official Secrets Act, which overturns the First Amendment right to free speech. While George W. Bush was still in office, Attorneys General Gonzales and his successor Michael Mukasey indicted and prosecuted whistle-blowers, using the Espionage Act of 1917. In at least two cases, the whistle-blowers were suspected of leaking embarrassing information about failed secret programs and outright national security state crimes to journalists from the *Baltimore Sun* and the *New York Times*.

E. Obama has continued and even expanded the

Bush/Cheney Administration's program of warrantless spying by the National Security Agency on the electronic communications of millions of Americans.

F. Obama is guilty of obstruction of justice by blocking criminal investigations of various Wall Street predators.

In these respects, President Obama is engaged in a conspiracy to overturn the constitutional order of the United States, including the guarantee of a republican government.

For these high crimes, President Obama must be impeached.

Count III. Conspiracy To Commit the United States to an International Genocide Policy

President Obama's actions around the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Summit demonstrate not only his endorsement of the international depopulation policy of the British monarchy, but his intent but to unconstitutionally commit the United States to implement that policy.

A. The policy of the Obama Administration going into the Copenhagen summit, was a wholehearted embrace of the Green genocide agenda being promoted by the British monarchy, its agents, and its sycophants. That agenda called for an attack on population itself, as the major cause of so-called Global Warming, in addition to reducing life-sustaining activities such as modern agriculture and industry, nuclear power, and major infrastructure projects. In addition, the British-sponsored program called for the establishment of an international governing (or policing) agency that would mandate and enforce measures to suppress such life-sustaining activity, over and above the decisions of sovereign governments.

Such a Green agenda would result in genocide, starting with the under-industrialized Third World, and expanding globally.

President Obama had no mandate from the Congress, or the American people, to embrace such an agenda. The Congress refused to pass his Climate Change legislation, or even the preceding treaty embodying the same idea, the Kyoto Protocol of 1997. He had no power to cede authorities of the U.S. govern-



AU-UN IST/Stuart Price

The Obama Administration's economic and environmental policy will result in a dramatic increase in mass death in the Third World—genocide. Here, current victims in Banadir Hospital in the Somali capital, Mogadishu.

ment, and the welfare of the U.S. population, to international authorities. Leading Senators had warned the President to make no commitments to that agenda, because Congress would never approve them.

In fact, the President was acting under the direction of a foreign power, the British monarchy, in furtherance of an international scheme which would lead to the commitment of Crimes Against Humanity against other nations, and the United States itself.

B. On the eve of the fullest Moon of the year, Jan. 29, 2010, President Obama announced that in his new budget, he was eliminating the space program's Constellation manned Moon missions. Constellation is the umbrella program that includes the Ares rocket—the replacement for the aging space shuttles. Marking the last shuttle launch, STS-135, *Atlantis*, launched to the International Space Station on July 8, 2011, closing out a 30-year history of the government-funded shuttle program, and leaving uncertain the future of U.S. manned spaceflight.

This cancellation will be deadly in terms of destroying the scientific capability of the United States, and the world, to survive, especially in the current and future periods of intensified extreme weather events.

In acting to cancel Constellation, as well as underfunding various NASA unmanned satellite programs,

Obama has caused a gap to be created in polar satellite weather observations, for example, as new satellites are not launched in time to replace those that have reached the end of their functionality. These are the very satellites that are critical to providing scientists with data needed for space- and Earth-weather forecasting. Obama has thus put at risk millions who live in areas subject to extreme weather and earthquake conditions. Obama is killing the future.

For this high crime, President Obama must be impeached.

Count IV. Conspiracy To Destroy the Sovereignty of the United States

President Obama, by his personal actions and those of his administration, has acted to destroy the United States economically, through commitments made to international agencies and powers, which are leading directly to the dissolution of the United States. These actions fall into the category of providing aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States, which makes them tantamount to treason.

A. The first indications that Obama was ceding the sovereignty of the United States occurred at the G-20 meeting in London in April 2009, at which time the President agreed to a communiqué which implicitly moved in the direction of implementing the British scheme of making the International Monetary Fund a world government. In the name of providing for “fiscal expansion,” the G-20 endorsed printing \$250 billion in the International Monetary Fund’s Special Drawing Rights, as a step toward dramatically increasing the reserves of the IMF. The promotion of SDRs is a step in the direction of replacing the U.S. dollar as the world’s reserve currency, and giving power over creation of credit, internationally, to the supranational IMF.

President Obama had no mandate for such an action from the U.S. government. To the contrary, the Congress had blocked a previous IMF resolution to double its number of SDRs, because such an issuance would not be subject to the sovereignty of the United States.

B. Obama has looted tens of trillions of dollars in taxpayer money to bail out losing bets of financial institutions, domestic and foreign, judged by his cronies Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner “too big to let fail,”



White House Photo/Pete Souza

He's not physically bowing, but Obama's financial and foreign policies are shaped to serve the avowed interests of the British monarchy. Here, Obama on his second visit with the Queen since coming into office, on May 25, 2011.

violating Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution, which reserves to Congress the power “To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof. . . .” The Administration is at the same time blocking Congress from acting in its constitutional capacity to issue directed credit for productive investments in the physical economy of this country, by returning to the banking principles codified in the Banking Act of 1933 (Glass-Steagall), to end this breakdown of our economy. As a result, tens of millions of Americans remain unemployed and are increasingly desperate.

Thus, once again, President Obama is acting at the behest of a foreign government, once again Great Britain, to the end of unconstitutionally yielding U.S. government control over its currency to a supranational power. The successful ceding of such power would lead to the destruction of the United States, by giving life-or-death power over the United States to the enemy power located in the British imperial monetary system—in a manner similar to the ceding of power by European nations to the European Union.

For this high crime, bordering on treason, President Obama must be impeached.

* * *

The question is whether enough Members of Congress will take their oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution seriously enough to act—before they find themselves behind bars for daring to whimper protests, after the fact, against Obama’s increasing dictatorial rule.