

Evidence

The presidential directive says that, when the president considers an emergency to have occurred, an "Enduring Constitutional Government" comprising **"a cooperative effort among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches** of the Federal Government, coordinated by the President," will take the place of the nation's regular government, presumably without the oversight of [Congress](#).^[3] Conservative activist [Jerome Corsi](#) and Marjorie Cohn of the [National Lawyers Guild](#) have said that this is a violation of the Constitution of the United States in that [the three branches of government are separate and equal](#), with no single branch coordinating the others.^[4] ^[5] **The directive, created by the president, claims that the president has the power to declare a catastrophic emergency. It does not specify who has the power to declare the emergency over.**

The directive further says that, in the case of such an emergency, the new position of "National Continuity Coordinator" would be filled by the assistant to the president for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism (this position was held by [Frances Townsend](#) until her resignation on November 19, 2007 and is now held by [Kenneth L. Wainstein](#)).^[6] The directive also specifies that a "Continuity Policy Coordination Committee", to be chaired by a senior director of the [Homeland Security Council](#) staff, and selected by the National Continuity Coordinator, shall be "the main day-to-day forum for such policy coordination".

The directive ends by describing a number of "annexes", of which Annex A is described as being not classified but which does not appear on the directive's Web page:

"(23) Annex A and the classified Continuity Annexes, attached hereto, are hereby incorporated into and made a part of this directive.

"(24) Security. This directive and the information contained herein shall be protected from unauthorized disclosure, provided that, except for Annex A, the Annexes attached to this directive are classified and shall be accorded appropriate handling, consistent with applicable Executive Orders."

The "[National Continuity Policy, Annex A, Categories of Departments and Agencies](#)",

available from the Financial and Banking Information Infrastructure Committee website,[7] indicates that "executive departments and agencies are assigned to one of four categories commensurate with their [COOP/COG/ECG](#) responsibilities during an emergency".

[\[edit\]](#)

Reception

The signing of this Directive was generally not covered by the mainstream U.S. media or discussed by the U.S. Congress. While similar executive security directives have been issued by previous presidents, with their texts kept secret, this is the first to be made public in part. It is unclear how the National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive will reconcile with the [National Emergencies Act](#), a U.S. federal law passed in 1976, which gives Congress oversight over presidential emergency powers during such emergencies. The National Emergencies Act is not mentioned in the text of the National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive.

After receiving concerned communications from constituents, in July 2007 [U.S. Representative](#) and [Homeland Security Committee](#) member [Peter DeFazio](#) made an official request to examine the classified Continuity Annexes described above in a secure "bubbleroom" in the [United States Capitol](#), but his request was denied by the [White House](#), which cited "national security concerns."^[8] This was the first time DeFazio had been denied access to documents. He was quoted as saying, "We're talking about the continuity of the government of the United States of America...I would think that would be relevant to any member of Congress, let alone a member of the Homeland Security Committee."^[8] After this denial, DeFazio joined with two colleagues ([Bennie Thompson](#), chairman of the committee; and [Chris Carney](#), chairman of the Homeland Security oversight subcommittee) in a renewed effort to gain access to the documents.^[9]

The [National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive](#), signed on May 9, 2007 declares that in the event of a "catastrophic event":

"The President shall lead the activities of the Federal Government for ensuring constitutional government."

This directive, completely unnoticed by the media, and given no

scrutiny by Congress, literally gives the White House unprecedented dictatorial power over the government and the country, bypassing the US Congress and obliterating the separation of powers. The directive also placed the Secretary of Homeland Security in charge of domestic "security".

(b) **Succession orders and pre-planned devolution of authorities** that ensure the emergency delegation of authority must be planned and documented in advance in accordance with applicable law;

(20) This directive shall be implemented in a manner that is consistent with, and facilitates effective implementation of, provisions of the Constitution concerning succession to the Presidency or the exercise of its powers, and the Presidential Succession Act of 1947 (3 U.S.C. 19), with consultation of the Vice President and, as appropriate, others involved. Heads of executive departments and agencies shall ensure that appropriate support is available to the Vice President and others involved as necessary to be prepared at all times to implement those provisions.

(22) **Revocation.** Presidential Decision Directive 67 of October 21, 1998 ("**Enduring Constitutional Government and Continuity of Government Operations**"), including all Annexes thereto, is hereby revoked.

(24) Security. This directive and the information contained herein shall be protected from unauthorized disclosure, provided that, except for Annex A, the Annexes attached to this directive are classified and shall be accorded appropriate handling, consistent with applicable Executive Orders.

[For the full Directive ...](#)

Obama has nullified none of the above or what follows.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 13233

Makes crimes, actions and records of President and former Presidents secret

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10990

allows the government to take over all modes of transportation and control of highways and seaports.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10995

allows the government to seize and control the communication media.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10997

allows the government to take over all electrical power, gas, petroleum, fuels and minerals.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10998

allows the government to seize all means of transportation, including personal cars, trucks or vehicles of any kind and total control over all highways, seaports, and waterways.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10999

allows the government to take over all food resources and farms.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11000

allows the government to mobilize civilians into work brigades under government supervision.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11001

allows the government to take over all health, education and welfare functions.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11002

designates the Postmaster General to operate a national registration of all persons.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11003

allows the government to take over all airports and aircraft, including commercial aircraft.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11004

allows the Housing and Finance Authority to relocate communities, build new housing with public funds, designate areas to be abandoned, and establish new locations for populations.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11005

allows the government to take over railroads, inland waterways and public storage facilities.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11051

specifies the responsibility of the Office of Emergency Planning and gives authorization to put all Executive Orders into effect in times of increased international tensions and economic or financial crisis.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11310

grants authority to the Department of Justice to enforce the plans set out in Executive Orders, to institute industrial support, to establish judicial and legislative liaison, to control all aliens, to operate penal and correctional institutions, and to advise and assist the President.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11049

assigns emergency preparedness function to federal departments and agencies, consolidating 21 operative Executive Orders issued over a fifteen year period.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11490

Assigns emergency preparedness function to federal departments and agencies, consolidating 21 operative Executive Orders issued over a fifteen year period

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11921

allows the Federal Emergency Preparedness Agency to develop plans to establish control over the mechanisms of production and distribution, of energy sources, wages, salaries, credit and the flow of money in U.S. financial institution in any undefined national emergency. It also provides that when a state of emergency is declared by the President, Congress cannot review the action for six months. The Federal Emergency Management Agency has broad powers in every aspect of the nation. General Frank Salzedo, chief of FEMA's Civil Security Division stated in a 1983 conference that he saw FEMA's role as a "new frontier in the protection of individual and governmental leaders from assassination, and of civil and military installations from sabotage and/or attack, as well as prevention of dissident groups from gaining access to U.S. opinion, or a global audience in times of crisis." FEMA's powers were consolidated by President Carter to incorporate the:

National Security Act of 1947

allows for the strategic relocation of industries, services, government and other essential economic activities, and to rationalize the requirements for manpower, resources and production facilities.

1950 Defense Production Act

gives the President sweeping powers over all aspects of the economy.

Act of August 29, 1916

authorizes the Secretary of the Army, in time of war, to take possession of any transportation system for transporting troops, material, or any other purpose related to the emergency.

International Emergency Economic Powers Act

enables the President to seize the property of a foreign country or national. These powers were transferred to FEMA in a sweeping consolidation in 1979

The Military Commissions Act of 2006 the bill governing the treatment of detainees, was adopted with lightning speed, and empowers the President to declare not just aliens, but also U.S. citizens as "unlawful enemy combatants." The bill also strips habeas corpus rights from 'enemy combatants'.

=====

2. The Presidential Directive in full

New presidential directive gives Bush dictatorial power

National Security & Homeland Security Presidential Directive establishes "National Continuity Policy"

[Global Research | May 21, 2007](#)

Larry Chin

The [National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive](#) , signed on May 9, 2007 declares that in the event of a "catastrophic event", George W. Bush can become what is best described as "a dictator":

"The President shall lead the activities of the Federal Government for ensuring constitutional government."

This directive, completely unnoticed by the media, and given no scrutiny by Congress, literally gives the White House unprecedented dictatorial power over the government and the country, bypassing the US Congress and obliterating the separation of powers. The directive also placed the Secretary of Homeland Security in charge of domestic "security".

The full text is below.

This is another step towards official martial law (see " [US government fans homeland security fears](#) " <http://www.globalresearch.ca/us-government-fans-homeland-terrorism-fear/5649>) , which suggests that a new "catastrophic event" 9/11-type pretext could be in the pipeline.

National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive

NATIONAL SECURITY PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVE/NSPD 51

HOMELAND SECURITY PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVE/HSPD-20

Subject: National Continuity Policy

Purpose

(1) This directive establishes a comprehensive national policy on the continuity of Federal Government structures and operations and a single National Continuity Coordinator responsible for coordinating the development and implementation of Federal continuity policies. This policy establishes "National Essential Functions," prescribes continuity requirements for all executive departments and agencies, and provides guidance for State, local, territorial, and tribal governments, and private sector organizations in order to ensure a comprehensive and integrated national continuity program that will enhance the credibility of our national security posture and enable a more rapid and effective response to and recovery from a national emergency.

Definitions

(2) In this directive:

(a) "Category" refers to the categories of executive departments and agencies listed in Annex A to this directive;

(b) "Catastrophic Emergency" means any incident, regardless of location, that results in extraordinary levels of mass casualties, damage, or disruption severely affecting the U.S. population, infrastructure, environment, economy, or government functions;

(c) "Continuity of Government," or "COG," means a coordinated effort within the Federal Government's executive branch to ensure that National Essential Functions continue to be performed during a Catastrophic Emergency;

(d) "Continuity of Operations," or "COOP," means an effort within individual executive departments and agencies to ensure that Primary Mission-Essential Functions continue to be performed during a wide range of emergencies, including localized acts of nature, accidents, and technological or attack-related emergencies;

(e) "Enduring Constitutional Government," or "ECG," means a cooperative effort among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, coordinated by the President, as a matter of comity with respect to the legislative and judicial branches and with proper respect for the constitutional separation of powers among the branches, to preserve the constitutional framework under which the Nation is governed and the capability of all three branches of government to execute constitutional responsibilities and provide for orderly succession, appropriate transition of leadership, and interoperability and support of the National Essential Functions during a catastrophic emergency;

(f) "Executive Departments and Agencies" means the executive departments enumerated in 5 U.S.C. 101, independent establishments as defined by 5 U.S.C. 104(1), Government corporations

as defined by 5 U.S.C. 103(1), and the United States Postal Service;

(g) "Government Functions" means the collective functions of the heads of executive departments and agencies as defined by statute, regulation, presidential direction, or other legal authority, and the functions of the legislative and judicial branches;

(h) "National Essential Functions," or "NEFs," means that subset of Government Functions that are necessary to lead and sustain the Nation during a catastrophic emergency and that, therefore, must be supported through COOP and COG capabilities; and

(i) "Primary Mission Essential Functions," or "PMEFs," means those Government Functions that must be performed in order to support or implement the performance of NEFs before, during, and in the aftermath of an emergency.

Policy

(3) It is the policy of the United States to maintain a comprehensive and effective continuity capability composed of Continuity of Operations and Continuity of Government programs in order to ensure the preservation of our form of government under the Constitution and the continuing performance of National Essential Functions under all conditions.

Implementation Actions

(4) Continuity requirements shall be incorporated into daily operations of all executive departments and agencies. As a result of the asymmetric threat environment, adequate warning of potential emergencies that could pose a significant risk to the homeland might not be available, and therefore all continuity planning shall be based on the assumption that no such warning will be received. Emphasis will be placed upon geographic dispersion of leadership, staff, and infrastructure in order to increase survivability and maintain uninterrupted Government Functions. Risk management principles shall be applied to ensure that appropriate operational readiness decisions are based on the probability of an attack or other incident and its consequences.

(5) The following NEFs are the foundation for all continuity programs and capabilities and represent the overarching responsibilities of the Federal Government to lead and sustain the Nation during a crisis, and therefore sustaining the following NEFs shall be the primary focus of

the Federal Government leadership during and in the aftermath of an emergency that adversely affects the performance of Government Functions:

(a) Ensuring the continued functioning of our form of government under the Constitution, including the functioning of the three separate branches of government;

(b) Providing leadership visible to the Nation and the world and maintaining the trust and confidence of the American people;

(c) Defending the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and preventing or interdicting attacks against the United States or its people, property, or interests;

- (d) Maintaining and fostering effective relationships with foreign nations;
- (e) Protecting against threats to the homeland and bringing to justice perpetrators of crimes or attacks against the United States or its people, property, or interests;
- (f) Providing rapid and effective response to and recovery from the domestic consequences of an attack or other incident;
- (g) Protecting and stabilizing the Nation's economy and ensuring public confidence in its financial systems; and
- (h) Providing for critical Federal Government services that address the national health, safety, and welfare needs of the United States.

(6) The President shall lead the activities of the Federal Government for ensuring constitutional government. In order to advise and assist the President in that function, the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism (APHS/CT) is hereby designated as the National Continuity Coordinator. The National Continuity Coordinator, in coordination with the Assistant to the President for National

Security Affairs (APNSA), without exercising directive authority, shall coordinate the development and implementation of continuity policy for executive departments and agencies. The Continuity Policy Coordination Committee (CPCC), chaired by a Senior Director from the Homeland Security Council staff, designated by the National Continuity Coordinator, shall be the main day-to-day forum for such policy coordination.

(7) For continuity purposes, each executive department and agency is assigned to a category in accordance with the nature and characteristics of its national security roles and

responsibilities in support of the Federal Government's ability to sustain the NEFs. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall serve as the President's lead agent for coordinating overall

continuity operations and activities of executive departments and agencies, and in such role shall perform the responsibilities set forth for the Secretary in sections 10 and 16 of this directive.

(8) The National Continuity Coordinator, in consultation with the heads of appropriate executive departments and agencies, will lead the development of a National Continuity Implementation Plan (Plan), which shall include prioritized goals and objectives, a concept of operations, performance metrics by which to measure continuity readiness, procedures for continuity and incident management activities, and clear direction to executive department and agency continuity coordinators, as well as guidance to promote interoperability of Federal Government continuity programs and procedures with State, local, territorial, and tribal governments, and private sector owners and operators of critical infrastructure, as appropriate. The Plan shall be submitted to the President for approval not later than 90 days after the date of this directive.

(9) Recognizing that each branch of the Federal Government is responsible for its own continuity programs, an official designated by the Chief of Staff to the President shall ensure that the executive branch's COOP and COG policies in support of ECG efforts are appropriately

coordinated with those of

the legislative and judicial branches in order to ensure interoperability and allocate national assets efficiently to maintain a functioning Federal Government.

(10) Federal Government COOP, COG, and ECG plans and operations shall be appropriately integrated with the emergency plans and capabilities of State, local, territorial, and tribal governments, and private sector owners and operators of critical infrastructure, as appropriate, in order to promote interoperability and to prevent redundancies and conflicting lines of authority. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall coordinate the integration of Federal continuity plans and operations with State, local, territorial, and tribal governments, and private sector owners and operators of critical infrastructure, as appropriate, in order to provide for the delivery of essential services during an emergency.

(11) Continuity requirements for the Executive Office of the President (EOP) and executive departments and agencies shall include the following:

(a) The continuation of the performance of PMEFS during any emergency must be for a period up to 30 days or until normal operations can be resumed, and the capability to be fully operational at alternate sites as soon as possible after the occurrence of an emergency, but not later than 12 hours after COOP activation;

(b) Succession orders and pre-planned devolution of authorities that ensure the emergency delegation of authority must be planned and documented in advance in accordance with applicable law;

(c) Vital resources, facilities, and records must be safeguarded, and official access to them must be provided;

(d) Provision must be made for the acquisition of the resources necessary for continuity operations on an emergency basis;

(e) Provision must be made for the availability and redundancy of critical communications capabilities at alternate sites in order to support connectivity between

and among key government leadership, internal elements, other executive departments and agencies, critical partners, and the public;

(f) Provision must be made for reconstitution capabilities that allow for recovery from a catastrophic emergency and resumption of normal operations; and

(g) Provision must be made for the identification, training, and preparedness of personnel capable of relocating to alternate facilities to support the continuation of the performance of PMEFS.

(12) In order to provide a coordinated response to escalating threat levels or actual emergencies, the Continuity of Government Readiness Conditions (COGCON) system establishes executive branch continuity program readiness levels, focusing

on possible threats to the National Capital Region. The President will determine and issue the

COGCON Level. Executive departments and agencies shall comply with the requirements and assigned responsibilities under the COGCON program. During COOP activation, executive departments and agencies shall report their readiness status to the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary's designee.

(13) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall:

(a) Conduct an annual assessment of executive department and agency continuity funding requests and performance data that are submitted by executive departments and agencies as part of the annual budget request process, in order to monitor progress in the implementation of the Plan and the execution of continuity budgets;

(b) In coordination with the National Continuity Coordinator, issue annual continuity planning guidance for the development of continuity budget requests; and

(c) Ensure that heads of executive departments and agencies prioritize budget resources for continuity capabilities, consistent with this directive.

(14) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall:

(a) Define and issue minimum requirements for continuity communications for executive departments and agencies, in consultation with the APHS/CT, the APNSA, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Chief of Staff to the President;

(b) Establish requirements for, and monitor the development, implementation, and maintenance of, a comprehensive communications architecture to integrate continuity components, in consultation with the APHS/CT, the APNSA, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Chief of Staff to the President; and

(c) Review quarterly and annual assessments of continuity communications capabilities, as prepared pursuant to section 16(d) of this directive or otherwise, and report the results and recommended remedial actions to the National Continuity Coordinator.

(15) An official designated by the Chief of Staff to the President shall:

(a) Advise the President, the Chief of Staff to the President, the APHS/CT, and the APNSA on COGCON operational execution options; and

(b) Consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security in order to ensure synchronization and integration of continuity activities among the four categories of executive departments and agencies.

(16) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall:

(a) Coordinate the implementation, execution, and assessment of continuity operations and activities;

(b) Develop and promulgate Federal Continuity Directives in order to establish continuity planning

requirements for executive departments and agencies;

(c) Conduct biennial assessments of individual department and agency continuity capabilities as prescribed by the Plan and report the results to the President through the APHS/CT;

(d) Conduct quarterly and annual assessments of continuity communications capabilities in consultation with an official designated by the Chief of Staff to the President;

(e) Develop, lead, and conduct a Federal continuity training and exercise program, which shall be incorporated into the National Exercise Program developed pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive-8 of December 17, 2003 ("National Preparedness"), in consultation with an official designated by the Chief of Staff to the President;

(f) Develop and promulgate continuity planning guidance to State, local, territorial, and tribal governments, and private sector critical infrastructure owners and operators;

(g) Make available continuity planning and exercise funding, in the form of grants as provided by law, to State, local, territorial, and tribal governments, and private sector critical infrastructure owners and operators; and

(h) As Executive Agent of the National Communications System, develop, implement, and maintain a comprehensive continuity communications architecture.

(17) The Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall produce a biennial assessment of the foreign and domestic threats to the Nation's continuity of government.

(18) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall provide secure, integrated, Continuity of Government communications to the President, the Vice President, and, at a minimum, Category I executive departments and agencies.

(19) Heads of executive departments and agencies shall execute their respective department or agency COOP plans in response to a localized emergency and shall:

(a) Appoint a senior accountable official, at the Assistant Secretary level, as the Continuity Coordinator for the department or agency;

(b) Identify and submit to the National Continuity Coordinator the list of PMEFs for the department or agency and develop continuity plans in support of the NEFs and the continuation of essential functions under all conditions;

(c) Plan, program, and budget for continuity capabilities consistent with this directive;

(d) Plan, conduct, and support annual tests and training, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, in order to evaluate program readiness and ensure adequacy and viability of continuity plans and communications systems; and

(e) Support other continuity requirements, as assigned by category, in accordance with the nature

and characteristics of its national security roles and responsibilities

General Provisions

(20) This directive shall be implemented in a manner that is consistent with, and facilitates effective implementation of, provisions of the Constitution concerning succession to the Presidency or the exercise of its powers, and the Presidential Succession Act of 1947 (3 U.S.C. 19), with consultation of the Vice President and, as appropriate, others involved. Heads of executive departments and agencies shall ensure that appropriate

support is available to the Vice President and others involved as necessary to be prepared at all times to implement those provisions.

(21) This directive:

(a) Shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and the authorities of agencies, or heads of agencies, vested by law, and subject to the availability of appropriations;

(b) Shall not be construed to impair or otherwise affect (i) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budget, administrative, and legislative proposals, or (ii) the authority of the Secretary of Defense over the Department of Defense, including the chain of command for military forces from the President, to the Secretary of Defense, to the commander of military forces, or military command and control procedures; and

(c) Is not intended to, and does not, create any rights or benefits, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by a party against the United States, its

agencies, instrumentalities, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

(22) Revocation. Presidential Decision Directive 67 of October 21, 1998 ("Enduring Constitutional Government and Continuity of Government Operations"), including all Annexes thereto, is hereby revoked.

(23) Annex A and the classified Continuity Annexes, attached hereto, are hereby incorporated into and made a part of this directive.

(24) Security. This directive and the information contained herein shall be protected from unauthorized disclosure, provided that, except for Annex A, the Annexes attached to this directive are classified and shall be accorded appropriate handling, consistent with applicable Executive Orders.

GEORGE W. BUSH

=====

A critical analysis on the Bush directive

Bush To Be Dictator In A Catastrophic Emergency

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/bush-to-be-dictator-in-a-catastrophic-emergency/5721>

By [Lee Rogers](#)

Global Research, May 21, 2007

roguegovernment.com 21 May 2007

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [9/11 & 'War on Terrorism'](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#)



The Bush administration has released a directive called the [National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive](#). The directive released on May 9th, 2007 has gone almost unnoticed by the mainstream and alternative media. This is understandable considering the huge Ron Paul and immigration news but this story is equally as huge. In this directive, Bush declares that in the event of a “Catastrophic Emergency”, the President will be entrusted with leading the activities to ensure constitutional government. The language in this directive would in effect make the President a dictator in the case of such an emergency.

The directive defines a “Catastrophic Emergency” as the following.

“Catastrophic Emergency” means any incident, regardless of location, that results in extraordinary levels of mass casualties, damage, or disruption severely affecting the U.S. population, infrastructure, environment, economy, or government functions;

So what does this mean? This is entirely subjective and doesn't provide any real concrete definition of what such an emergency would entail. Assuming that it means a disaster on the scale of the 9/11 attacks or Katrina, there is no question that the United States at some point in time will experience an emergency on par with either of those events. When one of those events takes place, the President will be a dictator in charge of ensuring a working constitutional government.

The language written in the directive is disturbing because it doesn't say that the President will work with the other branches of government equally to ensure a constitutional government is protected. It says clearly that there will be a cooperative effort among the three branches that will be coordinated by the President. If the President is coordinating these efforts it effectively puts him in charge of every branch. The language in the directive is entirely Orwellian in nature making it seem that it is a cooperative effort between all three branches but than it says that the President is in charge of the cooperative effort.

The directive defines Enduring Constitutional Government as the following.

“Enduring Constitutional Government,” or “ECG,” means a cooperative effort among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, coordinated by the President, as a matter of comity with respect to the legislative and judicial branches and with

proper respect for the constitutional separation of powers among the branches, to preserve the constitutional framework under which the Nation is governed and the capability of all three branches of government to execute constitutional responsibilities and provide for orderly succession, appropriate transition of leadership, and interoperability and support of the National Essential Functions during a catastrophic emergency;

Further on in the document it states the following .

The President shall lead the activities of the Federal Government for ensuring constitutional government.

This directive on its face is unconstitutional because each branch of government the executive, legislative and judicial are supposed to be equal in power. By putting the President in charge of coordinating such an effort to ensure constitutional government over all three branches is effectively making the President a dictator allowing him to tell all branches of government what to do.

Even worse is the fact that the directive states that the Secretary of Homeland Security will serve as the lead for coordinating overall continuity operations. We already know that the Homeland Security department is not really working to secure the homeland. Instead the Homeland Security department is really working to enslave the homeland just like the Home Office over in the United Kingdom has made that country an Orwellian hell of closed-circuit TV spy cameras. If such an emergency is declared, we can only guess what sort of surprises the Homeland Enslavement department will have for us.

The directive itself recognizes that each branch is already responsible for directing their own continuity of government procedures. If that's the case than why does the President need to coordinate these procedures for all of the branches? This is nothing more than a power grab that centralizes power and will make the President a dictator in the case of a so called "Catastrophic Emergency".

It is insane that this directive claims that its purpose is to define procedures to protect a working constitutional government when the very language in the document destroys what a working constitutional government is supposed to be. A working constitutional government contains a separation of powers between three equally powerful branches and this directive states that the executive branch has the power to coordinate the activities of the other branches. This directive is a clear violation of constitutional separation of powers and there should be angry protests from our legislators about this anti-American garbage that came from the President.

=====

For Immediate Release
July 31, 2014

Executive Order -- Revised List of

Quarantinable Communicable Diseases

EXECUTIVE ORDER

REVISED LIST OF QUARANTINABLE COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 264(b) of title 42, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Amendment to Executive Order 13295. Based upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Acting Surgeon General, and for the purposes set forth in section 1 of Executive Order 13295 of April 4, 2003, as amended by Executive Order 13375 of April 1, 2005, section 1 of Executive Order 13295 shall be further amended by replacing subsection (b) with the following:

"(b) Severe acute respiratory syndromes, which are diseases that are associated with fever and signs and symptoms of pneumonia or other respiratory illness, are capable of being transmitted from person to person, and that either are causing, or have the potential to cause, a pandemic, or, upon infection, are highly likely to cause mortality or serious morbidity if not properly controlled. This subsection does not apply to influenza."

Sec. 2. General Provisions. (a) Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

(i) the authority granted by law to an executive department, agency, or the head thereof; or

(ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals.

(b) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

BARACK OBAMA

=====

MODEL TO MONSTROSITY: The Emergency Health Powers Act

<http://www.iahf.com/20030117.html>

By Joanna Rohrback citizensfordem@hotmail.com

January 6, 2003

The Center for Disease Control (CDC) finally had their wishes come true to change the actual foundation of legislation for which this country rests upon. The Homeland Security Act, the culmination of a failed nationwide attempt to get the states of the union to pass their own legislation allowing greater authority to the CDC and state health departments, now hands the authority over to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and Tommy Thompson. He will oversee all our states in establishing and directing a health emergency, which by the way can be merely the "potential" of a health emergency.

According to Barbara Loe Fisher of the National Vaccination Information Center, the CDC has been salivating to get this type of legislation through for years. 1 Although the initial seeds of these changes may be seen in the Federal Health Emergency Act (FEMA) of the 70's, the pinnacle of their efforts may now have been reached through their Model State Emergency Health Powers Act (MSEHPA, MEHPA, or EHPA) and the Homeland Security Act (HSA). The EHPA provides opportunity for forced vaccinations of the entire public as well as other forms of medical intervention deemed necessary in a health emergency as defined by a health official, who is appointed to office. This is a threat that could be equal to or greater than a terrorist attack.

The initial problem with the CDC aiding and prompting a change in legislation is that they have definite conflicts of interest. These can be seen through the findings of Congress's Committee for Government Reform in 1999.

The Committee noted several specific problems, including:

- * The CDC routinely granted waivers from conflicts of interest rules to every member of its advisory committee.
- * CDC advisory committee members who were not allowed to vote on certain recommendations due to financial conflicts of interest, were allowed to actively participate in committee deliberations and advocate specific positions.
- * The Chairman of the CDC's advisory committee until recently owned 600 shares of stock in Merck, a pharmaceutical company with an active vaccine division.
- * Members of the CDC's advisory committee often left key details out of their financial disclosure statements, and were not required to provide the missing information by CDC ethics officials. 2

On June 15, 2000, further hearings by this committee again revealed a conflict of interest with the CDC Advisory committee and the Pharmaceutical companies. 3

These conflicts still exist today, as seen in the recent hearings of this committee on Dec. 10, 2002. At these hearings, Representative Dan Burton (R.-TX) ripped the CDC and National Institute for Health (NIH) for not recalling dangerous vaccines, and for their reluctance (resistance, if you will) to act in the public's best interest^{4,5}

What has been evident in similar situations, as in the area of accounting, when a firm like Arthur Anderson acts as the consultant and the accountant for the same client, there is a real conflict of interest. Such was the case with Arthur Anderson and Enron, where the Enron shareholder was

left destitute financially. With all the posturing, there has been little reform to actually protect investors. Similarly, with respect to medical protection, little more has been done: an even more chilling threat to the public.

The CDC, like the NIH and others, will be receiving extraordinary funding under Title III (Science and Technology in support of Homeland Security) Sections.305, 306, and 307 of the HSA.⁶

Dr Marcia Angell, former editor of the New England Journal of Medicine, was interviewed on ABC T.V. on Lateline about the control that the drug industry has taken on medical research. Most noteworthy was the following:

"It used to be that drug companies simply gave grants to academic medical centres for the use of their clinical researchers to do a study and that was it. It was at arm's length. The researcher did a study and he or she published the results, whatever those results would be. Now, it's very, very different. The drug companies increasingly design the studies. They keep the data. They don't even let the researchers see the data. They analyse the data. They decide whether they're going to even publish the data at the end of it. They sign contracts with researchers and with academic medical centres saying that they don't get to publish their work unless they get permission from the drug company. So, you can see that the distortion starts even before publication. It starts in determining what's going to be published and what isn't going to be published. This is no longer arm's length. It's treating the researchers and the academic medical centres as though they were hired guns or technicians or something. They just do the work. And the drug company will decide what the data show, what the conclusions are and whether it will even be published." ⁷

Certainly, if the manufacturers of the smallpox vaccines wished to determine their true safety, research would be handled much differently.

You might ask yourself how did we get from a simple proposal provided to the governors of our states for individual action on their part to extend their already existing powers for handling a state emergency, to this broadest range of power inherent in the Homeland Security Act?

Possibly the same brand of complicity that acts to corrupt the CDC may hold true of our elected officials whose jobs rest on the funding of companies like Enron and Merck. Well, I wish I could say it wasn't this simple to pass this legislation. However, it's most apparent that it was.

On October 23, 2001, the Center for Law and the Public's Health at Johns Hopkins and Georgetown Universities completed a draft of the Model State Emergency Health Powers Act. This model act was requested by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. It was intended to give public health authorities expanded powers to respond to emergency health threats. Following November 7, the Health Privacy Project sent a letter to Professor Lawrence Gostin, Director of the Center, requesting he review the model law and its approach to protecting the privacy of the public's health information. Other civil liberties groups were simultaneously pressuring for revision on various other concerns. Then once more on December 21, the Center released a second draft of the Act. This one incorporated some of the suggestions and comments that the Center had from members of the public and private sectors. The limited changes attributed to the second draft were more superficial than substantial, however.⁸

I find it striking that most states were appalled at even the second less obtrusive draft, with the exception of Florida, which lost no time signing into law SB1262 on May 23, 02, with a vote of

118/0 in the house and 34/0 in the senate. 9

In a Times-Union article that appeared only 5 days after Governor Bush Signed SB1262 into law, the American Civil Liberties Union of Florida said they did not attend the hearings on the bill. ACLU Legislative Director Larry Spalding said he had spoken with the governor's office about the matter and said the bill appeared to have too much support. There were too many other battles he continued, including ones against public records exemptions, to put up a fight, he concluded. 10

The 16 states that had passed legislation up through the passage of HSA were Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and Vermont. But of these states only Florida passed the original draft of the MSEHPA. This includes a very broad definition of a public health emergency and unlimited access to a person's protected health information; this original bill makes vaccinations forcible if found necessary. 11 Florida seemed anxious to be first in line for all kinds of additional state funds available for being the most obedient and "preparedness"-ready state. It is up front to receive FEMA and other aid that most other states aren't in a similar position for. 12

Idaho, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming have either defeated or inactivated both drafts of model legislation. The state of Wyoming defeated its version of this anti-terrorism bill in an 8-1 vote. Wyoming Legislators stated that a most objectionable aspect of the bill was a provision that gave an "incident commander" authority over everyone, including personnel and resources made available to him/her from any source. Wyoming legislators were outraged that anyone would attempt to pass a bill that would put American citizens under the authority of anyone with such dictatorial powers. 13.

"This legislation should be a concern to every American and all defenders of liberty. Elements of this legislation arguably violate the first, fourth, fifth, sixth and eighth amendments to the Constitution. Furthermore, it treats American citizens as if they are the enemy." 14.

The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS) (<http://www.aapsonline.org>) urges that states emphasize abilities to mitigate the situation, not powers to seize, commandeer, coerce, punish, and disrupt. 15.

The American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) (<http://www.alec.org>) recommends that all legislators seriously consider the impact of this legislation before taking immediate action. "We must take a much more deliberative approach in crafting effective policy without sacrificing the rights and liberties of individuals and families." 16.

"Doesn't common sense tell us that if vaccines really do work, those who choose to receive vaccines will not be at any risk from those who choose not to be vaccinated?" asks Dr. Wil Trebing, author of "Good-Bye Germ Theory." Trebing contends that a state of heightened fear has been used to facilitate a very questionable agenda. In a piece by him, he mentions the headline out of USA Today of 9/21/01, which stated: "Smallpox Fear Grips Nation CDC Orders 100 Million-Dose Vaccine Stockpile Untested Vaccine Will Be Mandatory During Public Health Emergencies State Militia May be Mobilized to Enforce Vaccination Policies" 17

Obviously a reason to raise many eyebrows!

As time passed and the legislation didn't pass, in most states, the CDC and our current administration found other avenues to accomplish their goals, as what was achieved in the Homeland Security Bill. Sandy Mintz outlines in her Scandals Newsletter some points of interest concerning the MSEPA. She says:

The following outlines the powers inherent in the CDC's original proposal for MSEHPA (as adopted by Florida), only superficial changes exist in the subsequent draft presented to the states.

1. Grant the governor of each state power to declare a "public health emergency" as defined in the act, with or without consulting anyone. (Article IV, Section 401)
2. Require medical examination and/or testing and force isolation or quarantine if it is deemed that refusal "poses a danger to public health". (Article VI, Section 602(c))
3. Require treatment and/or vaccination and "isolate or quarantine" those "unwilling or unable" to do so. (Article VI, (Article VI, Sections 603(a)(3) and 603(b)(3))
4. Constitute as a misdemeanor, "failure to obey these provisions" (for examination, testing, isolation or quarantine). (Article VI, Sections 604(a) and 604(c))
5. Provide that there be no liability for any "State or local official" causing harm to individuals in their efforts to comply with the provisions of the act, unless there is "gross negligence or willful misconduct". (Article VIII, Section 804(a))
6. Provide for similar absence of liability for "any private person, firm or corporation" and their "employees" or "agents". (Article VIII, Section 804(b)(2) and 804(b)(3))
7. Allow for the destruction of property without compensation if "there is reasonable cause to believe that they may endanger the public health pursuant to Section 501". (Article V, Sections 506 and 507) - (Note: "they" refers to the properties described in the act.)
8. Limit legal recourse. (Article VI, Section 605)
9. Allow for "the public safety authority (to) request assistance from the organized militia in enforcing the orders of the public health authority." (Article IV, Section 404) 18.

Now it seems however that Secretary of HHS Tommy Thompson who wouldn't take the small pox vaccine, by the way, when President Bush supposedly took his, now holds these powers regardless of individual state legislation.

Now with the easy passage of the Homeland Security Bill 11/13/02 in the House (299-121-11) and 11/19/02 in the senate 90/9, it leaves quite a few of us downright angry and many scratching our heads, still not sure what happened. 19.

Senator Robert Byrd (Dem. W.V.) stated in the Senate discussion prior to vote on the Homeland Security Bill:

And this is one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation I have seen in my 50 years. I will have been in Congress 50 years come January 3... Never have I seen such a monstrous piece of legislation sent to this body. And we are being asked to vote on that 484 pages tomorrow. Our poor staffs were up most of the night studying it. They know some of the things that are in there, but they don't know all of them. It is a sham and it is a shame. 20 But the way this bill was brought in here, less than 48 hours ago, a brand-new bill. It had not been before any committee. It had undergone no hearings, not this bill. It is a bill on our desks that has 484 pages. There are 484 pages in this bill. 21

As Ron Paul and Robert Byrd explain, and Sandy Mintz outlines, we've federalized the Emergency

Health Powers, overstepping individual and state's rights in one clean sweep!

Ron Paul agrees with some of the most renowned experts in the world on smallpox in opposing mass vaccinations. Dr. Thomas Mack, whose opinions are published in New England Journal of Medicine states: "Vaccinating large numbers of staff identified by the hospitals as well as the general public is a mistake, because the deaths from vaccine complications will outweigh any limited increase in protection. Mass vaccination will guarantee a few deaths." 22

Ron Paul States: "When we give government the power to make medical decisions for us, we in essence accept that the state owns our bodies."

"The possibility that the federal government could order vaccines is real. Provisions buried in the 500-page homeland security bill give federal health bureaucrats virtually unchecked power to declare health emergencies. Specifically, it gives the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services in my view one of the worst of all federal agencies- power to declare actual or potential bioterrorist emergencies; to administer forced "countermeasures," including vaccines, to individuals or whole groups; and to extend the emergency declaration indefinitely. These provisions mirror those found in the Model Emergency Health Powers Act, a troubling proposal that was rejected by most state legislatures last year. That Act would have given state governors broad powers to suspend civil liberties and declare health emergencies. Yet now we're giving virtually the same power to the Secretary of HHS. Equally troubling is the immunity from civil suit granted to vaccine manufacturers in the homeland security bill, which could leave individuals who get sick from a bad batch of vaccines without legal recourse." 23

This view, held by Representative Ron Paul, is also held by Barbara Loe Fisher of the National Vaccination Information Center (NVIC) who professes: "NVIC maintains that Section 304 of the bill is fulfillment of a federal plan in development for several years to allow public health officials to force vaccination and medical treatment on Americans without their informed consent while removing all accountability from drug companies and those who participate in enforcement of the policy when harm is done." 24

She further notes that "a voluntary decision about whether to take the risk, has been the centerpiece of bioethics ever since the Nuremberg Code was adopted after World War II and the doctrine of informed consent was introduced into U.S. case law in 1957."

As the saying goes: he who does not learn from history is doomed to repeat it. People tend to want to believe the best of things, human nature works that way, but blind faith is a very sharp instrument indeed!

The Patriot Act was swept into law in a similar context and fashion as the Homeland Security Act was with the inherent EHPA blended into it. The Patriot Act was also a monstrosity of paperwork passed with no public hearing or debate and no conference or committee report on Oct.26, 2001. That piece of legislation passed easily by our elected officials in the heated aftermath of 9/11, it acted as the initial blow to our civil liberties, usurping our due process rights, expanding executive powers considerably, while enhancing surveillance powers and again overriding due process rights in detention and search and seizures. Finally, to add insult to injury, it suppresses political dissent such as our right to protest this very act! Now over a year later the Homeland Security Act further invades our privacy rights to the point of even overriding our medical rights, including informed

consent and our ability for recourse in damages stemming from medical intervention leading to personal injury. It continues to enhance the government's authority to seize and have surveillance of our property and detain or quarantine (detain or arrest if in violation of a quarantine or such). Well, if we've relinquished all this, what actually is there left to protect? Perhaps our minds, because they still might decide we're too powerful yet and try to microchip us for purposes of mind control! 25.

ENDNOTES:

1. <http://www.909shot.com/PressReleases/prhomelandsecurityhtm.htm>
2. <http://www.healing-arts.org/children/vaccines/vaccines-conflict.htm#conflict>
3. <http://autism.about.com/library/weekly/aa061900a.htm> (October 3, 2001, Chairman Burton Requests Recall Of Childhood Vaccines with Thimerosal)
4. <http://autismawakeninginva.bizland.com/autismthevaccineconnectionandrelatedstories/id10.html>
5. http://video.c-span.org:8080/ramgen/kdrive/e121002_vaccine.rm
6. <http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/homeland.cfm>
7. <http://www.vaccinationnews.com/DailyNews/August2001/ConflictInt&Vax.htm>
8. http://www.healthprivacy.org/info-url_nocat2303/info-url_nocat_show.htm?doc_id=98595;
<http://www.alec.org/viewpage.cfm?pgname=5.103>
9. http://www.flsenate.gov/session/index.cfm?Mode=Bills&SubMenu=1&Tab=session&BI_Mode=ViewBillInfo&BillNum=1262&Chamber=Senate&Year=2002&Title=-
10. http://www.jacksonville.com/tu-online/stories/052802/met_9516399.html
11. http://www.healthprivacy.org/info-url_nocat2303/info-url_nocat_show.htm?doc_id=98595
12. http://www.fema.gov/regions/iv/2002/r4_154.shtm;
<http://www.nctimes.net/news/2002/20021102/65004.html>
13. <http://www.vaclib.org/indexdoc.htm>;
<http://www.know-vaccines.org/bioterror5.html>
14. Id. (George Annas, Chairman, Health Law Department, Boston University School of Public Health)
15. Id.
16. Id. (Director, Health and Services, ALEC)
17. <http://www.vaccinealert.com/pages/whatsnew.html>
18. http://www.vaccinationnews.com/Scandals/past_scandals.htm
<http://www.909shot.com>
<http://www.redflagsweekly.com>
19. <http://www.aamc.org/advocacy/library/washhigh/2002/111502/4.htm>;
http://www.adn.com/24hour/special_reports/terrorism/story/628556p-4811302c.html
20. http://truthout.com/docs_02/11.20A.byrd.home.htm
21. Id.
22. <http://www.vaclib.org/news/drmack.htm> (N Engl J Med. 2002;348(5):000-000 (Reviewed by Gary D. Vugin, MD))
23. <http://www.lewrockwell.com/paul/paul66.html>
24. <http://www.909shot.com/PressReleases/prhomelandsecurityhtm.htm>
<http://www.909shot.com/Newsletters/spsmallpox.htm>
<http://ohsr.od.nih.gov/nuremberg.php3>

25. <http://www.ccr-ny.org/whatsnew>

=====
<http://www.sfgate.com/opinion/article/Rule-by-fear-or-rule-by-law-3229509.php>

Rule by fear or rule by law?

Lewis Seiler and Dan Hamburg

Published 4:00 am, Monday, February 4, 2008

4



Larger | Smaller



Printable Version



[Email This](#)



[Font](#)

"The power of the Executive to cast a man into prison without formulating any charge known to the law, and particularly to deny him the judgment of his peers, is in the highest degree odious and is the foundation of all totalitarian government whether Nazi or Communist."

- [Winston Churchill](#), Nov. 21, 1943

Since 9/11, and seemingly without the notice of most Americans, the federal government has assumed the authority to institute martial law, arrest a wide swath of dissidents (citizen and noncitizen alike), and detain people without legal or constitutional recourse in the event of "an emergency influx of immigrants in the U.S., or to support the rapid development of new programs."

Beginning in 1999, the government has entered into a series of single-bid contracts with Halliburton subsidiary Kellogg, Brown and Root (KBR) to build detention camps at undisclosed locations within the United States. The government has also contracted with several companies to build thousands of railcars, some reportedly equipped with shackles, ostensibly to

transport detainees.

According to diplomat and author [Peter Dale Scott](#), the KBR contract is part of a [Homeland Security](#) plan titled ENDGAME, which sets as its goal the removal of "all removable aliens" and "potential terrorists."

Fraud-busters such as Rep. [Henry Waxman](#), D-Los Angeles, have complained about these contracts, saying that more taxpayer dollars should not go to taxpayer-gouging Halliburton. But the real question is: What kind of "new programs" require the construction and refurbishment of detention facilities in nearly every state of the union with the capacity to house perhaps millions of people?

Sect. 1042 of the 2007 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), "Use of the Armed Forces in Major [Public Emergencies](#)," gives the executive the power to invoke martial law. For the first time in more than a century, the president is now authorized to use the military in response to "a natural disaster, a disease outbreak, a terrorist attack or any other condition in which the President determines that domestic violence has occurred to the extent that state officials cannot maintain public order."

The Military Commissions Act of 2006, rammed through Congress just before the 2006 midterm elections, allows for the indefinite imprisonment of anyone who donates money to a charity that turns up on a list of "terrorist" organizations, or who speaks out against the government's policies. The law calls for secret trials for citizens and noncitizens alike.

Also in 2007, the White House quietly issued National Security Presidential Directive 51 (NSPD-51), to ensure "continuity of government" in the event of what the document vaguely calls a "catastrophic emergency." Should the president determine that such an emergency has occurred, he and he alone is empowered to do whatever he deems necessary to ensure "continuity of government." This could include everything from canceling elections to suspending the Constitution to launching a nuclear attack. Congress has yet to hold a single hearing on NSPD-51.

U.S. Rep. [Jane Harman](#), D-Venice (Los Angeles County) has come up with a new way to expand the domestic "war on terror." Her Violent Radicalization and Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007 (HR1955), which passed the House by the lopsided vote of 404-6, would set up a commission to "examine and report upon the facts and causes" of so-called violent radicalism and extremist ideology, then make legislative recommendations on combatting it.

According to commentary in the Baltimore Sun, Rep. Harman and her colleagues from both sides of the aisle believe the country faces a native brand of terrorism, and needs a commission with sweeping investigative power to combat it.

A clue as to where Harman's commission might be aiming is the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act, a law that labels those who "engage in sit-ins, civil disobedience, trespass, or any other crime in the name of animal rights" as terrorists. Other groups in the crosshairs could be anti-abortion protesters, anti-tax agitators, immigration activists, environmentalists, peace demonstrators, Second Amendment rights supporters ... the list goes on and on. According to author [Naomi Wolf](#), the [National Counterterrorism Center](#) holds the names of roughly 775,000 "terror suspects" with the

number increasing by 20,000 per month.

What could the government be contemplating that leads it to make contingency plans to detain without recourse millions of its own citizens?

The Constitution does not allow the executive to have unchecked power under any circumstances. The people must not allow the president to use the war on terrorism to rule by fear instead of by law.

The Laws of the Pharmaceutical Industry

The main principles governing the pharmaceutical “business with disease.” It is not in the financial interests of the pharmaceutical industry to prevent common diseases – the maintenance and expansion of diseases is a precondition for the financial growth of this industry.

1

The pharmaceutical industry is an [investment industry](#) driven by the profits of its shareholders. Improving human health is not the driving force of this industry.

2

The pharmaceutical investment industry was artificially created and strategically developed over an entire century by the same investment groups that control the global petrochemical and chemical industries.

3

The [huge profits](#) of the pharmaceutical industry are based on the patenting of new drugs. These patents essentially allow drug manufacturers to arbitrarily define the profits for their products.

4

The marketplace for the pharmaceutical industry is the human body – but only for as long as the body hosts diseases. Thus, [maintaining and expanding diseases](#) is a precondition for the growth of the pharmaceutical industry.

5

A key strategy to accomplish this goal is the development of [drugs that merely mask symptoms](#) while avoiding the curing or elimination of diseases. This explains why most prescription drugs marketed today have no proven efficacy and merely target symptoms.

6

To further expand their pharmaceutical market, the drug companies are continuously looking for [new applications](#) (indications) for the use of drugs they already market. For example, Bayer's pain pill Aspirin is now taken by 50 million healthy US citizens under the illusion it will prevent heart attacks.

7

Another key strategy to expand pharmaceutical markets is to cause new diseases with drugs. While merely masking symptoms short term, most of the prescription drugs taken by millions of patients today cause a multitude of new diseases as a result of their [known long-term side effects](#). For example, all cholesterol-lowering drugs currently on the market are known to increase the risk of developing cancer – but only after the patient has been taking the drug for several years.

8

The known deadly side effects of prescription drugs are the fourth leading cause of death in the industrialized world, surpassed only by the number of deaths from heart attacks, cancer and strokes (Journal of the American Medical Association, April 15, 1998). This fact is no surprise either, because drug patents are primarily issued for new synthetic molecules. All synthetic molecules need to be detoxified and eliminated from the body, a system that frequently fails and results in an epidemic of severe and deadly side effects. 106,000 people die yearly from pharmaceutical industry side effects. Americans killed each year during WWII - 49,000. Americans killed each year of the Vietnam War - 10,000.

9

While the promotion and expansion of diseases increase the market of the pharmaceutical investment industry - prevention and root cause treatment of diseases decrease long-term profitability; therefore, they are avoided or even obstructed by this industry.

10

Worst of all, the eradication of diseases is by its very nature incompatible with and diametrically opposed to the interests of the pharmaceutical investment industry. The eradication of diseases now considered as potential drug markets will destroy billions of investment dollars and eventually will eliminate this entire industry.

11

Vitamins and other effective natural health therapies that optimize cellular metabolism threaten the pharmaceutical “business with disease” because they target the cellular cause of today’s most common diseases - and these natural substances cannot be patented.

12

Throughout the more than one hundred year existence of the pharmaceutical industry, vitamins and other essential nutrients, with defined functions as cofactors in cellular metabolism, have been the fiercest competition and the greatest threat to the long-term success of the pharmaceutical investment business.

13

Vitamins and other effective natural health therapies that effectively prevent diseases are incompatible with the very nature of the pharmaceutical “business with disease.”

14

To protect the strategic development of its investment business against the threat from effective, natural and non-patentable therapies, the pharmaceutical industry has – over an entire century - used the most unscrupulous methods, such as:

(1) Withholding life-saving health information from millions of people. It is simply unacceptable that today so few know that the human body cannot produce vitamin C and lysine, two key molecules for connective tissue stability and disease prevention.

(2) Discrediting natural health therapies. The most common way is through global PR campaigns organized by the Pharma-Cartel that spread lies about the alleged side effects of natural substances – molecules that have been used by Nature for millennia.

(3) Banning by law the dissemination of information about natural health therapies. To that end, the pharmaceutical industry has placed its lobbyists in key political positions in key markets and leading drug export nations.

15

The pharmaceutical “business with disease” is the largest deception and fraud business in human history. The product “health” promised by drug companies is not delivered to millions of patients. Instead, the “products” most often delivered are the opposite: new diseases and frequently, death.
http://www4.dr-rath-foundation.org/PHARMACEUTICAL_BUSINESS/laws/law15.htm

The survival of the pharmaceutical industry is dependent on the elimination by any means of effective natural health therapies. These natural and non-patentable therapies have become the treatment of choice for millions of people despite the combined economic, political and media opposition of the world’s largest investment industry.

===== <http://mnhopkins.blogspot.com>

[30 Years of Secret Official Transcripts Show UK Government Experts Cover Up Vaccine Hazards](http://childhealthsafety.wordpress.com/2012/03/14/government-experts-cover-up-vaccine-hazards/)

<http://childhealthsafety.wordpress.com/2012/03/14/government-experts-cover-up-vaccine-hazards/>

Posted on March 14, 2012 by ChildHealthSafety
[ED: Readers should note that a paper presented at a scientific conference is a citable reference for publication purposes. That applies to Dr Lucija Tomljenovic's paper discussed in this article.]

An extraordinary new paper published by a courageous doctor and investigative medical researcher has dug the dirt on 30 years of secret official transcripts of meetings of UK government vaccine committees and the supposedly independent medical “experts” sitting on them with their drug industry connections.

If you want to get an idea of who is responsible for your child’s condition resulting from a vaccine adverse reaction then this is the paper to read. What you have to ask yourself is if the people on these committees are honest and honourable and acting in the best interests of British children, how is it this has been going on for at least 30 years?

This is what everyone has always known but could never prove before now. Pass this information on to others so they can see what goes on in Government health committees behind locked doors.

We quote here from the author’s summary and the paper:

Deliberately concealing information from parents for the sole purpose of getting them to comply with an “official” vaccination schedule could be considered as a form of ethical violation or misconduct. Official documents obtained from the UK Department of Health (DH) and the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) reveal that the British health authorities have been engaging

in such practice for the last 30 years, apparently for the sole purpose of protecting the national vaccination program.

The 45 page paper with detailed evidence can be downloaded here: [The vaccination policy and the Code of Practice of the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation \(JCVI\): are they at odds?](#) Lucija Tomljenovic, Neural Dynamics Research Group, Dept. of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. It was presented at and forms part of the proceedings of The 2011 BSEM Scientific Conference now published online here: [The Health Hazards of Disease Prevention](#) BSEM Scientific Conference, March 2011. [ED: BSEM HAVE REORGANISED THEIR WEBSITE AND THIS PAGE NO LONGER EXISTS THERE - Note Added 8 May 2014]

There are other papers also found at that link which you will find an excellent read.

The author, Dr Lucija Tomljenovic writes:

Here I present the documentation which appears to show that the JCVI made continuous efforts to withhold critical data on severe adverse reactions and contraindications to vaccinations to both parents and health practitioners in order to reach overall vaccination rates which they deemed were necessary for “herd immunity”, a concept which with regards to vaccination, and contrary to prevalent beliefs, does not rest on solid scientific evidence as will be explained. As a result of such vaccination policy promoted by the JCVI and the DH, many children have been vaccinated without their parents being disclosed the critical information about demonstrated risks of serious adverse reactions, one that the JCVI appeared to have been fully aware of. It would also appear that, by withholding this information, the JCVI/DH neglected the right of individuals to make an informed consent concerning vaccination. By doing so, the JCVI/DH may have violated not only International Guidelines for Medical Ethics (i.e., [Helsinki Declaration](#) <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/> and the International Code of Medical Ethics) [2] but also, [their own Code of Practice](#).

[ED: THE UK DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH APPEARS TO HAVE CHANGED ALL THE LINKS TO THEIR DOCUMENTS BY ARCHIVING THEM WITH THE UK NATIONAL ARCHIVE - IF READERS WOULD LIKE

TO ATTEMPT TO FIND THE CORRECT LINKS ON THE UK NATIONAL ARCHIVE AND POST THEM IN A COMMENT HERE THAT WOULD BE WELCOME - Note Added 9 May 2014]

Dr Lucija Tomljenovic continues:

The transcripts of the JCVI meetings also show that some of the Committee members had extensive ties to pharmaceutical companies and that the JCVI frequently co-operated with vaccine manufacturers on strategies aimed at boosting vaccine uptake. Some of the meetings at which such controversial items were discussed were not intended to be publicly available, as the transcripts were only released later, through the Freedom of Information Act (FOI). These particular meetings are denoted in the transcripts as “commercial in confidence”, and reveal a clear and disturbing lack of transparency, as some of the information was removed from the text (i.e., the names of the participants) prior to transcript release under the FOI section at the JCVI website (for example, JCVI CSM/DH (Committee on the Safety of Medicines/Department of Health) [Joint Committee on Adverse Reactions Minutes 1986-1992](#)).

In summary, the transcripts of the JCVI/DH meetings from the period from 1983 to 2010 appear to show that:

- 1) Instead of reacting appropriately by re-examining existing vaccination policies when safety concerns over specific vaccines were identified by their own investigations, the JCVI either a) took no action, b) skewed or selectively removed unfavourable safety data from public reports and c) made intensive efforts to reassure both the public and the authorities in the safety of respective vaccines;
- 2) Significantly restricted contraindication to vaccination criteria in order to increase vaccination rates despite outstanding and unresolved safety issues;
- 3) On multiple occasions requested from vaccine manufacturers to make specific amendments to their data sheets, when these were in

conflict with JCVI's official advices on immunisations;

4) Persistently relied on methodologically dubious studies, while dismissing independent research, to promote vaccine policies;

5) Persistently and categorically downplayed safety concerns while over-inflating vaccine benefits;

6) Promoted and elaborated a plan for introducing new vaccines of questionable efficacy and safety into the routine paediatric schedule, on the assumption that the licenses would eventually be granted;

7) Actively discouraged research on vaccine safety issues;

8) Deliberately took advantage of parents' trust and lack of relevant knowledge on vaccinations in order to promote a scientifically unsupported immunisation program which could put certain children at risk of severe long-term neurological damage;

Notably, all of these actions appear to violate the JCVI's own Code of Practice.

Read the paper here for the full evidence to back up these conclusions in its 45 pages. An excellent piece of investigative research:

[The vaccination policy and the Code of Practice of the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation \(JCVI\): are they at odds?](#)

<http://nsnbc.me/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/BSEM-2011.pdf>

And don't forget to read more from the proceedings of The 2011 BSEM Scientific Conference now published online here:

[The Health Hazards of Disease Prevention – BSEM Scientific Conference, March 2011.](#)

<http://nsnbc.me/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/BSEM-2011.pdf>

BSEM Scientific Conference, March 2011. **[ED: BSEM HAVE REORGANISED**

THEIR WEBSITE AND THIS PAGE NO LONGER EXISTS THERE - Note
Added 8 May 2014]

[About these ads](#)