

KC & Associates Investigations Research Associates

Quinault Valley Guns & Blades / Urban Escape & Evasion Course For 1st Responders

International Relations * Military * Terrorism * Business * Security

www.kcandassociates.org orders@kcandassociates.org

Kathleen Louise dePass Press Agent/Publicist .360.288.2652

Triste cosa es no tener amigos, pero más triste ha de ser no tener enemigos porque quién no tenga enemigos señal es de que no tiene talento que haga sombra, ni carácter que impresione, ni valor temido, ni honra de la que se murmure, ni bienes que se le codicien, ni cosa alguna que se le envidie. A sad thing it is to not have friends, but even sadder must it be not having any enemies; that a man should have no enemies is a sign that he has no talent to outshine others, nor character that inspires, nor valor that is feared, nor honor to be rumored, nor goods to be coveted, nor anything to be envied. -Jose Marti

From the desk of Craig B Hulet?

Washington DC: Inside the beltway:

Two Parties, One Funeral

The Biggest Assault on Our Democracy Is Coming from the Center of Our Own Government and the Obama Executive Branch

Defense Spending on Candidates: US Congress, Senate and President

Candidate Office	Amount
Romney, Mitt (R)	\$1,423,658
Obama, Barack (D)	\$1,189,216
McKeon, Buck (R-CA) House	\$566,850
Brown, Scott (R-MA) Senate	\$283,288
Ruppersberger, Dutch (D-MD) House	\$233,550

Records show that Secretary John Kerry has received large sums of money from Raytheon - the company behind the Tomahawk Cruise missiles and drone / robots that are used in an attack against Syria.

Has The War Machine Bought Congress? Ten Members Own Raytheon Shares

Syria: Pro-War Senators Took 83% More Money From Military Industry




Defense Spending on Candidates US Congress Senate and President.

Although the defense sector contributes far less money to politicians than many other sectors, it is one of the most powerful in politics. The sector includes defense aerospace, defense electronics and other miscellaneous defense companies.

Individuals and political action committees associated with the defense sector [contributed](#) more than \$27 million to political candidates and committees during the 2012 campaign cycle, with far more going to Republicans than Democrats: \$16.4 million versus \$11 million. [[Read more Background](#)]

Top Contributors, 2011-2012



Top 20 Senators

Rank	Candidate	Amount
1	Brown, Scott (R-MA)	\$283,288
2	Nelson, Bill (D-FL)	\$189,800
3	Gillibrand, Kirsten (D-NY)	\$157,964
4	Feinstein, Dianne (D-CA)	\$137,550
5	Casey, Bob (D-PA)	\$104,825
6	Manchin, Joe (D-WV)	\$101,000
7	Wicker, Roger (R-MS)	\$95,400
8	Lugar, Richard G (R-IN)	\$94,300
9	Hatch, Orrin G (R-UT)	\$82,750
10	Mikulski, Barbara A (D-MD)	\$80,250
11	Brown, Sherrod (D-OH)	\$73,800
12	Collins, Susan M (R-ME)	\$71,500
13	Tester, Jon (D-MT)	\$69,300
14	Inhofe, James M (R-OK)	\$67,150
15	Barrasso, John A (R-WY)	\$66,000
16	Shelby, Richard C (R-AL)	\$57,500
17	Chambliss, Saxby (R-GA)	\$56,500
18	Udall, Mark (D-CO)	\$56,400
18	McConnell, Mitch (R-KY)	\$56,400
20	Carper, Tom (D-DE)	\$56,000

METHODOLOGY: The numbers on this page are based on contributions from PACs and individuals giving \$200 or more.

All donations took place during the 2011-2012 election cycle and were released by the Federal Election Commission on Monday, March 25, 2013.

Top Industries Lobbying on Defense, 2012

Industry	Total
Defense Aerospace	\$58,436,226
Misc Defense	\$37,149,617
Defense Electronics	\$36,158,520

Data for the current election cycle were released by the Federal Election Commission on Monday, March 25, 2013

Top Recipients, 2011-2012

Candidate	Office	Amount
Romney, Mitt (R)		\$1,423,658
Obama, Barack (D)		\$1,189,216
McKeon, Buck (R-CA)	House	\$566,850
Brown, Scott (R-MA)	Senate	\$283,288
Ruppersberger, Dutch (D-MD)	House	\$233,550

Defense: Money to Congress

Summary	<input type="Submit" value="GO">
Top 20 Members	
All Senators	
All Members of the House	
All Senate Candidates	
All House Candidates	

Party Split:	Dems: \$9,370,413
	Repubs: \$13,780,064
	Others: \$48,204
All Candidates:	\$23,198,681
Incumbents Only:	\$18,725,976

House	# of Members	Average Contribution	Total Contributions
-------	--------------	----------------------	---------------------

Democrats	187	\$31,336	\$5,859,824
Republicans	239	\$40,871	\$9,768,125
Independents	0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	426	\$36,685	\$15,627,949

*The US House of Representatives has 435 members and 5 non-voting delegates.
Totals may exceed 440 due to mid-term replacements.*

Senate	# of Members	Average Contribution	Total Contributions
Democrats	46	\$36,901	\$1,697,464
Republicans	42	\$32,716	\$1,374,063
Independents	2	\$-200	\$-400
TOTAL	90	\$34,124	\$3,071,127

*The US Senate has 100 members.
Totals may exceed 100 due to mid-term replacements.*

The numbers on this page are based on contributions from PACs and individuals giving \$200 or more.

All donations took place during the 2011-2012 election cycle and were released by the Federal Election Commission on Monday, March 25, 2013.

Defense: Top Recipients

All Recipients
Presidential Candidates
Senators
Members of the House
Senate Candidates
House Candidates
All Members of Congress
PAC Recipients

Top 20 Recipients

Rank	Candidate	Office	Amount
1	Romney, Mitt (R)		\$1,423,658
2	Obama, Barack (D)		\$1,189,216
3	McKeon, Buck (R-CA)	House	\$566,850
4	Brown, Scott (R-MA)	Senate	\$283,288
5	Ruppersberger, Dutch (D-MD)	House	\$233,550
6	Young, C W Bill (R-FL)	House	\$230,260
7	Brooks, Mo (R-AL)	House	\$205,520
8	Smith, Adam (D-WA)	House	\$201,000
9	Reyes, Silvestre (D-TX)	House	\$199,500
10	Nelson, Bill (D-FL)	Senate	\$189,800
11	Paul, Ron (R)	House	\$184,530
12	Granger, Kay (R-TX)	House	\$182,950
13	Wittman, Rob (R-VA)	House	\$165,600
14	Critz, Mark (D-PA)	House	\$163,374
15	Thornberry, Mac (R-TX)	House	\$160,800
16	Gillibrand, Kirsten (D-NY)	Senate	\$157,964
17	Aderholt, Robert B (R-AL)	House	\$156,500
17	Moran, Jim (D-VA)	House	\$156,500
19	Rogers, Hal (R-KY)	House	\$151,750
20	Hoyer, Steny H (D-MD)	House	\$148,700

METHODOLOGY: The numbers on this page are based on contributions from PACs and individuals giving \$200 or more.


All donations took place during the 2011-2012 election cycle and were released by the Federal Election Commission on Monday, March 25, 2013.

Revolving Door: Top Industries

Practically every industry and special interest area hires lobbyists to represent and defend their interests in Washington, D.C. But some industries frequently employ a special breed of lobbyist: those who previously worked for the federal government they're now tasked with lobbying.

Some of these "revolving door" lobbyists once toiled as low-level congressional staffers or entry-level bureaucrats. Plenty more, however, worked within government's upper ranks, serving as top agency officials, congressional chiefs of staff and even as members of the U.S. House and U.S. Senate.

The chart below details which industries and special interest areas most frequently use lobbyists who have spun through the revolving door of federal politics and government:



Industry	Number of revolving door people profiled
Beer, Wine & Liquor	210 (77.5%)
Misc Communications/Electronics	37 (75.5%)
Tobacco	132 (75.0%)

Industry	Number of revolving door people profiled
Finance/Credit Companies	273 (74.0%)
TV/Movies/Music	494 (73.5%)
Telephone Utilities	247 (71.4%)
Accountants	114 (71.3%)
Defense Aerospace	325 (71.1%)
Retail Sales	310 (71.1%)
Telecom Services & Equipment	371 (71.1%)
Railroads	234 (70.7%)
Automotive	411 (70.4%)
Securities & Investment	569 (70.2%)
Misc Defense	324 (70.1%)
Lobbyists	188 (69.9%)
Food & Beverage	218 (69.0%)
Environmental Svcs/Equipment	145 (68.7%)

Industry	Number of revolving door people profiled
Defense Electronics	295 (68.4%)
Lawyers/Law Firms	249 (68.2%)
Misc Finance	303 (68.1%)

Defense: Top Contributors to Federal Candidates, Parties, and Outside Groups

Election cycle:

Total contributions: **\$27,595,579**

Rank	Organization	Amount	 Dems  Repubs	Source		
				Indivs	PACs	Soft \$
1	Lockheed Martin	\$3,050,123	39%	60%		
2	Boeing Co	\$2,844,669	46%	54%		
3	Raytheon Co	\$2,631,809	38%	62%		
4	Northrop Grumman	\$2,300,553	41%	58%		
5	General Dynamics	\$1,830,558	39%	60%		
6	United Technologies	\$1,495,825	43%	56%		
7	BAE Systems	\$1,104,221	42%	58%		
8	SAIC Inc	\$1,000,595	44%	56%		
9	Huntington Ingalls Industries	\$830,888	44%	56%		
10	Finmeccanica SpA	\$583,746	46%	54%		

Rank	Organization	Amount	 Dems	 Repubs	Source		
					 Indivs	 PACs	 Soft \$
11	Honeywell International	\$548,804	46%	54%			
12	Harris Corp	\$546,974	50%	50%			
13	L-3 Communications	\$447,093	38%	61%			
14	Emergent BioSolutions	\$324,974	30%	70%			
15	Alliant Techsystems	\$311,475	29%	71%			
16	EADS North America	\$300,612	34%	66%			
17	DynCorp International	\$273,736	41%	58%			
18	General Electric	\$252,400	42%	58%			
19	Mantech International	\$248,526	59%	41%			
20	Ameriquel Group	\$245,712	4%	96%			




METHODOLOGY: The numbers on this page are based on contributions from PACs, soft [money](#) donors, and individuals giving \$200 or more. (Only those groups giving \$5,000 or more are listed here. Soft money applies only to cycles 1992-2002.) *In many cases, the organizations themselves did not donate; rather the [money](#) came from the organization's PAC, its individual members or employees or owners, and those individuals' immediate families. Organization totals include subsidiaries and affiliates.*

All donations took place during the 2011-2012 election cycle and were released by the Federal Election Commission.

Defense: Money to Congress

Summary
Top 20 Members
All Senators
All Members of the House
All Senate Candidates
All House Candidates

<input type="Submit" value="GO">

Party Split:
 Dems:  \$9,370,413
 Repubs:  \$13,780,064
 Others:  \$48,204

All Candidates:  \$23,198,681

Incumbents Only:  \$18,725,976

House	# of Members	Average Contribution	Total Contributions
Democrats	187	\$31,336	\$5,859,824
Republicans	239	\$40,871	\$9,768,125
Independents	0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	426	\$36,685	\$15,627,949

The [US House](#) of Representatives has 435 members and 5 non-voting delegates. Totals may exceed 440 due to mid-term replacements.

Senate	# of Members	Average Contribution	Total Contributions
Democrats	46	\$36,901	\$1,697,464
Republicans	42	\$32,716	\$1,374,063
Independents	2	\$-200	\$-400
TOTAL	90	\$34,124	\$3,071,127

All House Candidates

Candidate	Amount
McKeon, Buck (R-CA)	\$566,850
Ruppersberger, Dutch (D-MD)	\$233,550
Young, C W Bill (R-FL)	\$230,260
Brooks, Mo (R-AL)	\$205,520
Smith, Adam (D-WA)	\$201,000
Reyes, Silvestre (D-TX)	\$199,500
Granger, Kay (R-TX)	\$182,950
Wittman, Rob (R-VA)	\$165,600
Critz, Mark (D-PA)	\$163,374
Thornberry, Mac (R-TX)	\$160,800
Aderholt, Robert B (R-AL)	\$156,500
Moran, Jim (D-VA)	\$156,500
Rogers, Hal (R-KY)	\$151,750
Hoyer, Steny H (D-MD)	\$148,700
Hunter, Duncan D (R-CA)	\$145,450
Rogers, Mike D (R-AL)	\$139,200
Turner, Michael R (R-OH)	\$137,275
Bartlett, Roscoe G (R-MD)	\$135,100
Boehner, John (R-OH)	\$132,100
Frelinghuysen, Rodney (R-NJ)	\$131,775
Courtney, Joe (D-CT)	\$131,000
Forbes, Randy (R-VA)	\$129,800
Rigell, Scott (R-VA)	\$123,349

Candidate	Amount
Connolly, Gerry (D-VA)	\$122,250
Langevin, Jim (D-RI)	\$119,750
Kingston, Jack (R-GA)	\$117,000
Andrews, Robert E (D-NJ)	\$113,200
Rogers, Mike (R-MI)	\$112,250
Rothman, Steven R (D-NJ)	\$109,750
Miller, Jeff (R-FL)	\$109,250
Calvert, Ken (R-CA)	\$106,500
Palazzo, Steven (R-MS)	\$106,500
Wilson, Joe (R-SC)	\$105,100
West, Allen (R-FL)	\$104,829
Cantor, Eric (R-VA)	\$102,900
Visclosky, Pete (D-IN)	\$99,500
Runyan, Jon (R-NJ)	\$96,798
Coffman, Mike (R-CO)	\$96,400
McIntyre, Mike (D-NC)	\$95,124
Sanchez, Loretta (D-CA)	\$95,000
Heck, Joe (R-NV)	\$94,199
Israel, Steve (D-NY)	\$93,750
King, Pete (R-NY)	\$92,500
Dicks, Norm (D-WA)	\$92,250
Hanabusa, Colleen (D-HI)	\$88,300
Wolf, Frank R (R-VA)	\$88,196

Candidate	Amount
Bonner, Jo (R-AL)	\$85,850
Crenshaw, Ander (R-FL)	\$85,500
Lamborn, Douglas L (R-CO)	\$85,000
Latham, Tom (R-IA)	\$83,650
Posey, Bill (R-FL)	\$82,200
Kaptur, Marcy (D-OH)	\$81,500
Larsen, Rick (D-WA)	\$81,500
LoBiondo, Frank A (R-NJ)	\$80,750
Thompson, Bennie G (D-MS)	\$79,250
Gibson, Chris (R-NY)	\$77,498
Clyburn, James E (D-SC)	\$77,000
Conaway, Mike (R-TX)	\$75,000
Hochul, Kathleen (D-NY)	\$74,900
Larson, John B (D-CT)	\$73,700
Lungren, Dan (R-CA)	\$73,000
Bilbray, Brian P (R-CA)	\$72,000
Owens, Bill (D-NY)	\$71,624
Cole, Tom (R-OK)	\$71,250
Lewis, Jerry (R-CA)	\$70,500
Issa, Darrell (R-CA)	\$69,800
Hartzler, Vicky (R-MO)	\$69,634
Rooney, Tom (R-FL)	\$68,900
Bishop, Sanford (D-GA)	\$68,500

Candidate	Amount
McCarthy, Kevin (R-CA)	\$68,500
Price, David (D-NC)	\$67,850
Pastor, Ed (D-AZ)	\$67,500
McCaul, Michael (R-TX)	\$67,000
Shuster, Bill (R-PA)	\$65,000
Franks, Trent (R-AZ)	\$64,000
Bass, Charles (R-NH)	\$62,150
Young, Todd (R-IN)	\$61,750
Levin, Sander (D-MI)	\$60,500
Van Hollen, Chris (D-MD)	\$60,500
Schilling, Bobby (R-IL)	\$60,499
Austria, Steve (R-OH)	\$59,360
Scott, Austin (R-GA)	\$58,648
Davis, Susan A (D-CA)	\$58,550
Kissell, Larry (D-NC)	\$58,499
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana (R-FL)	\$57,250
Ryan, Tim (D-OH)	\$55,500
Roby, Martha (R-AL)	\$55,000
Giffords, Gabrielle (D-AZ)	\$54,779
Fleming, John (R-LA)	\$53,500
Loeb sack, David (D-IA)	\$53,000
Neal, Richard E (D-MA)	\$53,000
Tsongas, Niki (D-MA)	\$52,950

Candidate	Amount
Berman, Howard L (D-CA)	\$51,150
Boustany, Charles W Jr (R-LA)	\$50,800
Cuellar, Henry (D-TX)	\$50,000
Slaughter, Louise M (D-NY)	\$49,500
Tiberi, Patrick J (R-OH)	\$49,300
Nunnelee, Alan (R-MS)	\$49,000
Camp, Dave (R-MI)	\$47,500
Griffin, Tim (R-AR)	\$47,134
Pelosi, Nancy (D-CA)	\$47,000
Perlmutter, Edwin G (D-CO)	\$46,831
Perkins, Christopher S (R-VA)	\$46,750
Hall, Ralph M (R-TX)	\$46,500
Schiff, Adam (D-CA)	\$46,250
Carter, John (R-TX)	\$45,500
Kline, John (R-MN)	\$45,250
Pascrell, Bill Jr (D-NJ)	\$44,950
Dent, Charlie (R-PA)	\$44,500
Johnson, Sam (R-TX)	\$42,750
Fattah, Chaka (D-PA)	\$42,500
Hurt, Robert (R-VA)	\$42,400
Schultz, Debbie Wasserman (D-FL)	\$42,400
Barrow, John (D-GA)	\$41,750
Garamendi, John (D-CA)	\$41,250

Candidate	Amount
Bachmann, Michele (R-MN)	\$40,587
Culberson, John (R-TX)	\$40,500
Sutton, Betty Sue (D-OH)	\$40,500
Scott, Tim (R-SC)	\$39,750
Westmoreland, Lynn A (R-GA)	\$39,000

Candidate	Amount
McKeon, Buck (R-CA)	\$566,850
Ruppersberger, Dutch (D-MD)	\$233,550
Young, C W Bill (R-FL)	\$230,260
Brooks, Mo (R-AL)	\$205,520
Smith, Adam (D-WA)	\$201,000
Reyes, Silvestre (D-TX)	\$199,500
Granger, Kay (R-TX)	\$182,950
Wittman, Rob (R-VA)	\$165,600
Critz, Mark (D-PA)	\$163,374
Thornberry, Mac (R-TX)	\$160,800
Aderholt, Robert B (R-AL)	\$156,500
Moran, Jim (D-VA)	\$156,500
Rogers, Hal (R-KY)	\$151,750
Hoyer, Steny H (D-MD)	\$148,700
Hunter, Duncan D (R-CA)	\$145,450
Rogers, Mike D (R-AL)	\$139,200
Turner, Michael R (R-OH)	\$137,275

Candidate	Amount
Bartlett, Roscoe G (R-MD)	\$135,100
Boehner, John (R-OH)	\$132,100
Frelinghuysen, Rodney (R-NJ)	\$131,775
Courtney, Joe (D-CT)	\$131,000
Forbes, Randy (R-VA)	\$129,800
Rigell, Scott (R-VA)	\$123,349
Connolly, Gerry (D-VA)	\$122,250
Langevin, Jim (D-RI)	\$119,750
Kingston, Jack (R-GA)	\$117,000
Andrews, Robert E (D-NJ)	\$113,200
Rogers, Mike (R-MI)	\$112,250
Rothman, Steven R (D-NJ)	\$109,750
Miller, Jeff (R-FL)	\$109,250
Calvert, Ken (R-CA)	\$106,500
Palazzo, Steven (R-MS)	\$106,500
Wilson, Joe (R-SC)	\$105,100
West, Allen (R-FL)	\$104,829
Cantor, Eric (R-VA)	\$102,900
Visclosky, Pete (D-IN)	\$99,500
Runyan, Jon (R-NJ)	\$96,798
Coffman, Mike (R-CO)	\$96,400
McIntyre, Mike (D-NC)	\$95,124
Sanchez, Loretta (D-CA)	\$95,000

Candidate	Amount
Heck, Joe (R-NV)	\$94,199
Israel, Steve (D-NY)	\$93,750
King, Pete (R-NY)	\$92,500
Dicks, Norm (D-WA)	\$92,250
Hanabusa, Colleen (D-HI)	\$88,300
Wolf, Frank R (R-VA)	\$88,196
Bonner, Jo (R-AL)	\$85,850
Crenshaw, Ander (R-FL)	\$85,500
Lamborn, Douglas L (R-CO)	\$85,000
Latham, Tom (R-IA)	\$83,650
Posey, Bill (R-FL)	\$82,200
Kaptur, Marcy (D-OH)	\$81,500
Larsen, Rick (D-WA)	\$81,500
LoBiondo, Frank A (R-NJ)	\$80,750
Thompson, Bennie G (D-MS)	\$79,250
Gibson, Chris (R-NY)	\$77,498
Clyburn, James E (D-SC)	\$77,000
Conaway, Mike (R-TX)	\$75,000
Hochul, Kathleen (D-NY)	\$74,900
Larson, John B (D-CT)	\$73,700
Lungren, Dan (R-CA)	\$73,000
Bilbray, Brian P (R-CA)	\$72,000
Owens, Bill (D-NY)	\$71,624

Candidate	Amount
Cole, Tom (R-OK)	\$71,250
Lewis, Jerry (R-CA)	\$70,500
Issa, Darrell (R-CA)	\$69,800
Hartzler, Vicky (R-MO)	\$69,634
Rooney, Tom (R-FL)	\$68,900
Bishop, Sanford (D-GA)	\$68,500
McCarthy, Kevin (R-CA)	\$68,500
Price, David (D-NC)	\$67,850
Pastor, Ed (D-AZ)	\$67,500
McCaul, Michael (R-TX)	\$67,000
Shuster, Bill (R-PA)	\$65,000
Franks, Trent (R-AZ)	\$64,000
Bass, Charles (R-NH)	\$62,150
Young, Todd (R-IN)	\$61,750
Levin, Sander (D-MI)	\$60,500
Van Hollen, Chris (D-MD)	\$60,500
Schilling, Bobby (R-IL)	\$60,499
Austria, Steve (R-OH)	\$59,360
Scott, Austin (R-GA)	\$58,648
Davis, Susan A (D-CA)	\$58,550
Kissell, Larry (D-NC)	\$58,499
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana (R-FL)	\$57,250
Ryan, Tim (D-OH)	\$55,500

Candidate	Amount
Roby, Martha (R-AL)	\$55,000
Giffords, Gabrielle (D-AZ)	\$54,779
Fleming, John (R-LA)	\$53,500
Loeb sack, David (D-IA)	\$53,000
Neal, Richard E (D-MA)	\$53,000
Tsongas, Niki (D-MA)	\$52,950
Berman, Howard L (D-CA)	\$51,150
Boustany, Charles W Jr (R-LA)	\$50,800
Cuellar, Henry (D-TX)	\$50,000
Slaughter, Louise M (D-NY)	\$49,500
Tiberi, Patrick J (R-OH)	\$49,300
Nunnelee, Alan (R-MS)	\$49,000
Camp, Dave (R-MI)	\$47,500
Griffin, Tim (R-AR)	\$47,134
Pelosi, Nancy (D-CA)	\$47,000
Perlmutter, Edwin G (D-CO)	\$46,831
Perkins, Christopher S (R-VA)	\$46,750
Hall, Ralph M (R-TX)	\$46,500
Schiff, Adam (D-CA)	\$46,250
Carter, John (R-TX)	\$45,500
Kline, John (R-MN)	\$45,250
Pascrell, Bill Jr (D-NJ)	\$44,950
Dent, Charlie (R-PA)	\$44,500

Candidate	Amount
Johnson, Sam (R-TX)	\$42,750
Fattah, Chaka (D-PA)	\$42,500
Hurt, Robert (R-VA)	\$42,400
Schultz, Debbie Wasserman (D-FL)	\$42,400
Barrow, John (D-GA)	\$41,750
Garamendi, John (D-CA)	\$41,250
Bachmann, Michele (R-MN)	\$40,587
Culberson, John (R-TX)	\$40,500
Sutton, Betty Sue (D-OH)	\$40,500
Scott, Tim (R-SC)	\$39,750
Westmoreland, Lynn A (R-GA)	\$39,000

The numbers on this page are based on contributions from PACs and individuals giving \$200 or more.

All donations took place during the 2011-2012 election cycle and were released by the Federal Election Commission on Monday, March 25, 2013.

Defense: Money to Congress

Summary	
Top 20 Members	
All Senators	Sort by Amount
All Members of the House	Sort by Name
All Senate Candidates	Sort by State
All House Candidates	

All Senators

Candidate	Amount
Brown, Scott (R-MA)	\$283,288
Nelson, Bill (D-FL)	\$189,800
Gillibrand, Kirsten (D-NY)	\$157,964
Feinstein, Dianne (D-CA)	\$137,550
Casey, Bob (D-PA)	\$104,825
Manchin, Joe (D-WV)	\$101,000
Wicker, Roger (R-MS)	\$95,400
Lugar, Richard G (R-IN)	\$94,300
Hatch, Orrin G (R-UT)	\$82,750
Mikulski, Barbara A (D-MD)	\$80,250
Brown, Sherrod (D-OH)	\$73,800
Collins, Susan M (R-ME)	\$71,500
Tester, Jon (D-MT)	\$69,300
Inhofe, James M (R-OK)	\$67,150
Barrasso, John A (R-WY)	\$66,000
Shelby, Richard C (R-AL)	\$57,500
Chambliss, Saxby (R-GA)	\$56,500
McCConnell , Mitch (R-KY)	\$56,400

Candidate	Amount
Udall, Mark (D-CO)	\$56,400
Carper, Tom (D-DE)	\$56,000
Stabenow, Debbie (D-MI)	\$55,200
Cardin, Ben (D-MD)	\$55,050
Menendez, Robert (D-NJ)	\$53,000
Whitehouse, Sheldon (D-RI)	\$50,350
McCaskill, Claire (D-MO)	\$48,250
Corker, Bob (R-TN)	\$47,250
Coats , Dan (R-IN)	\$46,550
Warner, Mark (D-VA)	\$41,500
Snowe, Olympia (R-ME)	\$39,600
Hagan, Kay R (D-NC)	\$37,750
Inouye, Daniel K (D-HI)	\$36,500
Cantwell, Maria (D-WA)	\$35,225
Portman, Rob (R-OH)	\$30,250
Heller, Dean (R-NV)	\$29,750
Ayotte, Kelly (R-NH)	\$28,500
Landrieu, Mary L (D-LA)	\$26,400
Cornyn, John (R-TX)	\$26,050
Graham, Lindsey (R-SC)	\$24,300
Nelson, Ben (D-NE)	\$23,850
Kirk, Mark (R-IL)	\$21,500
Shaheen, Jeanne (D-NH)	\$21,000

Candidate	Amount
Vitter, David (R-LA)	\$21,000
Rubio, Marco (R-FL)	\$19,575
Begich, Mark (D-AK)	\$17,500
Cochran, Thad (R-MS)	\$17,500
Johnson, Tim (D-SD)	\$17,000
Hoeven, John (R-ND)	\$15,500
Blunt, Roy (R-MO)	\$15,400
Blumenthal, Richard (D-CT)	\$15,250
Moran, Jerry (R-KS)	\$15,000
Leahy, Patrick (D-VT)	\$14,800
Murkowski, Lisa (R-AK)	\$13,000
Schumer, Charles E (D-NY)	\$13,000
Baucus, Max (D-MT)	\$12,500
Durbin, Dick (D-IL)	\$12,500
Pryor, Mark (D-AR)	\$11,500
Reid, Harry (D-NV)	\$11,500
Isakson, Johnny (R-GA)	\$10,500
Rockefeller, Jay (D-WV)	\$8,500
Murray, Patty (D-WA)	\$7,250
Harkin, Tom (D-IA)	\$7,000
Sessions, Jeff (R-AL)	\$7,000
Klobuchar, Amy (D-MN)	\$6,900
Bennet, Michael F (D-CO)	\$6,500

Candidate	Amount
Coons, Chris (D-DE)	\$6,000
Thune, John (R-SD)	\$6,000
Udall, Tom (D-NM)	\$5,750
Grassley, Chuck (R-IA)	\$5,000
Kerry, John (D-MA)	\$5,000
Risch, James E (R-ID)	\$5,000
Reed, Jack (D-RI)	\$4,250
Alexander, Lamar (R-TN)	\$4,000
Lautenberg, Frank (D-NJ)	\$3,800
Lee, Mike (R-UT)	\$3,500
Roberts, Pat (R-KS)	\$3,250
Toomey, Pat (R-PA)	\$3,000
DeMint, Jim (R-SC)	\$2,500
Franken, Al (D-MN)	\$2,300
Hutchison, Kay Bailey (R-TX)	\$2,300
Sanders, Bernie (I-VT)	\$1,200
Boxer, Barbara (D-CA)	\$1,000
Ensign, John (R-NV)	\$1,000
Johanns, Mike (R-NE)	\$1,000
Johnson, Ron (R-WI)	\$500
Merkley, Jeff (D-OR)	\$500
Bingaman, Jeff (D-NM)	\$-500
Lieberman, Joe (I-CT)	\$-1,600

Candidate	Amount
McCain, John (R-AZ)	\$-2,000
Webb, James (D-VA)	\$-3,300
Burr, Richard (R-NC)	\$-20,000

The numbers on this page are based on contributions from PACs and individuals giving \$200 or more.

Has The War Machine Bought Congress? Ten Members Own Raytheon Shares

By: Sarah Jones Aug. 31st, 2013

Obama announced Saturday that [he is rightly taking the issue of Syria to Congress](#), so now people who stand to profit from the matter will have a vote.

There are ten members of Congress who own Raytheon shares, and seven of them are Republicans while three are Democrats. Raytheon is an international aerospace and Defense Company that makes the Tomahawk cruise missiles many speculate would be used in Syria.

Their names via [Open Secrets](#) (scream if you think these folks should have to disclose this when they weigh in on matters related to their financial investments):

Campbell,John	(R-CA)
Carper,Tom	(D-DE)
Cohen,Steve	(D-TN)
Fitzpatrick,Michael	(R-PA)
Hagan,Kay	(D-NC)
Hanna,Richard	(R-NY)
Isakson,Johnny	(R-GA)
Kingston,Jack	(R-GA)
Renacci,Jim	(R-OH)
Upton, Fred	(R-MI)

Sen. Isakson has been pushing for action in Syria for two years. At a [2012 fundraiser](#), Isakson said, “Exactly how we do it and exactly when you pull that trigger is going to be a combination of a number of factors coming together.”

[Rep. Fred Upton also supports an attack, but wants Congress to approve it](#), “The Assad regime’s use of chemical weapons on innocent civilians is atrocious and will not go unanswered by the international community. Anything beyond an expected multi-national effort to establish a no-fly

zone over Syria must require the president to have prior approval of the House and Senate. It is certainly a critical area of the world containing massive U.S. interests, and a stern 'red-line' warning was given months ago.”

Raytheon donated more money to [Mitt Romney](#) in 2012 than to Obama, \$143,806 to \$89,788. They gave just under that to Republican Scott Brown, who took in \$84,350. Their PACs, which gave 4 times more than individuals, gave a majority to Republicans.

You might be thinking that just ten members isn't very many, but on issues of military action, ten can be enough to [win](#) the vote.

Even without the complication of personal financial interest getting the vote in Congress, it's frightening to think of the petty House weighing in on any matter of importance, especially given their [defunding of Libya just to get Obama \(admitted to by Republicans\)](#). They then spent years blaming Obama for their own actions. It's enough to make us wish we could put the House in time out while the grown ups make important decisions.

The delusional media acts as if this House would listen to Obama and then do the right thing. Can the media name an instance in the last 3 years when the Republican House did the right thing in a timely manner if Obama wanted it? It has not happened.

However, that's no justification for not taking it to Congress. The President has bucked tradition and gone old [school](#) constitution on Congress by turning the decision over to them. He set a precedent that will put future Presidents in a tough spot, especially since both parties clamored for Obama to do this.

They thought that Obama would not want to do this, especially with the media repeating ad nauseam that Obama's red line put him in a tough spot. Congress thought they'd save face by being able to avoid a vote on an unpopular military action while appearing as if they were pushing for the "right thing". Obama wasn't having any of it. He said he expects them to do their jobs. Cue the whining from the House that may have to do a day's work in September now.

Obama didn't let them off the hook, so now it's up to Congress. We know they won't do the right thing for the right reason, blinded as they are to hatred of this President and owned as they are by corporate influence. However they vote, it looks as if there are ten votes in the bag for the wrong reason.

Syria: Pro-War Senators Took 83% More Money from Military Industry

Posted: 09/12/2013 3:19 pm

Last week, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted 10 to 7 to approve the use of military force in Syria. A [Maplight](#) analysis reveals that senators voting 'yes' received, on average, 83 percent more campaign money from defense contractors than senators voting 'no.'

These numbers are unnerving to a war-weary American public still licking its wounds from a [\\$2 trillion](#), 10-year quagmire in Iraq justified by [lies](#) about alleged weapons of mass destruction. That public is profoundly [distrustful](#) of its leaders who have achieved [power](#) in a system of, by, and for whichever interests have the most money.

The mere idea that politicians voting on matters of war and peace -- life and death -- could be influenced by contributions is the most perverted money in politics nightmare. You can be sure that senators voting 'yes' on Syria emphatically deny a quid pro quo with military industrial donors, saying that defense lobbyists give them money because they happen to agree on military matters, and because everyone on the Foreign Relations Committee gets [more money](#) from those industries. That's just how the status quo is.

But the status quo is the problem. Politicians should not be allowed to receive money from interests they regulate. Period. As soon as Foreign Relations Committee members take money from the very companies that stand to make millions from military action, we the people can no longer be unequivocally sure that they are making decisions purely on the merits of what's best for our nation.

Even if quid pro quo politics had no role in last week's Syria vote, the glaring problem is that 93 percent of the time, the political candidate with the [most money wins](#). Deep-pocketed interests know the game, so they spend millions on lobbying expenditures, contributions and PAC donations to support their favored candidates -- in this case military hawks who are more likely to support intervention. Can you blame them? They're playing by the rules we give them, and they are playing the system like a Stradivarius while raking in breathtaking profits.

This special interest capture of government and policymaking is the same dysfunction that led to the financial meltdown of 2008; the failure to curb exorbitant profiteering in the [health care](#) industry; the failure to enact policies that actually help the middle class and create jobs, rather than just talk about it... the list goes on.

But in 2013, rather than hear about real solutions to this profound political dysfunction, we await the October 8th opening arguments of the "[McCutcheon v. FEC](#)" Supreme Court case that would make things [even worse](#). It would remove the "aggregate" contribution limits that prevent wealthy donors from giving more than \$123,000 to federal candidates and political parties each election cycle. Yep, our highest court is actually considering a radical "[Citizens United 2](#)" that would yet again slash our already-shredded campaign [finance](#) laws.

This story is not about whether military action in Syria is warranted or not. There are legitimate arguments on both sides of that debate. This is about the fact that the laws that govern campaign [finance](#) and lobbying range from profoundly broken to nonexistent. Congress has become much like a bunch of despots in a lawless nation. Lobbyists give them what they want, and the Supreme Court is their protection racket. It's up to us, the people, to restore law, order, and fairness to the system that funds and elects our lawmakers. And to do that, millions of us must wake up to the gravity of the problem and coalesce around a few winning reform proposals. We must force our leaders to enact those reforms, and we must unseat politicians who stand in our way. We must build a massive movement made up of Americans progressive, conservative and

disaffected as we build an [anti-corruption movement](#) unlike any our nation has ever seen before. This is our only hope, and it's time to get started.

Raytheon Stands To Profit Big From A Syria Strike, But Personnel Safety May Outweigh Civilian Casualties *By ALEXANDER C. KAUFMAN September 03 2013 4*



Raytheon Company re-upped a \$254.6 million contract for Tomahawk Block IV cruise missiles with the U.S. Navy last December. [REUTERS](#)

Now, those tubular, jet-powered missiles – each worth about \$1.45 million – are aimed at Syria.

The Waltham, Mass., defense giant stands to make a killing – pun intended – if Congress green lights President Barack Obama's proposal to strike Syria in the coming weeks.

Already, the White House ordered 196 Tomahawks for fiscal 2013 – totaling about \$320 million. It is requesting the same number for the next fiscal year, at a total cost of about \$5 million, thanks to inflation and a shrinking supply chain, [Politico reported](#).

A spokesman for Raytheon told International Business Times that the Department of Defense asked that all reporter inquiries about weapons that may be used in Syria be directed to the Pentagon.

The 20-foot-long missiles – used widely in Afghanistan, Iraq and, most recently, Libya – will likely garner Raytheon some extra sales to the Pentagon in the coming years, if, say, 100 are fired off at Syrian targets this year.

“It certainly gets some replacement business out of it,” William Hartung, an analyst at the Center for International Policy, told IBTimes. “But compared to the size of the company, it won’t be huge, especially given that the Pentagon budget has leveled off.”

Using the missiles won’t be without consequences, though.

As with the rest of the international community, Washington appears split on whether to bomb Syria, which allegedly used sarin nerve gas to slaughter more than 1,400 civilians in August, according to U.S. officials.

“If you look at what would be the likely strategic objectives of any campaign, like limiting civilian casualties or containing the scope of the conflict, or, for some, tipping the military balance in favor of the opposition,” Jeffrey Martini, a Middle East analyst at the Washington-based Rand Corporation, told IBTimes, “it doesn’t appear that any of the military options the U.S. has would be very effective.”

“It underscores the poor choices the Obama administration has,” he added.

Indeed, while Raytheon boasts about the Block IV missile’s accuracy, Hartung said the projectiles are responsible for some “failed strikes” on al-Qaeda operatives during President Bill Clinton’s administration.

“They’re not as accurate as some other ways of delivering warheads,” he said, hinting that using them could increase the possibility of killing civilians, which seems to be the antithesis of the West’s goals in a country stricken by two years of brutal civil war.

But because they are easily fired from air bases or submarines, they represent a low-risk option for U.S. forces.

And as criticism of Obama being a “reluctant warrior” (repeatedly, just scroll through this Google search) pours in, it’s the choice that keeps U.S. personnel out of harm’s way.

He was similarly called a “reluctant warrior” when he committed U.S. missiles and warplanes to the opposition side in Libya two years ago, a decision which, as Michael Lewis said in Vanity Fair last year, was almost entirely his own.

If U.S. Air Force pilot Tyler Stark had died when his plane was shot down over Libya, history would likely judge Obama as an extension of his predecessor George W. Bush, whose presidency was marred by what most of the world perceived as war-mongering and stars-and-stripes-covered coffins.

Raytheon’s missiles, it seems, may be his safest option.

Records show that Secretary John Kerry has received large sums of money from Raytheon - the company behind the robots can be used in an attack against Syria.



September 9th, 2013 at 10:52, Updated: September 9, 2013 at 14:45

WASHINGTON

It is not anymore about some simple fusiform containers loaded with explosives. Rather, the fast remote controlled robots that precipitates the small wings and can hover over targets plotted by five-meter accuracy.

The delivery of the Tomahawk robotar discussed in the "limited attack" against Syria come from including Group Raytheon whose shares are doing fine. Today, noted the near year high of \$ 77, as against less than 52 dollars. The highs are also defense players Boeing and Northrop Grumman.

In May, Foreign Minister John Kerry on tour of the Middle East and then personally thanked makers in Oman because they had selected Raytheon as a supplier of a land-based air defense. The price tag was 1.2 billion, and was only one of large orders in Raytheon's growing export portfolio.

It was far from the first time John Kerry had to do with Raytheon.

When he was still a senator he reported donations from not just Raytheon but also Boeing and Northrop Grumman. And he is not alone.

Data shows that the small group of U.S. defense conglomerate donate substantial sums to congressional politicians.

Their presence is visible in Washington and neighborhoods around the Pentagon, and in particular has Republican John McCain, who has long called for U.S. efforts in Syria, in total received \$ 1.2 million from defense companies. It displays information from the Center for Responsible politics, which tracks money in politics.

After the terrorist attacks in September 2001 clubbed huge grants and partly to homeland security, and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Now the U.S. has left Iraq and begun their exodus from Afghanistan, which means shrinking defense orders in the longer term. But the words on the home. Abroad spins shops on in relatively good rate.

Substantial proportions of U.S. aid to Israel and Egypt, as well as to Pakistan, goes to the purchase of U.S. defense materials. The shops are extremely important from a job standpoint of the individual members of Congress who have such companies in their districts.

Television network CBS highlighted previously the American small town reliance on this very special type of business. One example mentioned was the General Dynamics that manufactures components for the M1A1 Abrams tank in Archbald, Pennsylvania. Over the years, hundreds of tanks shipped from factories in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Michigan.

In Defense headquarters the Pentagon's own projections seen harder times.

It is envisaged that the budget shrink by 20 percent from the peak years of 2010-11 (about \$ 700 billion in spending per year) until 2017. The same trend was noted in several major cities. Those who suffer are the first private service providers hired largely to be responsible for everything from food service to laundry.

Any "peace dividend" is hardly relevant, notes Pentagon dry in his äskande in April this year with reference to the geopolitical threat from North Korea and Iran. Among the priorities going forward are more visible to elite troops and increased research on cyber warfare.

http://www.svd.se/naringsliv/nyheter/varlden/vapenforetag-betalade-kerry_8498932.svd

The Biggest Assault on Our Democracy Is Coming from the Center of Our Own Government

September 4, 2013 |

"America no longer has a functioning democracy. This invasion of privacy has been excessive, so bringing it to public notice has probably been beneficial —President Jimmy Carter

Millions of Americans will [face](#) a basic question in the coming decade: how much loyalty do we owe a U.S. Executive Branch which extracts huge sums from us to spy upon and lie to us, on the false grounds that doing so is protecting us? Or do we owe our moral allegiance to the ideal of democracy, which requires us to fight the Executive which is its enemy?

Senate Intelligence Committee member Ron Wyden recently issued an urgent [call](#) [3] to "rein in this omnipresent, ever-expanding [surveillance](#) state", warning that "if we don't do it now our generation's going to regret it forever". Wyden and his colleague Mark Udall - who have revealed that even as Senators they have been consistently [denied information](#), [4] [lied to](#) [5], treated like children unable even to [take notes](#) [6], and are even now muzzled from [revealing](#) [7] far more massive Executive subversions of democracy than is known - have become the canaries in the coalmine. They warn us that though still largely odorless, colorless and invisible to most of us, poisonous Executive [power](#) is slowly destroying what remains of a "functioning democracy" in this country.

The meaning of an ex-U.S. President's astonishing statement is clear. For the Executive's threat is not only to "privacy" or "civil liberties" but the very structure of democracy itself. As Wyden and Udall have demonstrated, the Executive Branch has unilaterally seized [power](#) since 9/11, behind a curtain of secrecy, in a way that has destroyed our constitutional system of legislative and judicial "checks and balances" on its power.

This threat has been ignored by many because it so counters our childhood beliefs that our government fights for democracy against foreign enemies. But the evidence clearly indicates that it is the U.S. Executive Branch, not foreigners, which is today U.S. democracy's main enemy. And it also clear that saving our liberties will require a new pro-democracy mass movement as unprecedented as the Executive's post-9/11 [power](#) grab.

It is our own Executive Branch, after all, not a foreign enemy which has unilaterally and [illegally stored](#) [8] our [phone](#) calls and emails without even informing us let alone obtaining the constitutionally-required "[consent of the](#) [9] [governed](#) [9]" to do so; constantly broken the law by violating the [Patriot](#) Act, as its Republican author has [attested](#) [10], and lying to the [Legislative](#) [11] and [Judicial](#) [12] branches; [illegally accessed](#) [13] our private data on tens of thousands of known occasions while falsely claiming they have not - with even these abuses only "[the tip of the iceberg](#)"; [7] attacked freedom of the press by spying on organizations like the [Associated Press](#) [14], [intimidating journalists](#) [15], and trying to [jail](#) [16] them if they do not reveal their sources; seized emails from [private](#) [17] companies and threatened to [jail](#) [18] their CEOs if they revealed it; pushed through a law giving them the right to [assassinate or jail](#) [19] any of us for life without a trial or other opportunity to prove our innocence; classified [trillions of documents](#) [20] annually, [less than 5% of which](#) [21] are of any conceivable use to a foreign enemy, so as to hide evidence of their massive waste, fraud, abuse and crimes; [prosecuted unprecedented numbers of whistleblowers](#) [22] who reveal their secret crimes and abuses; [lied continuously](#) [11] to the American people whenever their mistakes and crimes have been revealed; required millions of their own employees [to inform on each other](#) [23], and even threatened to fire them for simply declining to spy on their colleagues; funded [SWAT teams already abusing their power](#) [24], and provided [paramilitary training and equipment](#) [25] to police forces around the country; begun [using drones domestically](#) [26]; and demanded that the Judiciary make [decisions](#) [27] based only on Executive assertions, as it withhold any evidence for them on the grounds of "national security."

As millions of us come to realize the truth of Wyden's warning over the next decade, we will be forced to ask the most basic of questions: is this the America we grew up believing in, or want to

live in now? And, if not, are we willing to fight for democracy before, as Wyden warns, it is too late? It may sound over-dramatic to the comfortable, complacent, or fearful, but he is correct. Our generation must respond to his call to arms for democracy or it will disappear.

This nation has of course faced threats to democracy in the past, in the last century from the [Palmer raids](#) [28] and jailing of [Eugene V. Debs](#) [29] for speaking out against World War One, [McCarthyism](#) [30], [FBI criminality](#) [31] in the 1960s and beyond, the CIA abuses catalogued by [Senator Frank Church](#) [32] in the mid-1970s, and [Iran-Contra](#) [33] in the 1980s. And, as President [Eisenhower](#) [34] warned us, the "military-industrial" complex has been slowly choking off democracy since the end of World War II.

But the Executive's current assault on democracy is unprecedented. As a result of previous unimaginable technologies of surveillance and control, and the fear generated by the attacks on 9/11, the U.S. Executive has constructed on American soil a massive apparatus of surveillance and potential population control never before seen in our history.

This apparatus includes the mammoth [Department of Homeland Security](#) [35] and intelligence-gathering and police entities located in 17,000 buildings (1) around the nation; giant [data storage](#) [36] and collection centers driven by ever more powerful and intrusive software storing all Americans' phone and Internet data; 72 police/military intelligence "[fusion centers](#) [37]", which have already [begun](#) [38] to [target](#) [39] domestic dissidents; and increasingly [paramilitary-oriented](#) [24] police-departments, often with secret police units. While most of this apparatus is presently directed at potential threats from abroad, it is already devoting an unprecedented amount of time and money surveilling Americans at home. And it can be increasingly turned against the American people, media, Congress and the Judiciary in the likely event of increasing social disruption, and/or new domestic 9/11s, in the coming decade.

And this visible threat to democracy is only part of the problem, as the Executive Branch behaves more like an Occupying Power ruling from above than a democratic institution controlled from below. In the past, it waged its wars abroad and an American middle class still prospered at home. But today its priorities are also accelerating America's economic and social decline, as it wasted [\\$4-6 trillion long-term](#) [40] on two losing wars in the past decade alone and consumes over [\\$1 trillion annually](#) [41], as the middle class slowly disappears.

As America's [economic health](#) [42], [society](#) [43], [infrastructure](#) [44], [schools](#) [45] and [social mobility](#) [46] continue to decline, [the rich grow richer and the poor poorer](#) [47], [automation](#) [48] and the continued [export of jobs](#) [49] leads to rising mass [underemployment](#) [50], our youth are increasingly [indentured](#) [51] by massive student debt, millions of workers can barely survive even when [working two or three jobs](#) [52], and [assaults on the safety net](#) [53] grow, it is inevitable that growing numbers of Americans will protest their conditions. And, unless we rein in the Executive, it will inevitably respond to increased protest with increased police tactics threatening democracy itself.

Self-Censorship: The Worst Abuse

And putting aside the flagrant abuses that we now know about, the creation of an Executive Branch Surveillance State already threatens to cast a subtler and ultimately more disturbing pall over the land.

Conservative columnist Peggy Noonan has properly [written](#) [54] that " a loss of the expectation of privacy in communications is a loss of something personal and intimate, and it will have broader implications", and then approvingly quoted the liberal "Nat Hentoff, the great journalist and civil libertarian," as saying that "Americans will become careful about what they say that can be misunderstood or misinterpreted, and then too careful about what they say that can be understood. The inevitable end of surveillance is self-censorship."

The little jokes so many now make along the lines of "this email is just between you, me and the NSA" suggest that many Americans are already nervous about expressing views, or writing words, that might trigger government scrutiny. And self-censorship is far more pernicious than heavy-handed government censorship. And, worse, there comes a point when we don't even realize we are censoring ourselves anymore, when "dangerous thoughts" are not even brought to consciousness.

Millions of our young people, forced to seek scarce government or corporate jobs to pay off [massive student loans](#) [55], are increasingly fearful of political associations or activities that they fear might hurt their future employment prospects. Many are careful about what they say or write to each other on the phone or in emails and, unconsciously, even what they think.

And, as [McClatchy](#) [56] has reported, millions more federal employees are now required to spy and inform on each other at the risk of losing their jobs. They are not even allowed to remain silent, since employees can be fired if it is subsequently found that they could have reported a co-worker but did not. An estimated 1.4 million public and private sector employees have obtained their "top secret" security clearances by submitting to intrusive and thorough "background checks". They have done so because such a clearance is, in Dana Priest and Bill Arkin's words, "a passport to prosperity for life", offering secure, high-paying jobs. They tend to live close to one another, in some of the wealthiest communities in America. (2)

The result is an increasing tendency toward ["group think"](#) [57] and conformity, as such individuals lose even the capacity for independent thought outside politically prescribed limits. And those charged with protecting our privacy can hardly be trusted to do so when they have already given up their own.

From "Civil Rights" to a New "Democratic Rights" Movement

The Executive's unprecedented threat to democracy requires an unprecedented response. The great mass movements of the postwar era have involved issues of social, economic, gender, sexual and racial justice, war and peace, and the environment. "Civil liberties" have largely been left to organizations like the ACLU.

But now a new "Democratic Rights" movement, with at least as much public support as the "Civil Rights" movement of the 1960s, will be required for democracy to exist. And if

democracy goes, so too will social justice, the environment and peace. A "Democratic Rights" movement is a necessary precondition for everything else.

A New Politics, A New Hope

Until recently it was difficult to even imagine how Executive power could be limited, as a cowed Congress massively funded it after 9/11 while democracy burned. But on July 24, like a bolt of lightning suddenly illuminating a dark graveyard, a surprising [Congressional vote](#) [58] provided the first hope for asserting democratic control over Executive power.

A unique coalition of 111 Democrats and 94 conservatives came within only 7 switched votes of passing a bill to halt the Executive Branch's unconstitutional collection of all Americans' phone and Internet records.

The vote's importance was not only that it was the first major challenge to the Executive's post-9/11 power grab. It also significant showed there was a difference between Congress and the Executive. Overall, Members of Congress are controlled by the economic interests upon whose money they depend for reelection, and they have done nothing to halt climate change, growing inequality, and Executive drone and ground assassination abroad, etc. But this vote suggested that there is daylight between Congress and the Executive on the issue of surveillance and, hopefully, other issues fundamental to democracy. The hope that Congress will create a functioning democracy in America may prove to be naïve. But, if a grassroots movement can arise to support this cause, it will be Americans' only hope of rolling back authoritarian Executive Branch power.

The greatest significance of the Conyers-Amash vote was that embodied a new politics entirely different from the traditional liberal vs. conservative divisions that have brought a moribund Congress to a halt.

This new politics pits both liberal and conservative opponents of government surveillance against an unholy and unprincipled alliance for authoritarianism that includes Barack Obama, Paul Ryan, Nancy Pelosi, Eric Cantor, and John Boehner. After years of gridlock, the House experienced a sudden pushback against Executive power unlike any we have seen in our lifetimes.

This new Congressional coalition gives new meaning to the saying that politics makes strange bedfellows. Republican votes for Conyers-Amash included both principled opponents of surveillance, and those who [support](#) [59] surveillance but want it done entirely by the private sector. And Democratic supporters for the amendment included both principled progressives who have long fought for civil liberties and peace, and more centrist types who have rubber-stamped past Executive war-making without a peep.

It is uncertain whether this unwieldy coalition can hold in coming months given these differences, the gravitational pull of the old politics, and the enormous Executive power and deception they will face. We can safely assume that military-intelligence-police firms and the Pentagon itself are already mercilessly pressuring pro Conyers-Amash Members back in their

districts and in D.C. Mr. Obama and Ms. Pelosi are also strongly lobbying for mass surveillance to continue, covering up their betrayal of democracy with meaningless promises of greater transparency. And even if restrictions on NSA spying on innocent Americans pass the House, they would face an uncertain future in the Senate.

But two things are certain: only if the proto-coalition that favored the amendment can hold and expand in coming years will there be any hope of creating a "functioning democracy" in our nation. And second, for this to happen there will need to be a new grassroots movement of similarly strange bedfellows committed to fighting for democracy.

The Amash-Conyers vote also provided dramatic evidence of how the U.S. Executive does not represent the American people. The Executive was only able to spy on Americans because it deceived them by denying it was doing so. When Americans found out about the spying, however, an Economist [poll](#) [60] showed Americans opposed NSA surveillance by a 59-35 margin. Americans clearly would not have agreed, had the Executive Branch honestly sought "the consent of the governed," to allow it collect all their phone and Internet records. By unilaterally, lawlessly and secretly seizing the power to do so, and lying about it when asked, the Executive Branch has clearly lost its moral legitimacy.

We may obey the Executive because, like any people living under illegitimate power, we fear the legal consequences of disobedience.

But it has clearly forfeited any claim to our moral allegiance.

An Illegitimate Executive Branch Is Endangering Not Protecting Us

The Executive has justified its assaults on democracy, like all authoritarian institutions before it, on the grounds that it is protecting us. We frequently hear, for example, that we must accept less freedom in order to have more security. In fact, under present Executive rule, we have neither.

Executive officials insult reason itself when they claim that to protect us they need to collect billions of innocent Americans' phone calls and Internet records, at a time President Obama himself has said we face a [reduced foreign threat](#) [61] that can best be met by police work. Senators Wyden and Udall have [stated](#) [62] that "we have not yet seen any evidence showing that the NSA's dragnet collection of Americans' phone records has produced any uniquely valuable intelligence."

On August 21, the Washington Post [reported](#) [63] that it took a year-long Electronic Frontier Foundation lawsuit to force the NSA to declassify a secret court ruling revealing they had been illegally spying on American-to-American communications in violation of every public claim they had made on the subject. The idea that this document was classified because some "foreign enemy" could use this FISA report to hurt us is silly. What possible interest could al-Qaeda have in a document proving American agencies were spying on their own people? The FISA court document, like most Executive classified material, was obviously kept secret to hide Executive wrongdoing from Americans not "foreign terrorists".

And not only does Executive Branch spying on innocent Americans at home not protect us. As dozens of national security experts have stated), its foreign drone and ground assassination programs are in fact endangering us (please see [list of experts cited at the end of Part I](#) [64] of this series). They have created exponentially more enemies than they have killed, strengthening U.S. foes and weakening potential allies, and increased the possibility of more domestic terrorist attacks and nuclear materials falling into terrorist hands. A U.S. foreign policy that turns nations like Pakistan into allies not enemies, e.g. by bringing them electricity rather than drones, will make possible the kind of joint police-work which alone can significantly reduce the foreign terrorist threat to America - at a fraction of present vast over-spending.

The Fundamental Moral Issue: Loyalty to Democracy Not the Executive Branch

Article One of the [Federal Code of Ethics](#) [65] adopted by Congress in 1958 states that there is a fundamental distinction between loyalty to country and loyalty to any government entity: "any person in Government service should put loyalty to principles and to country above loyalty to Government persons, party, or department."

As former Army Colonel Andrew Bacevich, who lost a son fighting in Iraq, has [put it](#) [66] in the Washington Post: "to whom do Army privates and intelligence contractors owe their loyalty? To state or to country? To the national security apparatus that employs them or to the people that apparatus is said to protect? What if the interests of the state do not automatically align with those of the country? In that event, the state pursues its own agenda. In doing so, it stealthily but inexorably accumulates power, privilege and prerogatives."

At the start of each new Congress, members [swear](#) [67] to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic." This oath clearly obligates them today to fight democracy's chief domestic enemy today: the U.S. Executive Branch.

And it is not only Members of Congress and Federal Employees who have a duty to fight to preserve democracy against the Executive.

So do we all.

Understanding Democracy's Enemy: The Problem of "True Believers"

In speaking of the U.S. Executive Branch as the enemy of democracy it is important not to demonize its leaders as individuals. They are like most Americans in their off-hours. Many are patriotic and believe that they are protecting the American people, and their patriotism deserves respect. They presumably love their mates, children and pets in the same proportion as does the general population, also hit Home Depot on the weekends, and enjoy sports and "Downton Abbey" as much as any of us. We are not talking about Nazis here.

But when they go to work for the institution we call the Executive Branch, it is a very different matter. They spy on us, we do not surveil them. They take and waste enormous sums of our money, we do not take theirs. They hide their activities from us and lie to us when they are caught - we do not do so to them. They threaten whistleblowers and journalists, we do not. They

claim the right to murder or imprison us without trial, we make no such claim on them. They have endangered us creating exponentially more enemies than they kill, we do not endanger them.

The danger they pose to democracy is not like that of previous authoritarians, who made no secret of their contempt for democracy. On the contrary. This danger arises from people who genuinely think they are protecting democracy even as they destroy it. They have a deep inner need to see themselves as does Rep. Peter King, when he [referred](#) [68] to "the thousands of good men and women who every day dedicate their lives to our country, and particularly General Alexander, who is as patriotic as anyone I have ever met in government or anywhere."

It is the problem of the "True Believer," one of the most dangerous of social phenomena. Their self-righteous need to feel they are protecting us leads them to feel justified in breaking any law and telling any lie in pursuit of their mission. Freedom of the press, telling the American people the truth, obeying the law, are irrelevant to true believers who decide they have a higher calling.

It is the same phenomenon observed during the Iran-Contra scandal after Congress halted military aid to the Contras. Because Executive Branch officials like James Poindexter and Oliver North were so convinced that they were on the side of the angels they felt justified in operating secretly, lying about their actions, and breaking just laws.

As the Executive Comes Home, Americans Can No Longer Ignore Its Illegitimate Power

For the past 50 years many Americans, notably its political-media-intellectual elites who have known the horrific facts, have turned a blind eye to the Executive Branch's murder, maiming and making homeless over 20 million non-Americans, mainly civilians. (Please see [Part 2](#) [69] of this series, "The World's Most Evil And Lawless Institution? The Executive Branch Of The U.S. Government.")

CNN commentator Jeffrey Toobin recently reflected the Washington elite's indifference to this mass murder when he [called for](#) [70] Private Manning's imprisonment because the Foreign Service Officers, " who wrote these cables have devoted their lives to making the world a better place." Like his compatriots, he simply ignored the fact that those Foreign Service Officers have been an integral part of the U.S. Executive apparatus that ruined those 20 million lives, and has in many other nations propped up savage dictatorships practicing mass murder, assassination, torture and incarceration of the innocent.

Joshua Oppenheimer, producer of *The Act of Killing* about the Indonesian army's murder of more than 1 million civilians in the 1960, has [reported](#) [71] that "you can see that the United States made it very clear that, as a condition for future aid, the Indonesian army must go after the whole Communist Party. And they had guys in the State Department compiling death lists for the army—communist leaders, union leaders, intellectuals who were left-leaning. The signal from the U.S. was clear: 'We want these people dead.'"

But as the Executive's indifference to the rule of law and human decency now increasingly comes home, millions of us will no longer be able to ignore Executive wrongdoing. We will be forced to decide whether American democracy is worth fighting for.

Executive Branch secrecy, deception, and surveillance has reached such levels that it has become a revolutionary act simply to insist that U.S. Constitution be obeyed, i.e. that the Executive obtain the "consent of the governed" for its actions - the trailblazing concept by which America replaced the "Divine Right of Kings" with the will of the governed as the basis for legitimate rule.

The Washington political-media elite who call for jailing whistle-blowers for "breaking the law" has lacked the integrity to demand similar punishment for the far more lawless criminal behavior of such Executive Branch officials as NSA chief Keith Alexander and Director of National Intelligence James Clapper.

The recent FISA Court document declassified as a result of an Electronic Frontier Foundation lawsuit, for example, [stated](#) [72] that "the court is troubled that the government's revelations mark the third instance in less than three years in which the government has disclosed a substantial misrepresentation regarding the scope of a major collection program."

Does anything threaten democracy more than when Executive Branch officials repeatedly deceive the Judiciary, as well as the Legislature and American people? Should not this behavior lead to criminal sanctions for General Alexander?

Many mass media journalists ask who gave whistleblowers the right to release classified information. It is a fair question. But they have not dared ask a far more serious question: who gave Executive Branch officials the right to secretly and unilaterally collect all Americans' phone and Internet records?

It certainly wasn't Congress, almost all of whose members had no idea this was going on. The Republican head of the House Judiciary Committee, Bob Goodlatte, recently [stated](#) [73] on Face The Nation that "when this was made known (by) Edward Snowden, the Judiciary Committee conducted a briefing for all of the members of the House. It was very clear then that many of them did not know about these programs or how they worked, including the former chairman of the committee Jim Sensenbrenner who was the chairman when these laws were written and myself." Mr. Sensenbrenner, who wrote the Patriot Act has, [stated](#) [74] that "as I have said numerous times, I did not know the administration was using the Patriot Act for bulk collection, and neither did a majority of my colleagues."

It certainly wasn't the judiciary which allowed the Executive to spy on us, as the Washington Post recently [reported](#) [75]: "the leader of the secret court that is supposed to provide critical oversight of the government's vast spying programs said that its ability to do so is limited and that it must trust the government to report when it improperly spies on Americans."

And it certainly wasn't Mr. Obama, who we now know was elected on false promises that he would bring transparency, respect for civil liberties and a free press, and whistleblower

protection to the Oval Office. He clearly does not have the right to unilaterally and secretly create a Surveillance State in this country without the consent of the governed. Mr. Obama placed his former post as a Constitutional Lecturer at the very core of his identity. Americans certainly did not give him the right to betray them, everything he claimed to stand for, and the constitution. His approval of Executive spying on Americans, and constant lying about it ever since, in no way legitimizes it.

No, the Executive Branch has seized this power simply because it could, in a lawless power grab without precedent in this country. And if democracy is to be preserved here this rule of men not laws, this practice of might makes right, must be ended.

Known Executive Abuses: Only "The Tip Of An Iceberg"

The Washington Post recently [reported](#) [13] on an internal NSA audit revealing that the NSA had violated the law "thousands of times" a year since 2008 at its Fort Meade headquarters alone. And "a single `incident' in February 2012 involved the unlawful retention of 3,032 files that the surveillance court had ordered the NSA to destroy." That is, we now know the NSA had committed tens of thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands, of individual abuses already.

It is important to note also that this audit was kept secret from the American people until Edward Snowden revealed it. Typically, it was not hidden because its contents would help America's enemies. It is laughable to imagine that Ayman al-Zawahari would be helped by knowing that the NSA was constantly breaking American law and lying to its citizens about it. Like the FISA Court report cited above, it was classified secret to keep its findings of NSA abuse from the American people.

This story also revealed that President Obama had again [lied](#) [76] to the American people when he stated eight days earlier that "I am comfortable that the program currently is not being abused". And it was quickly followed by another bombshell. Senate Intelligence Committee members Ron Wyden and Mark Udall, who have been muzzled from revealing specifics, [stated](#) [77] that "we have previously said that the violations of these laws and rules were more serious than had been acknowledged", and we believe Americans should know that even these revelations were but the tip of an iceberg of far greater abuses."

We now know where the most massive Executive Branch abuses of democracy in postwar history have begun. But we have no idea yet where they will end.

A New Movement To Meet "The Generational Challenge"

The surprising support for the amendment forbidding NSA spying on innocent Americans gave hope that Congress could eventually act to curb the Executive's threat to democracy. Amazing even its own sponsors it was only stopped because Mr. Obama and Nancy Pelosi abandoned their core principles to muscle Democrats into opposing it.

In an article entitled "How Nancy Pelosi Saved the NSA Surveillance Program," Foreign Policy Magazine [explained](#) [78] how Pelosi betrayed her own constituents, among the most pro-

civil liberties voters in the nation: "Hill sources say most of the credit for the amendment's defeat goes to House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi. Pelosi privately and aggressively lobbied wayward Democrats to torpedo the amendment". It quoted a Democratic aide as saying that "Pelosi had meetings and made a plea to vote against the amendment and that had a much bigger effect on swing Democratic votes against the amendment than anything (NSA Chief Keith) Alexander had to say." Typically, after killing the bill, the magazine reported that Pelosi sought to cover up her misdeeds: "despite the minority leader's instrumental role in swaying the vote, you won't find her taking credit: She's busy protecting her left flank from liberal supporters of Amash's amendment."

Despite Obama and Pelosi's short-term success in beating back attempts to limit mass spying on Americans against their will, however, the bill represented a watershed in American political life. Providing a desperately needed fresh and cleansing wind blowing across a sick and dying Congress, it foreshadowed a new movement aimed at saving American democracy before it is too late.

In the concluding section of this series we will discuss what the basic goals of a new "Democratic Rights Movement" must be if we are to end the Executive Branch's threat to freedom in this country.

“The World Understands that the American People Are Being Zombified”

Mac Slavo
August 30th, 2013

What exactly is President Obama doing and why all the delays? Is he looking for a way out, in essence telling the Syrians and Russians we are going to strike, but don't worry, we aren't going to go after anything important in the hopes that nothing else will come of it?

Our Commander-in-Chief has not only shown his incompetence in geo-political matters, but has, as Greg Mannarino notes in the commentary below, turned the United States into the laughing stock of the world.

All signs suggest that the President of the United States has no idea what is really going on in the world. And after [Russian troops started piling off ships into Syria](#), and [Vladimir Putin mobilized](#) his Navy and reportedly [threatened a counter-strike](#) on Saudi Arabia, Obama may have realized that he is in way over his head, and that he has brought the world to the brink of global conflict.

Nonetheless, out of [desperation](#) and to save face, the distinct possibility of confrontation remains, and will more than likely be initiated within the next 72 hours.

What is really going on here?

Outlining detail for detail what is going to unfold.

...

What's really going on here people... the President, Kerry, all of them, they're not talking to the American people about this.

They're talking to Russia, they're talking to China, to Syria, to Iran... understand, President Obama is fearful of where this may go.

So, he's laying out the groundwork being as precise as possible... he's giving the Syrian regime, the Syria military all the time they need to move whatever weapons and equipment they may have from high priority targets.

It's a joke. It's being broadcast with such detail you really have to ask yourself, "what is really going on here?"

It's a shame what has happened to our country. we've become the laughing stock – the laughing stock of the world.

Our economy is absolutely in shambles. We understand this.

The world understands that the American people are being zombified and are being completely lied to and misled at every single corner.

The American people are on a need-to-know basis, and based on Secretary of State John Kerry's speech earlier today, we don't need to know:

What do we know?

“And I believe, as President Obama does, that **it is also important to discuss this directly with the American people.** That's our responsibility: to talk with the citizens who have entrusted all of us in the administration and the Congress with responsibility for their security.”

Later

“But still, in order to protect sources and methods, some of what we know will only be released to members of Congress, the representatives of the American people. **That means that some things we do know, we can't talk about publicly.**“

And still later

“So that is what we know. That's what the leaders of Congress now know. **And that's what the American people need to know.**”

Translation: You, the American People, are on a 'need-to-know' basis and you do not need to know. Trust us. We're the government.

The fate of the world is in the hands of sociopaths.

If you're [betting](#) on a peaceful resolution to all this, then you are entrusting your life to people who have done nothing but shifted blame, obfuscated facts, and lied to achieve their long-term globalist agenda.

Study: “Beginning of the Longest Period of Economic Decline in American History”

Mac Slavo

September 5th, 2013

PHOTO COURTESY OF BOHOCOMMUNITY.ORG



Economists will often argue that booms and busts are cyclical. Every [depression](#) or recession we've ever experienced in America has, usually within just a few years, been followed by booming periods of growth.

But, as the best and brightest of the financial world like to say, past performance is not a guarantee of future results.

According to a demographic study from economists at [Cornell University](#) and the Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation, the [recovery](#) that many Americans believe is taking hold right now may not actually be happening. In fact, it could take another 30 years or more...

Keep in mind that [the study](#) takes into account *only* the demographic factors over the next several decades and does not include additional government taxation, currency devaluation, and overall global economic supply & demand factors.

The next few decades could be uncharacteristically bleak, according to a new study.

Demographic factors — which have largely aided the U.S. economy in the past — could end up pushing incomes down for the next 30 years or more. **If other factors don't force incomes up, we may be at the beginning of the longest period of economic decline in American history.**

These trends alone could reduce the median income by 0.43 percentage points per year between now and 2020, 0.52 points per year between 2020 and 2030, and 0.2 points per year between 2030 and 2040.

Those numbers might sound small, but over time they would add up to a significant loss of purchasing power for the typical American and a long era of decline for the nation as a whole.

A typical worker earning \$50,000 today would [earn](#) only about \$48,400 by 2020 if his or her income fell by the amounts projected in the study. The worker's income would fall to about \$45,900 in 2030, \$45,000 in 2040 and to less than \$44,000 in 2050. In a society built upon consumer power and the idea that succeeding generations leap ahead of preceding ones—rather than fall behind them—four decades of falling incomes could be catastrophic.

The study only makes income projections relating to demographic changes.

Other changes could either offset those income declines, or exacerbate them. Future tax hikes or cutbacks in Social Security—some combination of which seems likely, to deal with mounting government debt—would reduce income even more, for instance.

It's no secret that the [middle class is dying](#) a slow and horrible death, which will [ultimately lead to impoverishment](#) of the majority of our population. As of right now [100 million Americans](#) are already living at or near poverty – and this is supposed to be an economic recovery!

The study notes that if you're making \$50,000 today, you'd be making \$45,000 by 2040. And again, this analysis is based strictly on demographic changes.

Now take into account the continued and inevitable destruction of the US dollar. Over the last hundred years, since the establishment of the Federal Reserve, the US dollar has lost over 95% of its value. In another 30 years we can expect a further devaluation, if not an all out collapse. That reduces your purchasing power another 30% or so. In the future, you'll be paying \$10 for a gallon of gas or milk, but making less money.

And that purchasing power decrease doesn't even take into account the increased demand on global resources for economies like China, India, Russia, and Brazil, which are adding more strain on supplies of oil and [food commodities](#). Supply and demand alone will drive prices higher.


Finally, as the government (local, state, and federal) goes deeper into the hole, we can fully expect a number of austerity measures that will include increased taxation on individuals (think Obamacare, which has been officially labeled a tax by the U.S. Supreme Court), cuts in benefits like social security & disability, and increased regulatory fees and burdensome mandates on businesses.

Everything that is being done right now is working against us, on almost every level.

While there may be positive swings in economic growth, wages or real estate prices throughout the next thirty years, the reality is that Americans will continue to get poorer, until there is no middle class left.

We often look to the third-world for an idea of what real poverty looks like, but we don't have to do that anymore.

This trend is now taking shape in the United States, and we'll soon see slums like those in Detroit springing up all over the country to house the tens of millions of people who will be affected by this collapse over coming years.



(Pictured: Slums of Manila)

This is our future.

If we can weather the storm without riots, rebellion and bloodshed it'll be a miracle

Craig B Hulet was both speech writer and *Special Assistant for Special Projects* to Congressman Jack Metcalf (Retired); he has been a consultant to federal law enforcement DEA, ATF&E of Justice/Homeland Security for over 25 years; he has written four books on international relations and philosophy, his latest is *The Hydra of Carnage: Bush's Imperial War-making and the Rule of Law - An Analysis of the Objectives and Delusions of Empire*. He has appeared on over 12,000 hours of TV and Radio: *The History Channel* "De-Coded"; He is a regular on *Coast to Coast* AM w/ George Noory and Coffee Talk KBKW; *CNN, C-Span ; European Television "American Dream"* and *The Arsenio Hall Show; The Carl Nelson Show* live in DC and *Trending with Carl Nelson* syndicated live; he has written for Soldier of Fortune Magazine, International Combat Arms, Financial Security Digest, etc.; Hulet served in Vietnam 1969-70, 101st Airborne, C Troop 2/17th Air Cav and graduated 3rd in his class at *Aberdeen Proving Grounds Ordnance School* MOS 45J20 Weapons. He remains a paid analyst and consultant in various areas of geopolitical, business and security issues: terrorism and military affairs. Hulet lives in the ancient old growth *Quinalt Rain Forest*.