

RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE

A Journal of the Democratic Resistance

JULY 2013

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

THE LEMMINGS ARE MASSING

**IRISH PEOPLE ISSUE WARNING TO BANKS BY SHUTTING DOWN
REPOSSESSION AUCTION**

Awaken Longford; Sovereign Independent via Joe Scanlan

SURVEILLANCE AND THE POLICE STATE: LET US HOLD IT TO ACCOUNT

Colin Todhunter; Global Research

HOW MICROSOFT HANDED THE NSA ACCESS TO ENCRYPTED MESSAGES

Glenn Greenwald, et al; The Guardian; via John NeWELL

ECHELON TODAY: THE EVOLUTION OF AN NSA BLACK PROGRAM

Tom Burghardt; Global Research

WORLD'S MOST INTRUSIVE DATABASE TO GO LIVE IN DECEMBER

Mick Meaney; Activist Post

**SURVEILLANCE STATE: FIRST STEP TO CREATING A SINGLE UNIVERSAL
MIND**

Jon Rappoport; Activist Post

POWER, PROTEST AND SUBVERSION

Critical Thinking

SELF RELIANCE UNDER SEIGE AS EU HERBAL REGULATIONS TAKE HOLD

Lance Devon; via John Newell

FOUR BRAVE MEN - FASCIST EU PERSECUTES WHISTLEBLOWERS

Freenations; via John Newell

**INSIDE BILDERBERG: CLUES LEFT IN THE GROVE HOTEL REVEAL
ANOTHER PIECE TO THEIR FINANCIAL AGENDA**

21st Century Wire via Activist Post

THE SOLE LEGAL PANACEA

Kenn d'Oudney; Democracy Defined

**WHAT PRICE WILL WE PAY FOR GREED? WHY GREED MAY BE OUR
UNDOING**

Ray Williams; Wired for Success; via Critical Thinking

**THE CRIME OF ALLEVIATING POVERTY: A LOCAL COMMUNITY
CURRENCY BATTLES THE CENTRAL BANK OF KENYA**

Ellen Brown; Global Research; Web of Debt

DEBT IN A FREE ECONOMY

D. J. Webb; via Sean Gabb; Libertarian Alliance

ARE LITECOINS THE NEXT BIG THING?

Anna Irrera; Money Beat; via Activist Post

POSITIVE MONEY BULLETIN EXTRACTS

Positive Money Team

EDITORIAL

THE LEMMINGS ARE MASSING

Those who only float on the surface of events might characterise the post World War II period as witnessing the dismantling of colonialism. They might ignore or even discount the fact that political colonialism has been replaced by an even more aggressive economic colonialism.

But, blow me down, here they are building a new empire in Brussels! Across the world other supranational structures are under construction ... ASEAN, NAFTA, the African Union. George Orwell's horrific vision, in *1984*, of a world comprising of militarised continental superstates, in a state of permanent contrived war with one another, is steadily becoming a reality.

Of course, the sheer scale and reach of such structures, creates what we might call homeopathic democracy in which any mandate is so dilute as to be imperceptible and whoever the little people vote in as their representatives an irrelevance. The global super-entity comprising of these supranational structures in alliance with the banks and the

multinational corporations knows best how we should be governed. Oligarchy, in some form, has existed in all ages, but never more than the present.

Against this background, the prospect of a referendum on our membership of the EU is being dangled before us.

But this is not, and never will be, a 'referendum'. Beyond parish polls ... which are in any event merely advisory ... there is no provision for such a process in our constitution. What is being proposed is, in fact, a plebiscite.

The difference is crucial and cannot be emphasised enough. A referendum is a process held as of right. In some countries such as Ireland and Denmark, important and especially constitutional changes will trigger a referendum automatically. In others, such as Switzerland and California, people may demand a referendum on certain issues as of right.

On the other hand, a plebiscite is a process held when no such rights exist and at the behest of the government, usually when it thinks it can win. We have had plebiscites for the governance of Scotland, Wales, and London. Next year there will be a plebiscite on Scottish independence. The only one to have gone wrong from the point of view of the government was John Prescott's ill-fated effort to create a North East assembly.

As the term implies a plebiscite is an opportunity for the plebs to vote. As with 1975, there is absolutely no chance of an EU Plebiscite, if that ever happens, taking place without being hugely gerrymandered.

You could easily write the script. Electoral rules might be changed to allow (as in Scotland, where many think that younger voters are more pro-independence) to allow under-18's of non-British EU citizens to vote, if it is thought that these might favourably effect the outcome. Such rules may also be changed to allow to pro-Europe campaign spend more than the opposition. Campaign expenses will, in any event, be circumvented to allow both Brussels and the Westminster government to spend mind boggling sums on pro-EU propaganda under the pretence of 'public information' ... again much like 1975.

All this will be nothing compared to the economic warfare. The good and the great from the multinational corporations will line up to predict doom, collapse and mass unemployment. We have already had a good whiff of such grapeshot from the US and Japan.

Perhaps it may come to pass the certain hedge funds and banks may be persuaded to speculate against Sterling. Perhaps grants may be offered to relocate industry to the continent. The more totemic the investment, such as BMW's Mini plant at Cowley, the better. The EU recently gave a grant to Ford to relocate from Southampton to Turkey. We pray the price for allowing ownership of so many industries, such as is left of them, to pass beyond our shores, and to the beck and call of every oligarch from Berlin to Tokyo.

If, despite all this, we were still to vote the 'wrong way', the script is very likely to be already in place. The subsequent negotiations would be protracted and replete with all manner of contrived 'difficulties'. More disinvestment blackmail and currency speculation would be applied. We would be subjected to further endless reams of 'public information'. At the end of this process we would be invited to vote again, ostensibly to approve the terms of withdrawal. And we would have to keep voting until we voted the 'right way'.

Those who build empires do not willingly yield them. That the European project, as envisaged by Jean Monnet and his entourage in the 1950's, was to create, by stealth, a European superstate is well documented. It has been equally well disguised in the weasel language of 'integration', 'competences', 'ever closer union', and so forth.

Some talk of a 'federal Europe'. This too is nonsense. Already the level of control by Brussels over vast range of 'competences' from vehicle construction to fisheries, from building specifications to food labelling, from the administration of justice to the regulation of agriculture, goes far beyond anything Washington would be allowed to impose on the constituent states of the USA. The blueprint is very much for a unitary rather than a federal

state.

The Eurosceptic lemmings really must understand how high the cliff is on which they are now massing.

Frank Taylor

IRISH PEOPLE ISSUE WARNING TO BANKS BY SHUTTING DOWN REPOSSESSION AUCTION

Awaken Longford; Sovereign Independent via Joe Scanlan

Allsop Auction...what a day!..what a victory....

Well, what can I say?..today was one of the good days, as everyone will know by now, the scheduled Allsop Space Auction of distressed, repossessed property at the Shelbourne Hotel was cancelled due to the protest organised by Friends of Banking Ireland, FBI, (not friends of Bankers!),

A massive victory for not only FBI but for all the groups who came along and all the individual Irish people who are not aligned to any group who came and supported the common goal.

Allsop Space is an English Company who had no involvement with Ireland until after the Banking Crisis and resulting attack on struggling homeowners and small business people, they are here for one purpose and one purpose only, to cash in on the misery and misfortune of Irish people who have been let down by Banks and betrayed by politicians, I have no axe to grind with any of the Allsop employee's personally but in their alleged "professional" capacity they are not welcome in Ireland, we have a deep-rooted history of dealing with English oppressors and our track record speaks for itself, we will not tolerate their presence now or ever, today is a perfect example of our resolve, a resolve which will only grow as the financial crisis grows!

The Shelbourne Hotel would be well advised to revisit their policy with regard to allowing such events to take place, I was more than sickened to stand in the very room where our constitution was drafted (regardless of which constitution one agrees with) and see the bones of victimised Irish property owners picked over by these foreign vultures. We will not forget!

If I have one small wish that emanates from today, it is that all the groups engaged with fighting the corrupt, insolvent bankers would come together for a real show of strength, to this end I am extending an open invitation to representatives of all groups regardless of who you are to come and attend a meeting which is held by Friends of Banking Ireland at Foleys Pub in Merrion Row Dublin each and every Saturday at 3pm, please nominate one or two representatives from each groups only as the venue is not very big, the focus of this meeting on Saturday next is to concentrate the efforts of all groups in relation a common goal of meeting the banks and their agents (receivers & auctioneer's) head on, building on the momentum generated by the Anglo Tapes and today's victory at the Shelbourne Hotel against Allsops.

We must continue to step up the pressure on all levels and from all angles against the banks and their agents because they will not back off, they will keep coming and coming until they have everything!

<http://awakenlongford.wordpress.com/2013/07/04/allsop-auction-what-a-day-what-a-victory/>

“There’s class warfare, all right, but it’s my class, the rich class, that’s making war, and we’re winning.”

Warren Buffett; thanks to Critical Thinking

SURVEILLANCE AND THE POLICE STATE: LET US HOLD IT TO ACCOUNT

Colin Todhunter; Global Research

Url of this article: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/surveillance-and-the-police-state-let-us-hold-it-to-account/5340786>

"If you are a law-abiding citizen of this country, going about your business and your personal life, you have nothing to fear." British Foreign Secretary William Hague, responding to the revelations of mass surveillance in the US and the UK (BBC's The Andrew Marr Show on 9 June).

What does William Hague take the British public for?

This bureaucrat politician stands in front of the cameras time and again setting out to mislead with his self righteous platitudes. He did it over Libya and tens of thousands lost their lives. His is doing it over Syria with similar results. And he is doing it over mass surveillance by the state.

Do not believe we have nothing to fear. We have much to fear.

Take the case of Stephen Lawrence, for example, who was lawfully 'going about his business' in April 1993, when white racists murdered him while he was waiting for a bus. It has now emerged that, after the murder, four London Metropolitan police officers were deployed to spy on the Lawrence family and Stephen's friends. The Lawrences were just 'law-abiding citizens going about their business'. But undercover police were used to smear the Lawrence family's fight for justice (1). One of those the spies says he job was to hunt for disinformation and dirt in order to stop the Lawrence's justice campaign in its tracks. Nothing to fear from the state Mr Hague.

And then there are the numerous well-documented cases of the police and/or intelligence agencies infiltrating legitimate campaign and protest groups (2) and 'investigating' political parties or prominent figures (3)(4) in order to subvert or discredit them. Let us not forget too (how could we?) the massive police cover ups, none more prominent than the Hillsborough case (5). Still nothing to fear Mr Hague?

But let's not be too harsh on Hague. The same 'terror threat/nothing to fear' script is being read out to the public in the US. Politicians elsewhere are using 'terror' as an excuse for spying on the public at large as well. German Chancellor Angela Merkel is convinced that Germany has to protect itself against potential terrorist attacks by using mass surveillance: "We are dependent on being able to act and not being entirely at the mercy of the terrorists. And today, it's on the Internet that communication takes place." (6)

Alexander Dix, data protection commissioner for the city of Berlin, is a lot more sceptical. He calls for more restraint in the collection of data: "You don't have to follow conspiracy theories in order to suspect that data collected for fighting terrorism will also be used in other areas." (6)

It's all very convenient for politicians to pull out the magic phrase 'war on terror' in a futile attempt to stop any discussion on surveillance in its tracks. If the US-led alliance really wanted to stop or drastically reduce terrorism, it should listen to journalist Nir Rosen's advice: stop committing it (7).

We need more monitoring and surveillance

The likes of Obama, Kerry, Hague or Cameron have become experts in churning out their fear-mongering platitudes by using some abstract notion of 'we' to imply 'the nation' or the 'national interest'. But 'we' – the ordinary folk – need to hold power to account, to question its legitimacy and to challenge it when it is illegitimate.

We need to do this to help guarantee our safety, our common interests, our freedoms and threats to democracy. How about more but bottom-up monitoring and surveillance in terms of transparency within government and accountability to ensure decisions are properly scrutinized and genuinely open to public debate. In the absence of this, we have corruption, profiteering and the revolving door between government and big business, which all ensure that the powerful and wealthy get away with murder, quite literally when it comes to their illegal wars and mass killing.

In the absence of real democracy, we have food safety/regulation authorities being hijacked by corporate interests in order to feather their own nests. We have armaments companies using politicians as their sales lackeys. We have police and intelligence agencies infiltrating, harassing or subverting legitimate groups that have every right to protest, dissent and oppose. We have a wide range of powerful corporate players that lobby, threaten or buy their way towards casting the world in their own

self-serving nuclear, retail, biotech, petro-chemical or pharmaceutical image. And we have banks, industries and whole economies that are undemocratically owned and controlled.

We also have 'stuff' being sprayed onto us without our consent (or very often knowledge) and have no power to stop 'stuff' from being sprayed onto us (8).

But we are told all this top-down surveillance and all of the increasing unfreedoms are for our own good. We are told that public servants serve us by bowing down to elite interests. We are told that an incredible mass media is credible even though it serves a corporate agenda.

Based on his research for the book *Who Killed Diana?*, the late journalist Simon Regan stated that it is (paraphrased):

Whitehall that really runs the country with a close-knit Mafia-like clique... made up of a handful of powerful, but low-key, City brokers and financiers; the top brains at the Foreign Office, the Treasury, the Ministry of Defence and the Trade Department. Key figures in the security forces... and... at least one key member of the prime minister's secretariat... the police and judiciary... through the Home Office... can certainly be manipulated. The Super-Establishment's power is based upon its ability to manipulate the level below it – the individuals that most people believe are governing our country. The elected government is almost irrelevant... The world in which the Super-Establishment exists is a grey and murky world in which sensitive matters of state are planned and executed in gentlemen's clubs. It is where manipulation plots are hatched, whether it is manipulation of a certain minister towards a certain viewpoint, or the wholesale orchestration of a Foreign Office ploy to bring down a foreign government... It is almost the divine mission of the secret services to protect the status quo, and hitherto it has been their full intention to thwart anyone who tried to disrupt it. The actual existence of the Super-Establishment is not a flight of fancy. It is entirely manipulative and exercises a great deal of power behind the scenes. (9)

The elite, the oligarchs, the ruling class, the one percent – call it how you will. Yet it is we, the people, who are spied on and monitored by them for their good, to serve their interests and to feather their highly privileged and secretive world, a world built on the stolen wealth of both past and present deeds. But don't worry about any of this. There is no need. If that nice Mr Hague says we've nothing to fear, he must be right.

Notes

- 1) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/video/2013/jun/24/undercover-police-stephen-lawrence-video>
- 2) <http://towardfreedom.com/europe/2337-the-political-policing-of-dissent-in-the-uk>
- 3) <http://www.lobster-magazine.co.uk/articles/rrtalk.htm>
- 4) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2009/oct/06/mi5-union-leaders-surveillance>
- 5) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hillsborough_disaster
- 6) <http://www.dw.de/how-much-surveillance-do-we-need/a-16888265>
- 7) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dW0eiPiuUuk>
- 8) <http://www.countercurrents.org/todhunter260613.htm>
- 9) <http://shoestring911.blogspot.co.uk/2007/08/british-establishment-revealed.html>

HOW MICROSOFT HANDED THE NSA ACCESS TO ENCRYPTED MESSAGES

Glenn Greenwald, et al; The Guardian; via John Newell

- Secret files show scale of Silicon Valley co-operation on Prism
- Outlook.com encryption unlocked even before official launch
- Skype worked to enable Prism collection of video calls
- Company says it is legally compelled to comply

Skype worked with intelligence agencies last year to allow Prism to collect video and audio conversations. Microsoft has collaborated closely with US intelligence services to allow users' communications to be intercepted, including helping the National Security Agency to circumvent the company's own encryption, according to top-secret documents obtained by the Guardian.

The files provided by Edward Snowden illustrate the scale of co-operation between Silicon Valley and the intelligence agencies over the last three years. They also shed new light on the workings of the top-secret

Prism program, which was disclosed by the Guardian and the Washington Post last month. The documents show that:

- Microsoft helped the NSA to circumvent its encryption to address concerns that the agency would be unable to intercept web chats on the new Outlook.com portal;
- The agency already had pre-encryption stage access to email on Outlook.com, including Hotmail;
- The company worked with the FBI this year to allow the NSA easier access via Prism to its cloud storage service SkyDrive, which now has more than 250 million users worldwide;
- Microsoft also worked with the FBI's Data Intercept Unit to "understand" potential issues with a feature in Outlook.com that allows users to create email aliases;
- In July last year, nine months after Microsoft bought Skype, the NSA boasted that a new capability had tripled the amount of Skype video calls being collected through Prism;
- Material collected through Prism is routinely shared with the FBI and CIA, with one NSA document describing the program as a "team sport".

The latest NSA revelations further expose the tensions between Silicon Valley and the Obama administration. All the major tech firms are lobbying the government to allow them to disclose more fully the extent and nature of their co-operation with the NSA to meet their customers' privacy concerns. Privately, tech executives are at pains to distance themselves from claims of collaboration and teamwork given by the NSA documents, and insist the process is driven by legal compulsion.

In a statement, Microsoft said: "When we upgrade or update products we aren't absolved from the need to comply with existing or future lawful demands." The company reiterated its argument that it provides customer data "only in response to government demands and we only ever comply with orders for requests about specific accounts or identifiers".

In June, the Guardian revealed that the NSA claimed to have "direct access" through the Prism program to the systems of many major internet companies, including Microsoft, Skype, Apple, Google, Facebook and Yahoo.

Blanket orders from the secret surveillance court allow these communications to be collected without an individual warrant if the NSA operative has a 51% belief that the target is not a US citizen and is not on US soil at the time. Targeting US citizens does require an individual warrant, but the NSA is able to collect Americans' communications without a warrant if the target is a foreign national located overseas.

Since Prism's existence became public, Microsoft and the other companies listed on the NSA documents as providers have denied all knowledge of the program and insisted that the intelligence agencies do not have back doors into their systems.

Microsoft's latest marketing campaign, launched in April, emphasizes its commitment to privacy with the slogan: "Your privacy is our priority." Similarly, Skype's privacy policy states: "Skype is committed to respecting your privacy and the confidentiality of your personal data, traffic data and communications content."

But internal NSA newsletters, marked top secret, suggest the co-operation between the intelligence community and the companies is deep and ongoing.

The latest documents come from the NSA's Special Source Operations (SSO) division, described by Snowden as the "crown jewel" of the agency. It is responsible for all programs aimed at US communications systems through corporate partnerships such as Prism.

The files show that the NSA became concerned about the interception of encrypted chats on Microsoft's Outlook.com portal from the moment the company began testing the service in July last year. Within five months, the documents explain, Microsoft and the FBI had come up with a solution that allowed the NSA to circumvent encryption on Outlook.com chats

A newsletter entry dated 26 December 2012 states: "MS [Microsoft], working with the FBI, developed a surveillance capability to deal" with the issue. "These solutions were successfully tested and went live 12 Dec 2012." Two months later, in February this year, Microsoft officially launched the Outlook.com portal.

Another newsletter entry stated that NSA already had pre-encryption access to Outlook email. "For Prism collection against Hotmail, Live, and Outlook.com emails will be unaffected because Prism collects this data prior to encryption."

Microsoft's co-operation was not limited to Outlook.com. An entry dated 8 April 2013 describes how the company worked "for many months" with the FBI – which acts as the liaison between the intelligence agencies and Silicon Valley on Prism – to allow Prism access without separate authorization to its cloud storage service SkyDrive.

The document describes how this access "means that analysts will no longer have to make a special

request to SSO for this – a process step that many analysts may not have known about".

The NSA explained that "this new capability will result in a much more complete and timely collection response". It continued: "This success is the result of the FBI working for many months with Microsoft to get this tasking and collection solution established."

A separate entry identified another area for collaboration. "The FBI Data Intercept Technology Unit (DITU) team is working with Microsoft to understand an additional feature in Outlook.com which allows users to create email aliases, which may affect our tasking processes."

The NSA has devoted substantial efforts in the last two years to work with Microsoft to ensure increased access to Skype, which has an estimated 663 million global users.

One document boasts that Prism monitoring of Skype video production has roughly tripled since a new capability was added on 14 July 2012. "The audio portions of these sessions have been processed correctly all along, but without the accompanying video. Now, analysts will have the complete 'picture'," it says.

Eight months before being bought by Microsoft, Skype joined the Prism program in February 2011.

According to the NSA documents, work had begun on smoothly integrating Skype into Prism in November 2010, but it was not until 4 February 2011 that the company was served with a directive to comply signed by the attorney general.

The NSA was able to start tasking Skype communications the following day, and collection began on 6 February. "Feedback indicated that a collected Skype call was very clear and the metadata looked complete," the document stated, praising the co-operation between NSA teams and the FBI. "Collaborative teamwork was the key to the successful addition of another provider to the Prism system."

ACLU technology expert Chris Soghoian said the revelations would surprise many Skype users. "In the past, Skype made affirmative promises to users about their inability to perform wiretaps," he said. "It's hard to square Microsoft's secret collaboration with the NSA with its high-profile efforts to compete on privacy with Google."

The information the NSA collects from Prism is routinely shared with both the FBI and CIA. A 3 August 2012 newsletter describes how the NSA has recently expanded sharing with the other two agencies.

The NSA, the entry reveals, has even automated the sharing of aspects of Prism, using software that "enables our partners to see which selectors [search terms] the National Security Agency has tasked to Prism". The document continues: "The FBI and CIA then can request a copy of Prism collection of any selector..." As a result, the author notes: "these two activities underscore the point that Prism is a team sport!"

In its statement to the Guardian, Microsoft said:

"We have clear principles which guide the response across our entire company to government demands for customer information for both law enforcement and national security issues. First, we take our commitments to our customers and to compliance with applicable law very seriously, so we provide customer data only in response to legal processes"

'Second, our compliance team examines all demands very closely, and we reject them if we believe they aren't valid. Third, we only ever comply with orders about specific accounts or identifiers, and we would not respond to the kind of blanket orders discussed in the press over the past few weeks, as the volumes documented in our most recent disclosure clearly illustrate.'

'Finally when we upgrade or update products legal obligations may in some circumstances require that we maintain the ability to provide information in response to a law enforcement or national security request. There are aspects of this debate that we wish we were able to discuss more freely. That's why we've argued for additional transparency that would help everyone understand and debate these important issues.'

In a joint statement, Shawn Turner, spokesman for the director of National Intelligence, and Judith Emmel, spokeswoman for the NSA, said: "The articles describe court-ordered surveillance – and a US company's efforts to comply with these legally mandated requirements. The US operates its programs under a strict oversight regime, with careful monitoring by the courts, Congress and the Director of National Intelligence. Not all countries have equivalent oversight requirements to protect civil liberties and privacy." They added: "In practice, US companies put energy, focus and commitment into consistently protecting the privacy of their customers around the world, while meeting their obligations under the laws of the US and other countries in which they operate."

- This article was amended on 11 July 2013 to reflect information from Microsoft that it did not make any changes to Skype to allow Prism collection on or around July 2012.

ECHELON TODAY: THE EVOLUTION OF AN NSA BLACK PROGRAM

Tom Burghardt; Global Research

Url of this article:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/echelon-today-the-evolution-of-an-nsa-black-program/5342646>

People are shocked by the scope of secret state spying on their private communications, especially in light of documentary evidence leaked to media outlets by former NSA contractor Edward Snowden.

While the public is rightly angered by the illegal, unconstitutional nature of NSA programs which seize and store data for retrospective harvesting by intelligence and law enforcement officials, including the content of phone calls, emails, geolocational information, bank records, credit card purchases, travel itineraries, even medical records—in secret, and with little in the way of effective oversight—the historical context of how, and why, this vast spying apparatus came to be is often given short shrift.

Revelations about NSA spying didn't begin June 5, 2013 however, the day when The Guardian published a top secret FISA Court Order to Verizon, ordering the firm turn over the telephone records on millions of its customers “on an ongoing daily basis.”

Before PRISM there was ECHELON: the top secret surveillance program whose all-encompassing “dictionaries” (high-speed computers powered by complex algorithms) ingest and sort key words and text scooped-up by a global network of satellites, from undersea cables and land-based microwave towers.

Past as Prologue

Confronted by a dizzying array of code-named programs, the casual observer will assume the spymasters running these intrusive operations are all-knowing mandarins with their fingers on the pulse of global events. Yet, if disastrous US policies from Afghanistan and Iraq to the ongoing capitalist economic meltdown tell us anything, it is that the American superpower, in President Nixon's immortal words, really is “a pitiful, helpless giant.”

In fact, the same programs used to surveil the population at large have also been turned inward by the National Security State against itself and targets military and political elites who long thought themselves immune from such close attention.

Coupled with Snowden's disclosures, those of former NSA officer Russell Tice (first reported here and here), revealed that the agency—far in excess of the dirt collected by FBI spymaster J. Edgar Hoover in his “secret and confidential” black files—has compiled dossiers on their alleged controllers, for political leverage and probably for blackmail purposes to boot.

While Tice's allegations certainly raised eyebrows and posed fundamental questions about who is really in charge of American policy—elected officials or unaccountable secuocrats with deep ties to private security corporations—despite being deep-sixed by US media, they confirm previous reporting about the agency.

When investigative journalist Duncan Campbell first blew the lid off NSA's ECHELON program, his 1988 piece for New Statesman revealed that a whistleblower, Margaret Newsham, a software designer employed by Lockheed at the giant agency listening post at Menwith Hill in North Yorkshire, England, stepped forward and told the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in closed session, that NSA was using its formidable intercept capabilities “to locate the telephone or other messages of target individuals.”

Campbell's reporting was followed in 1996 by New Zealand investigative journalist Nicky Hager's groundbreaking book, *Secret Power*, the first detailed account of NSA's global surveillance system. A summary of Hager's findings can be found in the 1997 piece that appeared in

CovertAction Quarterly.

As Campbell was preparing that 1988 article, a report in the Cleveland Plain Dealer alleged that arch-conservative US Senator Strom Thurman was one target of agency phone intercepts, raising fears in political circles that “NSA has restored domestic, electronic, surveillance programmes,” said to have been dialed-back in the wake of the Watergate scandal.

Ironically enough, congressional efforts to mitigate abuses by the intelligence agencies exposed by the Church and Pike Committees in the 1970s, resulted in the 1978 creation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. However, as The New York Times reported July 7, that court “in more than a dozen classified rulings . . . has created a secret body of law giving the National Security Agency the power to amass vast collections of data on Americans,” a “parallel Supreme Court” whose rulings are beyond legal challenge.

In an 88-page report on ECHELON published in 2000 by the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC) Newsham said that when she worked on the development of SILKWORTH at the secret US base, described as “a system for processing information relayed from signals intelligence satellites,” she told Campbell and other reporters, including CBS News’ 60 Minutes, that “she witnessed and overheard” one of Thurman’s intercepted phone calls.

Like Thomas Drake, the senior NSA official prosecuted by the Obama administration under the 1917 Espionage Act, for information he provided The Baltimore Sun over widespread waste, fraud and abuse in the agency’s failed Trailblazer program, Newsham had testified before Congress and filed a lawsuit against Lockheed over charges of sexual harassment, “corruption and mis-spending on other US government ‘black’ projects.”

A year earlier, in a 1999 on the record interview with the Danish newspaper Ekstra Bladet, Newsham spoke to journalists Bo Elkjaer and Kenan Seeberg, telling them of her “constant fear” that “certain elements” within the US secret state would “try to silence her”; a point not lost on Edward Snowden today.

“As a result,” the newspaper reported, “she sleeps with a loaded pistol under her mattress, and her best friend is Mr. Gunther—a 120-pound German shepherd that was trained to be a guard and attack dog by a good friend in the Nevada State Police.”

“To me,” the whistleblower said, “there are only two issues at stake here: right or wrong. And the longer I worked on the clandestine surveillance projects, the more I could see that they were not only illegal, but also unconstitutional.”

“Even then,” between 1974 and 1984 when she worked on ECHELON, it “was very big and sophisticated. As early as 1979 we could track a specific person and zoom in on his phone conversation while he was communicating,” Newsham averred. “Since our satellites could in 1984 film a postage stamp lying on the ground, it is almost impossible to imagine how all-encompassing the system must be today.”

When queried about “which part of the system is named Echelon,” Newsham told the reporters: “The computer network itself. The software programs are known as SILKWORTH and SIRE, and one of the most important surveillance satellites is named VORTEX. It intercepts things like phone conversations.”

Despite evidence presented in her congressional testimony about these illegal operations, “no substantive investigation took place, and no report was made to Congress,” Campbell later wrote.

“Since then,” the British journalist averred, “investigators have subpoenaed other witnesses and asked them to provide the complete plans and manuals of the ECHELON system and related projects. The plans and blueprints are said to show that targeting of US political figures would not occur by accident, but was designed into the system from the start.” (emphasis added)

This would explain why members of Congress, the federal Judiciary and the Executive Branch itself, as Tice alleges, tread lightly when it comes to crossing NSA. However, as information continues to emerge about these privacy-killing programs it should also be clear that the agency’s prime targets are not “terrorists,” judges or politicians, but the American people themselves.

In fact, as Snowden stated in a powerful message published by WikiLeaks: “In the end the Obama administration is not afraid of whistleblowers like me, Bradley Manning or Thomas Drake.

We are stateless, imprisoned, or powerless. No, the Obama administration is afraid of you. It is afraid of an informed, angry public demanding the constitutional government it was promised—and it should be.”

How did we get here? Is there a direct line from Cold War-era programs which targeted the Soviet Union and their allies, and which now, in the age of capitalist globalization, the epoch of planet-wide theft and plunder, now targets the entire world’s population?

ECHELON’s Roots: The UKUSA Agreement

Lost in the historical mists surrounding the origins of the Cold War, the close collaboration amongst Britain and the United States as they waged war against Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan, by war’s end had morphed into a permanent intelligence-military alliance which predated the founding of NATO. With the defeat of the Axis powers, a new global division of labor was in the offing led by the undisputed superpower which emerged from the conflagration, the United States.

Self-appointed administrator over Europe’s old colonial holdings across Africa, Asia and the Middle East (the US already viewed Latin America as its private export dumping ground and source for raw materials), the US used its unparalleled position to benefit the giant multinational American firms grown larger and more profitable than ever as a result of wartime economic mobilization managed by the state.

By 1946, the permanent war economy which later came to be known as the Military-Industrial Complex, a semi-command economy directed by corporate executives, based on military, but also on emerging high-tech industries bolstered by taxpayer-based government investments, was already firmly entrenched and formed the political-economic base on which the so-called “American Century” was constructed.

While resource extraction and export market domination remained the primary goal of successive US administrations (best summarized by the slogan, “the business of government is business”), advances in technology in general and telecommunications in particular, meant that the system’s overlords required an intelligence apparatus that was always “on” as it “captured” the flood of electronic signals coursing across the planet.

The secret British and US agencies responsible for cracking German, Japanese and Russian codes during the war found themselves in a quandary. Should they declare victory and go home or train their sights on the new (old) adversary—their former ally, the Soviet Union—but also on home grown and indigenous communist and socialist movements more generally?

In opting for the latter, the UK-US wartime partnership evolved into a broad agreement to share signals and communications intelligence (SIGINT and COMINT), a set-up which persists today. In 1946, Britain and the United States signed the United Kingdom-United States of America Agreement (UKUSA), a multilateral treaty to share signals intelligence amongst the two nations and Britain’s Commonwealth partners, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Known as the “Five Eyes” agreement, the treaty was such a closely-guarded secret that Australia’s Prime Minister was kept in the dark until 1973!

In 2010, the British National Archives released previously classified Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) files that provide an important historical overview of the agreement. Also in 2010, the National Security Agency followed suit and published formerly classified files from their archives. Accompanying NSA’s release was a 1955 amended version of the treaty. It’s secretive nature is clearly spelled out: “It will be contrary to this Agreement to reveal its existence to any third party unless otherwise agreed by the two parties.”

In 2005, 2009 and 2013, The National Security Archive published a series of previously classified documents obtained from NSA under the Freedom of Information Act that revealed agency thinking on a range of subjects, from global surveillance to cyberwar.

What we have learned from these sources and reporting by Duncan Campbell and Nicky Hager, are that the five agencies feeding the surveillance behemoth, America’s NSA, Britain’s GCHQ, Canada’s Communications Security Establishment (CSE), Australia’s Defence Signals Directorate (DSD) and New Zealand’s Government Communications Security Bureau (GCSB), are

subdivided into first and second tier partners, with the US, as befitting a hyperpower, forming the “1st party” and the UK, Australia, Canada and New Zealand forming “2nd party” partners.

Under terms of UKUSA, intelligence “products” are defined as “01. Collection of traffic. 02. Acquisition of communications documents and equipment. 03. Traffic analysis. 04. Cryptanalysis. 05. Decryption and translation. 06. Acquisition of information regarding communications organizations, procedures, practices and equipment.”

“Such exchange,” NSA informed us, “will be unrestricted on all work undertaken except when specifically excluded from the agreement at the request of either party and with the agreement of the other.”

“It is the intention of each party,” we’re told, “to limit such exceptions to the absolute minimum and to exercise no restrictions other than those reported and mutually agreed upon.”

This certainly leaves wide latitude for mischief as we learned with the Snowden disclosures.

Amid serious charges that “Five Eyes” were illegally seizing industrial and trade secrets from “3rd party” European partners such as France and Germany, detailed in the European Parliament’s 2001 ECHELON report, it should be clear by now that since its launch in 1968 when satellite communications became a practical reality, ECHELON has evolved into a global surveillance complex under US control.

The Global Surveillance System Today

The echoes of those earlier secret programs reverberate in today’s headlines. Last month, The Guardian reported that the “collection of traffic” cited in UKUSA has been expanded to GCHQ’s “ability to tap into and store huge volumes of data drawn from fibre-optic cables for up to 30 days so that it can be sifted and analysed. That operation, codenamed Tempora, has been running for some 18 months.”

Then on July 6, The Washington Post disclosed that NSA has tapped directly into those fiber optic cables, as AT&T whistleblower Mark Klein described to Wired Magazine in 2006, and now scoops-up petabyte scale communications flowing through the US internet backbone. The agency was able to accomplish this due to the existence of “an internal corporate cell of American citizens with government clearances.”

“Among their jobs documents show, was ensuring that surveillance requests got fulfilled quickly and confidentially.”

Following up on July 10, the Post published a new PRISM slide from the 41-slide deck provided to the paper by Edward Snowden.

The slide revealed that “two types of collection” now occur. One is the PRISM program that collects information from technology firms such as Google, Apple and Microsoft. The second source is “a separate category labeled ‘Upstream,’ described as accessing ‘communications on fiber cables and infrastructure as data flows past’.”

Recently, Der Spiegel, reported that NSA averred the agency “does NOT target its 2nd party partners, nor request that 2nd parties do anything that is inherently illegal for NSA to do.” This is an outright falsehood exposed by former Canadian Communications Security Establishment (CSE) officer Mike Frost.

In a 1997 CovertAction Quarterly exposé, Frost recounted how “CSE operated alone or joined with NSA or GCHQ to: intercept communications in other countries from the confines of Canadian embassies around the world with the knowledge of the ambassador; aid politicians, political parties, or factions in an allied country to gain partisan advantage; spy on its allies; spy on its own citizens; and perform ‘favors’ that helped its allies evade domestic laws against spying.”

“Throughout it all,” Frost insisted, “I was trained and controlled by US intelligence which told us what to do and how to do it.”

Everyone else, Der Spiegel reports, is fair game. “For all other countries, including the group of around 30 nations that are considered to be 3rd party partners, however, this protection does not apply. ‘We can, and often do, target the signals of most 3rd party foreign partners,’ the NSA boasts in an internal presentation.”

It should also be clear that targeting isn't strictly limited to the governments and economic institutions of "3rd party foreign partners," but extends to the private communications of their citizens. Der Spiegel, citing documents supplied by Snowden, reported that the agency "gathered metadata from some 15 million telephone conversations and 10 million Internet datasets." The newsmagazine noted that "the Americans are collecting from up to half a billion communications a month in Germany," describing the surveillance as "a complete structural acquisition of data."

Despite hypocritical protests by European governments, on the contrary, Snowden disclosed that those "3rd party" partners are joined at the hip with their "Five Eyes" cousins.

In a recent interview with Der Spiegel, Snowden was asked if "German authorities or German politicians [are] involved in the NSA surveillance system? Yes, of course. We're in bed together with the Germans the same as with most other Western countries. For example, we tip them off when someone we want is flying through their airports (that we for example, have learned from the cell phone of a suspected hacker's girlfriend in a totally unrelated third country—and they hand them over to us. They don't ask to justify how we know something, and vice versa, to insulate their political leaders from the backlash of knowing how grievously they're violating global privacy."

Disclosing new information on how UKUSA functions today, Snowden told the German newsmagazine: "In some cases, the so-called Five Eye Partners go beyond what NSA itself does. For instance, the UK's General [sic] Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) has a system called TEMPORA."

"TEMPORA," the whistleblower averred, "is the signals intelligence community's first 'full-take' Internet buffer that doesn't care about content type and pays only marginal attention to the Human Rights Act. It snarfs everything, in a rolling buffer to allow retroactive investigation without missing a single bit."

"Right now," Snowden said, "the buffer can hold three days of traffic, but that's being improved. Three days may not sound like much, but remember that that's not metadata. 'Full-take' means it doesn't miss anything, and ingests the entirety of each circuit's capacity. If you send a single ICMP packet and it routes through the UK, we get it. If you download something and the CDN (Content Delivery Network) happens to serve from the UK, we get it. If your sick daughter's medical records get processed at a London call center . . . well, you get the idea."

We do; and thanks to Edward Snowden we now know that everyone is a target.

WORLD'S MOST INTRUSIVE DATABASE TO GO LIVE IN DECEMBER

Mick Meaney; Activist Post

(This seems a natural corollary to the report on Scotland's Orwellian plans for children. The Scottish government continues to propagate the myth that a system exists which cannot be hacked or blagged - Ed)

Scotland plans to introduce a new highly intrusive database that will record every citizen's personal details from "cradle to grave",.

The Data Sharing and Linking Service (DSLS), the world's most intrusive database, is scheduled to go live in December and will begin logging and monitoring the name, dates of birth, genders and postcodes for everyone in Scotland, including health records, maternity details, mental health, cancer, GP and even dental notes.

Education, childhood and parenting profiles will also be stored. Social care, housing and justice statistics, as well as information from the 2011 Scottish Census – which includes financial and salary details, religious and sexual orientation, relationships and family life, will also be held in the database.

There is also the suggestion that the system will contain DNA records.

Ministers have lashed out at the plan saying it will turn millions of Scots into human guinea pigs at the expense of civil liberties.

Nick Pickles, director of campaign group Big Brother Watch, called the system "an identity card

system without the piece of plastic”.

He added:

“This is an unprecedented effort to open up our personal information to huge numbers of people across the public sector by joining up lots of separate databases to the point they might as well be one enormous database. We may live in tough times, but that’s no justification to sell-out the privacy of Scots for a short term gain or in the hope that companies are going to pay for the chance to use the country as a massive research lab. Sadly many parts of the public sector have a dubious record when it comes to protecting this kind of information and I’m afraid it is going to lead to some harrowing intrusions on people’s privacy.”

Mairi Clare Rodgers, director of media relations for Liberty, added: “Plans to access highly personal details via a large, unwieldy centralised database raise major concerns – these proposals fail to even mention ‘consent’ and without proper safeguards there’s a real risk data will be lost or misused.”

A Scottish Government spokeswoman said:

“The Data Sharing and Linkage Service will help by providing researchers with secure access to anonymous data. This government is committed to improving Scotland’s public services. Over the past few years we have been working together with our partners to use data that already exists in a way that is efficient, safe and secure and is fully respectful of people’s privacy.”

More news and videos can be found at Mick Meaney’s site RINF.com where this article first appeared.

SURVEILLANCE STATE: FIRST STEP TO CREATING A SINGLE UNIVERSAL MIND

Jon Rappoport; Activist Post

“Technical barriers to grafting one person’s head onto another person’s body can now be overcome, says Dr. Sergio Canavero, a member of the Turin Advanced Neuromodulation Group.” (Quartz.com July 2)

So...imagine we were living in that kind of society 50 years up the road. We might get something like the following:

Finally...

Your job at the Central General Corporation brings you a longed-for special perk. You can sign up and get on the list for a new mind.

The technical description of the surgery is over your head, but the basics are thrilling.

Two solid improvements are speed and accuracy. You will think 20 times faster, and your rate of mistakes will drop to .01%. Your IQ will rise by a minimum of 50 points.

There is also an automatic signal when a problem you’re working on won’t resolve. Your left ear lobe burns. This informs you that, no matter how hard you try, you won’t be able to come to a useful conclusion. You’ll save a great deal of time.

The new mind you’re getting contains several basic elements:

157,893 generalizations (or premises) deemed to be truthful;
a deductive logic program that is ironclad;
and an instantly accessible technical library adjusted to your job.

The library automatically generates, collates, and summarizes the best available information re the problem you’re working on, in line with the previously installed generalizations (premises) and the logic program. For an additional fee, you can opt for a social program that will enable you to shift out of work-mode and communicate effectively with colleagues, friends, and family.

The left-ear-lobe burn signal will go live whenever social conversations touch on controversial issues. This is your cue to back away and seek other company.

Your new mind will be monitored 24/7 from a combined NSA-DHS node that ensures proper functioning. If repairs are needed, a partial shutdown will deploy. Corrections will normally take less than three hours.

There is also a bullpen function. Persistent questions for which there is no available answer; personal reflections and contemplations; and any instance of social, political, financial, or existential

claustrophobia will all be funnelled to a dead space where they will linger and progressively fade.

A tiny but important Grand Slam Package will translate any thoughts once deemed to be creative into a sludge-mesh, where the velocity of transmission will slow to one synaptic flash per hour. In other words, you'll achieve close to a zero rate on imagination.

At the perimeter of your new mind is the Cattle Farm. Slow moving, meaningless, and random tautologies circulate there, efficiently blocking exit from the space of consciousness. You're centered where you're most needed, where you can perform usefully and swiftly.

The most delicate aspect of the new-mind surgery involves connecting programmed thought-impulses with neurotransmitters and hormones. Throughout the day, you'll think thoughts that trigger a carefully groomed and modulated pleasure-quotient. The overall effect will stimulate you to conclude you are satisfied. A leak-proof algorithm will regulate the interplay of this satisfaction with the delight of being able to think faster. The consequent sum will define that elusive quality called happiness.

Thought-forms called Border Collies will continuously roam the space of your mind and organize stray electrical effects, bringing them into symmetrical globular wholes. These wholes will automatically constitute your "aesthetic sense."

At night, while you sleep, regions of mind unreachable by the surgery will naturally expend extraordinary energies of outrage, resentment, resistance, and pure hatred. This is quite normal.

Scooper Drones will siphon off those energies and their attendant emotional wildfires into Sponge Wardens at seven key National Institutes of Health laboratories, where researchers will utilize them to build Strategic "Arab Spring" Platforms.

NASA is preparing to launch the Platforms. They will circle the Earth and beam wide-spectrum rage at key sites where wars, revolutions, and inciting events are deemed necessary to update mega-corporate healing enterprises. Further specific information on these corporate operations is, at present, classified.

But know you are contributing to a higher-order resolution of planetary conflict.

It's estimated that, with your new mind in tow, you'll require full overhauls every three years. During these periods of hospitalization, you'll experience total shutdown. You families, friends, and co-workers will be notified in advance.

As an historical note of interest, you recall, I'm sure, the so-called spying, the so-called Surveillance State, back in the old days. Yes?

Most people didn't realize the program was the first attempt to create a single Universal Mind.

It's about feedback:

When people know their every action and thought is monitored and watched, they naturally decide to change their thoughts, trim them down, make them more simple and lucid...so there is no misunderstanding.

You see?

The Surveillance State was really the first crude new-mind surgery that we have today.

But now we can guarantee the result. The science has advanced majestically. The surgery is extremely specific and comprehensive.

Fifty years ago, people didn't understand why the NSA and other organizations were spying on everybody all the time. It wasn't merely to stop terrorist attacks. So why?

Now it's all clear. It was step one in a lengthy process of coordinating and manufacturing all minds to move as One.

Central Planning for Planet Earth must restructure brains so they perform, in various ways, to produce what we call The Whole X.

What is The Whole X? It's the meshing of all human thought and function that will indeed produce the greatest good for the greatest number.

Whole X is the plan from above. It calculates every move and every thought-pattern the billions of Earth inhabitants undertake, during every hour of every day. Whole X dispenses justice and goods and services and sustainability from Nome to Tierra Del Fuego.

How can these four elements be parcelled out unless, at the level of mind, the rational processes of every human are coordinated?

Yes, we've come a long way from Spy Headquarters. That was then; this is now.

We've walked the path from the Bill of Rights to the Bill of the Mind.

Use your gifts wisely.

To those who lament the loss of freedom, privacy, and imagination, consider that those qualities led us to the brink of extinction. We turned the corner and found enduring peace in our time.

For more information, log on to The Church of Absolute Inescapable Unity.

Jon Rappoport is the author of two explosive collections, The Matrix Revealed and Exit From the Matrix, Jon

was a candidate for a US Congressional seat in the 29th District of California. Nominated for a Pulitzer Prize, he has worked as an investigative reporter for 30 years, writing articles on politics, medicine, and health for CBS Healthwatch, LA Weekly, Spin Magazine, Stern, and other newspapers and magazines in the US and Europe. Jon has delivered lectures and seminars on global politics, health, logic, and creative power to audiences around the world. You can sign up for his free emails at www.nomorefakenews.com

POWER, PROTEST AND SUBVERSION

Critical Thinking

The Bilderberg meeting in Watford and the subsequent G8 meeting in Northern Ireland, are attracting attention from Occupy and beyond. Hitherto, Bilderberg has been characterised either as manifestation of an evil cabal seeking world dominance or a talking shop for the great and the good, with no political significance. More rabid elements of opposition have achieved celebrity status through colourful description of Bilderberg participants as Zionists, Nazis, the Illuminati etc. In many ways, these more extreme claims (deliberately?) undermine real concern about the undemocratic nature of these meetings held in closed session.

It is (just) possible to put a benign interpretation on the Bilderberg meetings, held annually since 1954, but it would be naive not to recognise their threat to democratic government and individual liberty. The malign consequences of centralised power are self evident and the ruling elites have achieved an arrogance that "they know best" while living in a rarefied atmosphere, isolated from the realities of life for the majority of people. That they have worked for their self-interest is revealed by the numbers relating to inequality - while most in the western world have suffered declining living standards, the rich have got considerably richer. As Warren Buffett, one of the richest men in America, declared, "there's been a class war for the last 30 years and my class has won." (For the record, Buffett is not a Bilderberg attendee although he does have the ear of presidents and bankers.)

Bilderberg matters because it is where bankers (responsible for criminal behaviour and the biggest economic catastrophe in history) collude with politicians, industrialists, military and intelligence leaders, resource and oil company executives, "defence" companies, big pharma, insurers, central banks, the World Trade Organisation, Google, Amazon, European royalty and selected media participants chosen for their discretion. Prospective leaders are fêted at Bilderberg before their appointment, to bring them into the fold and ensure the collective will of the elites is carried through to national and international policy - Clinton, Blair and Obama were all attendees prior to their elevation to office. Think of how media ownership is concentrated and how influential media coverage is in elections and then consider how democracy is undermined by this collusion of interests. Justification for illegal wars is orchestrated through a similar process - think about whose interests are served. Mark Carney (a Goldman Sachs alumnus) attended last year's Bilderberg meeting in Chantilly, USA immediately prior to being appointed the next Governor of the Bank of England by regular Bilderberg attendee, George Osborne, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the UK government.

For those interested in creating a better world, knowledge and understanding of Bilderberg and its implications are essential, irrespective of the more colourful claims of celebrity activists.

SELF RELIANCE UNDER SEIGE AS EU HERBAL REGULATIONS TAKE HOLD

Lance Devon; via John Newell

The "all knowing" think they can govern the land, the plants, traditional herbal medicine, and each individual person, however they choose. That's why they have begun implementing the European Traditional Herbal Medicinal Products Directive all across Europe. As new regulations on herbal products take hold, the EU is telling the world that people cannot be trusted to self-regulate, self-medicate, and survive on their own. That's why they've put together a regulation committee to ensure everyone's continued "safety."

The all-wise regulators think they know your body best.

As the European Union injects new controls onto traditional herbs and other natural products,

people seeking herbal treatment for common ailments are being forced to rely less on themselves and more on the all knowing. This is putting people everywhere at a disadvantage. Using, trading, and selling herbs is becoming an underground business, as expensive licensing is driving up the costs and making herbal trade a black market. The new regulatory directive (ETHMPD), which came into effect April 30, 2011, established an approval process for herbal medicines, requiring each EU Member State to establish a traditional herbal registration scheme. Herbal products that are sold and manufactured must now do so with an appropriate license, including a full marketing authorization and a traditional herbal registration, which are to fully outline the safety, quality, efficacy, and evidence of traditional use.

Herbal wisdom - a valuable learned skill for the days ahead

This is driving up the cost of traditional remedies. Some shops cannot carry remedies that have been safely used for centuries. The increasing scarcity of remedies should be igniting passion in any self-driven, self-sufficient European to want to learn how to grow, wild craft, and use herbal remedies from their own home. In doing so, people will find a sense of self freedom and self-reliance they've never had before. The ability to treat oneself in their own home will set people free from a medical industry that is more costly than ever before. The ability to share and trade remedies with neighbors and friends will become a valuable learned skill in the days ahead. Informational and how-to books on herbs and their proper use are available to all. Herbs have been used for centuries. This kind of natural food and medicine is what helped the population arrive to where it is today.

Regulations to keep everyone "safe"

Michael McIntyre, chairman of the The European Herbal and Traditional Medicine Practitioners Association, thinks that regulations will increase safety. He cheered on the government's new regulations, "The Government is to be congratulated on making the right decision to bring in statutory regulation for all those prescribing herbal medicines. It is terribly important to have responsible people who have undergone training prescribing these products."

By regulating traditional, natural wellness, the EU is telling the people that they should not trust one another or themselves, but should trust the regulatory advice of the all powerful state. How can these new regulatory procedures be trusted? The regulators don't understand how an herb may work for each individual person. Each person is unique and must understand their own body's signals. Learning to trust and treat oneself will be valuable in the years ahead, as regulations make traditional remedies harder to attain. The good news about herbs is that they can be grown freely and used right at home, without regulation and license.

Who do you trust? So do regulations always lead to safety? It all depends on who you trust. Do you trust a government regulatory commission that has very little experience with any of the herbs they are banning and regulating? Or do you trust the collective experiences of herbalists, experience written into books, and personal insight? The liberty for each individual to understand their own body is essential to future health. It may in one's best interest to trust personally learned knowledge from books, experience, and others testimonies. Survival forward will be rooted in the self-driven ones, who aren't afraid to take a risk and trust oneself with the care of their own health. Herbs should remain freely accessible, fun to learn, and unregulated.

Sources for this article include:

<http://www.dw.de>

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-13215010>

<http://www.independent.co.uk>

<http://www.gopetition.com/petition/39757.html>

About the author: Lance Devon is an Entre-Health-Leader who's creating an all natural products movement from the ground up: Free Spirit All Natural Products. As more hearts are pulling toward natural solutions in a world of toxins and propaganda, Lance believes real health opportunities exist. Try out his Liberty Soap here: www.allnaturalfreespirit.com

FOUR BRAVE MEN - FASCIST EU PERSECUTES WHISTLEBLOWERS

Freenations; via John Newell

So, as in all Orwellian nightmares it is the reporter of crimes who is arrested or persecuted and the real criminals are not even investigated never mind put on trial. Such is the fascist nature of the European Union and of the European Governments which kow-tow to its anti democratic power.

Paul van Buitenen was a senior member of the EU's own Audit Commission when he revealed facts about the £6,000m losses in the EU budget due to fraud and mismanagement. He was threatened by Commission employees and taken to view guns stored on Commission premises - very subtle!

Bernard Connolly, who was Head of the Commission department responsible for working on the introduction of the Euro, and who wrote the book "The Rotten Heart of Europe" was excluded from Commission buildings, his picture was put up in public corridors, he was ordered, illegally, not to leave the country, his phone was tapped, his wife was followed in the street and received many nuisance telephone calls and his house was broken into. In other words a deliberate programme of vicious intimidation by those European Institutions which David Cameron thinks are essential to Britain's future!

Hans Martin Tillack, a Journalist for the German magazine Stern, published material exposing corruption in the European Commission's statistical office, Euro-Stat. Belgian police seized documents and his computer in raids on his home and office in March 2004. The well-known Brussels reporter said he was interrogated for hours without being granted contact with anybody and his treatment sparked worldwide condemnation from media and journalists' organisations. Aiden White of the European Federation of Journalists said: "The commission makes unsubstantiated allegations against a reporter and then gets access to his confidential files which potentially compromise anyone who has talked to him. It is a shocking denial of justice to journalists and their sources". It was not until 2009 that Tillack was eventually exonerated when he was awarded 10,000 Euros damages and 30,000 Euros costs by the Belgian Government. It was not the only time that heavy handed, not to say oppressive, actions of the Belgian Police did the dirty work for the Commission.

Ashley Mote, the former UKIP MEP, who has done much to expose fraud, corruption and illegality in the European Union to a wider audience, had his home raided, his phone and documents taken by the police following the publication of his memoirs "A Mote in Brussels Eye".

Three months later (June 2013) he has heard nothing. No accusations, no arrest, no explanation as to what he might have done wrong. Despite several letters to the Chief Constable and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire he still does not know (In this once free country of the rule of law!):

- Why the raid took place at all
- On what grounds the police were granted a search warrant
- By whom, and at what court the warrant was signed
- Why it referred to "the offences" without explanation, clarification or the use of the qualifying word "alleged"
- Who or what organisation persuaded the police to act
- Why they did not talk to him first, assuming there was anything to talk about
- Why they have kept his mobile phone for so long
- Why they have retained a few papers since early March, none of which can be of any relevance to anyone else, having returned the rest almost immediately
- Why they have refused to answer any questions or explain themselves

Mote writes:

In addition to all that, my entirely reasonable questions seeking an explanation of Chief Constable Andy Marsh's prima facie breaches of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 also remain unanswered. So do my questions to Hampshire's newly-elected Police and Crime Commissioner, Simon Hayes, who seems not to have exercised his own responsibilities to challenge the Chief Constable under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, Section 1(7).

Mote knows his law and so is of course a big threat to the fascist powers of the EU and the extension of those powers through the spineless British Government. All this I warned about in publications since 1989 for the European structures being built were a clear indication of the resurrection of those corporatist fascist ideas, economics and politics which we thought we had defeated in 1945. No one in Britain can say they

were not warned!

A written question about the police raid on my home was asked in the European Parliament and answered by the Lithuanian Commissioner for "Taxation, Customs, Statistics, Audit and Anti-Fraud", Algirdas Semeta. He denied any knowledge of my affairs since 2010. It is always possible, of course, that he was being economical with the truth, as the European Commission so often is. A letter from my MP Damian Hinds to the Home Secretary was side-stepped by the junior minister Damian Green who took three pages to say I should complain to the Independent Police Complaints Commission. Evasion at every turn.

Mote's "crime" of course is to spend so much time credibly exposing EU corruption something which the pathetic British press, if they still had an ounce of democratic sense would also be exposing and thus defending people like Mote. One of Mote's efforts involved taking several boxes of carefully documented and thoroughly researched evidence to the Serious Fraud Office (all of which was ignored and dismissed with contempt), to Scotland Yard (ditto), to a committee of the House of Lords (whose europhile chairman chose to turn a blind eye) and numerous MPs on both sides of the House of Commons (who were never able to gather enough support for effective action).

So, as in all Orwellian nightmares it is the reporter of crimes who is arrested or persecuted and the real criminals are not even investigated never mind put on trial. Such is the fascist nature of the European Union and of all the European Governments which kow-tow to its totalitarian power.

THE SOLE LEGAL PANACEA

Kenn d'Oudney; Democracy Defined www.democracydefined.org

(This slightly edited recent email from Kenn d'Oudney underscores points made previously in these pages. Firstly that under Common Law, if that were functioning properly and as it should, the law is not the property of any administrative, legal or political elite, but the property of the people. Secondly, juries are sovereign. Thirdly, it follows that juries ... again with the caveat that this is how things ought to be rather than as they are ... have the power not merely to delineate guilt or innocence, but to strike down law itself if they consider that law to be unjust, onerous, oppressive or disproportionate.

There has been much said and written recently about the revival of the Commons. It is most disappointing to see that the notion of the law as the central keystone of that Commons has received, so far as I know, no discussion in such circles - Ed)

The authentic Constitutional Trial by Jury Justice System operates either

(i) as a means of cost-free private civil, criminal or fiscal prosecution to establish rights and punish or obtain redress for wrongs, including those committed by judges, politicians people in government,

or

(ii) as a right by which to establish a person's innocence (lack of guilt or liability) in defence from all and any fines, summary punishments, accusation or prosecution.

Be it known: Trial by Jury is the ONLY peaceful means known to mankind by which to prevent or redress the deeds and punish the personnel of a government bent on injustice. Common Law Trial by Jury is the unique overall cure for the numerous government-inflicted injustices against which you and we are campaigning.

By contrast, petitions and the numerous separate and disparate causes (including regarding victims of injustice) generally prove to be examples of wasted effort because, in most cases, they cannot win...
...they do not campaign for restoration of the citizen's authority to judge and overrule the iniquitous legislation and the decisions of corrupted, prejudiced, and incompetent judges;
...they seldom bring relief to victims of judicial wrongdoing; and
...they do not bring about permanent expunction (repeal) of unjust laws and unconstitutional procedures by which the Trial by Jury is illegally denied.

These latter worthy goals are only achieved by (RESTORATION of) Trial by Jury.

Advising people that their method of campaigning is fundamentally flawed and going up a 'cul de sac', a blind alley, is a thankless task, but it remains the fact that until the Constitutional Trial by Jury Justice System is restored giving authority to decide justice issues to the randomly chosen 'ordinary' adults men and women sitting in the Jury, all and any gains or concessions achieved by petitions and appeals can be promptly reversed by subsequent legislation from Westminster or Brussels.

Bear in mind that population controls and even the right to have and be part of a family are subject to legislation adopting the unconscionable Platonic treaties of the NWO UNO Agendas, which are here to stay -- unless the People re-take control of their own destiny and well-being. This can only be peacefully achieved by the people having control over the system of the enforcement of law. This is the issue above all others, and by which injustices are prevented or put to rights.

The Common Law Trial by Jury is indispensable (and installed within Constitutions) not only to protect the people from common crimes by ascertaining guilt or innocence of the accused and where necessary apportioning retribution, but also, of transcendent importance, it is explicitly and precisely emplaced as a barrier to protect the vast mass of innocent citizenry from the crimes of arbitrary government, i.e., unjust laws, tyranny; and from the corruption, prejudices and incompetence of fallible judges.

This is achieved by the two aspects of Constitutional Common Law Trial by Jury as mentioned above: one for private, cost-free prosecution (by single or multiple plaintiffs); the other as jurors judging on the justice of the law, and, by pronouncing the Not Guilty Verdict, annulling any law or act of enforcement which is deemed unfair or unjust to the accused, according to the juror's conscience (i.e., sense of right and wrong).

RESTORATION of the sovereign power of the Jury referred to in Item (i) above, would swiftly produce ALL the goals which we all seek; economic, socio-political and legislative.

All societies, regardless of time or place, race, culture, religion, background or nationality, govern by their Justice System. The power to punish carries with it ALL power. It remains a universal eternal criterion of justice that the validity and justice of laws and all acts of their enforcement require to be judged not by those who make and enforce the laws (government), but by those who voluntarily agree to abide by the laws (all the adult citizens).

All who do not uphold this tenet are then promoting unlawful rule by a tyrannical élite. Unwittingly, or for self-advantage, they serve despots, abet tyranny, and are the criminal enemies of freedom and equal justice.

Because the fairness and justice of the laws and all acts of law enforcement require to be judged by those who agree to abide by the laws, according to natural law, common law, constitutional law, and the paramount requirement for Equal Justice, the Common Law Trial by Jury of ordinary adult citizens in which the jurors judge the justice of the law and each act of enforcement, is the only justice system which is legal and just everywhere, for all process of law, civil, criminal and fiscal.

That is why Common Law Trial by Jury is installed by all legitimate constitutions as the sole justice system for all crimes (unimpeachable), civil, criminal and fiscal.

On the aforesaid grounds, there is NO legal enforcement of ANY law but by the Trial by Jury. It is uniquely in the nature of Trial by Jury that juries fulfil the function and purpose of law in a democratic society. These are to maintain Justice by protecting the citizen from injustice and crime of all kinds, whether perpetrated by the state or by other citizens; and to uphold the rights, freedom and legitimate interests of all.

The Juror is sovereign* in Trial by Jury.

*Definition: Sovereignty, pre-eminence; the supreme and independent power expressed through the making and enforcing of the laws.

Trial by Jury defines democracy, sine qua non. Within a Hellenic or modern democracy...

The Jury Comprises the Supreme Legislature and Judicature.

THIS CASE RULING EXEMPLIFIES DEMOCRACY AT WORK:

"If the jury feels the law is unjust, we recognise the undisputed power of the jury to acquit even if its verdict is contrary to the law as given by the judge, and contrary to the evidence."

"If the jury feels that the law under which the defendant is accused is unjust, or that exigent circumstances justified the actions of the accused, or for any reason which appeals to their logic or passion, the jury has the power to acquit, and the courts must abide by that decision."

United States v. Moylan; U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 1969, 417 F. 2d 1002.

Neither in the United States, Britain, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, nor in all of Continental Europe and elsewhere, have legislatures ever been invested by the People with authority to impair the powers, to change the oaths, or abridge the jurisdiction of jurors to govern government; nor to remove the universal Right of the accused to the Trial by Jury of peers for any charge or offence whatever, however serious or trivial.

Today, U.S. v Moylan is not exemplified by the modus operandi of courts. Democracy has been overturned by miscreant politicians and judiciary, and the genuine emancipatory Trial by Jury is no more (ref. the illegally denied simple Juror's Duties definitive of Trial by Jury, which are delineated on the webpage).

Sabine,

ALL those worthy causes, restitution, compensation and redress will be swiftly WON by folks following RESTORATION of the Juror's Authority to decide such issues in the People's all-powerful Courts of the Constitutional Common Law Trial by Jury backed by the full apparatus of police, prison service and Armed Services.

Restoration permanently removes unconstitutional undue 'authority' from the felonious one-sided government-paid judges, Trial by Jury justly restoring this supreme sovereign rôle to We the People.

INSIDE BILDERBERG: CLUES LEFT IN THE GROVE HOTEL REVEAL ANOTHER PIECE TO THEIR FINANCIAL AGENDA

21st Century Wire via Activist Post

As the dust had settled from Bilderberg's global weekender held at The Grove Hotel in Watford, England, some members of the alternative media stayed on site continuing to dig for answers...

Investigative journalists from the UK Column, American Free Press and Sovereign Independent accidentally wandered into a presentation suite at the Grove – only discover the remnants of a presentation by Thomson Reuters which Bilderberg organisers had neglected to take down after the event. It read “unleashing the power of our unified platform on financial markets”.

Of course this reminds us of a similar international cartel, or syndicate called LIBOR, where bankers successfully gamed global interest rates enabling them to reap easy billions at the expense of the lower classes. Money for nothing. They did so with impunity, all but laughing in public at any attempt to bring any of the gold collar criminals to book for financial fraud and racketeering.

It's no coincidence that LIBOR's biggest inside player was also in attendance at Bilderberg 2013. The teflon banker himself – the elusive Marcus Agius, the former Group Chairman of Barclays, and chairman of the British Bankers Association (BBA). It's worth pointing that LIBOR's rate scam was being calculated and published by Thomson Reuters on behalf of the BBA.

Only days after, events on the news wires – of international banking tycoon gaming the world's currency markets – provided the connection to this topic discussed behind closed doors between members of the global industrial and political elite.

Why would Thomson Reuters advertise to Bilderberg Attendees? It is easy to see that Reuters would do so at a financial event for City of London traders or casino bank managers, but politicians and industrialists? How likely is it that the attending bankers were not already aware of the implications of Reuters trading platforms?

Was this just an advertisement, or were Reuters running some kind of presentation? Those who saw the room first hand certainly left with the opinion Reuters had given a presentation of some kind.

If that is the case, then the question becomes what is meant by “unleashing the power ... on financial markets?”

Perhaps some news released by Bloomberg yesterday gives a clue what happens when Reuters trading platform is unleashed on financial markets, for we seem to have yet another global manipulation scandal on our hands, possibly even more significant than LIBOR.

Bloomberg reported yesterday that five whistleblowers who have been working as foreign exchange traders have stated that the \$5 trillion foreign exchange market is rigged. They allege that the world's biggest banks have been systematically manipulating the foreign exchange rates used to set the value of trillions of dollars of investments and derivatives. The main target of this has been pension

funds all over the world. Not surprisingly the centre of this activity has been the City of London, just as with LIBOR.

The traders told Bloomberg that the banks were actively trading against their clients by making use of a 60 second window in which trading is supposed to be paused. The traders told Bloomberg that, "dealers colluded with counterparties to boost chances of moving the rates."

The Financial Conduct Authority, one of the bodies set up to replace the Financial Services Authority, says it is investigating and is speaking to the relevant parties.

Which platform is used to distribute the Foreign Exchange rates? None other than Thompson Reuters, as with LIBOR. The same Thompson Reuters which took part in Bilderberg.

WHAT PRICE WILL WE PAY FOR GREED? WHY GREED MAY BE OUR UNDOING

Ray Williams; Wired for Success; via Critical Thinking

(An interesting, and not altogether academic question, is the extent to which elites attract psychopathic and sociopathic individuals, or turn people into such individuals - Ed)

"Greed is good," Gordon Gekko trumpeted in the movie Wall Street. And don't the past few years provide plenty of evidence for that assertion? But while popular stereotypes often depict poor people as the most likely to lie and steal, new research shows that it's actually the wealthy who tend to behave unethically.

A study by Dr. Paul Piff at the University of California, Berkeley, published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, contends that wealthy people are more likely to lie, cheat and break the law for personal gain without compunction. The study concluded, "upper class individuals unethical tendencies are accounted for, in part, by their more favorable attitudes toward greed."

Seven experiments such as aggressive driving of a car, lying in a negotiation and cheating to win a prize, using different kinds of measures in different situations, comprised the study. One part of the study involved observing a large number of cars at a pedestrian crosswalk. The researchers found that almost 50% of the "higher-status" cars such as a Mercedes did not yield to pedestrians, while almost all of the "lowest-status" vehicles did yield.

Stephane Cote of the University of Toronto's Rotman School of Management, who co-authored the study with Piff concluded, "we found a trend that upper class individuals—people who have the most money, the most income, the best education and the most prestigious job—have a tendency to engage in less ethical behavior."

While there are examples of wealthy people who are generous and seemingly not motivated by greed—such as Warren Buffet, Bill Gates and George Soros—money seems to have a damaging effect in most cases, Piff concludes.

Piff also cited a 2008 study of shoplifting that found upper-income and more educated participants were more likely to have reported shoplifting in their lives. This finding is reflected in the book, *The Steal*, by Rachel Shteir, who cites the increased incidence of "ethical stealing" during the recession is due to the fact that people feel less guilty about stealing when they see the excess of celebrities and other wealthy people. Shteir cites a study that finds Americans with incomes of \$70,000 a year shoplift 30% more than those earning \$20,000 a year.

Another piece of research that examines the capacity for compassion and empathy of wealthy people compared to less wealthy people, is relevant here.

Michael Kraus, a researcher at the University of California, whose study was published in the journal *Psychological Science*, concludes that wealthy people are less adept at reading others' emotions in comparison with uneducated and poor people. Krause concluded that people from lower economic backgrounds often have to rely on others, whereas wealthy people don't ask for help often. Krause argues that wealthy people may be "less concerned and less perceptive of other people's needs and wishes. They show a deficit in empathetic accuracy."

The study's co-author Dacher Keltner, of the University of California says, "we are living in a period of historically high inequality [and] people in positions of power are not going to see [the inequality]. They are going to be blind to it and that has enormous implications for how we educate leaders, why they may not see what's obvious and why they may not even understand the suffering of the people below them."

The research cited is consistent with the studies that show wealthy people give less to charity than poor people. In a study by Paul Piff and his colleagues at the University of California and published in the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, they found that lower class individuals were prepared to devote a much greater share of their income to support charity than wealthy people. This study is supported by the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, which shows that people at the lower end of the income scale give almost 30% more of their income in comparison with the middle class and wealthy.

At the same time, the wealthy may have developed an attitude of aggressive entitlement. Economist Paul Krugman, writing in the New York Times, argues that "self-pity among the privileged has become acceptable, even fashionable," and "a belligerent sense of entitlement has taken hold."

The problem of ethically challenged behavior of the wealthy may become worse because income inequality is growing. The U.S. is the most economically stratified society in the western world. The Wall Street Journal reported a recent study that the top .01% or 14,000 American families hold 22.2% of the wealth and the bottom 90% or over 133 million families, hold just 4% of the nation's wealth. The U.S. Census Bureau and the World Wealth Report of 2010 both indicated wealth increased for the top 5% of households even during the recession. Based on Internal Revenue Service figures, the richest 1% has tripled their cut of America's income pie in one generation.

The gap between the wealthiest Americans and the middle-and-working-class Americans has more than tripled in the past three decades according to a 2010 report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. New data shows the gap in after-tax income between the richest 1% of Americans and the middle and poorest parts of the population in 2007 was the highest it's been in 80 years, while the share of income going to the middle 1/5 of the Americans shrank to its lowest level ever.

The Pew Foundation study, reported in the New York Times concluded, "The chance that children of the poor or middle class will climb up the income ladder, has not changed significantly over the last three decades." The Economist's special report, Inequality in America, concluded, "The fruits of productivity gains have been skewed towards the highest earners and towards companies whose profits have reached record levels as a share of GDP."

But it's not just income disparities that create problems, it's the accompanying social inequalities in health, education and other social indicators. Between 1983 and 1999, men's life expectancy decreased in more than 50 U.S. counties, according to a study by the Harvard School of Public Health. For women, the news was even worse; life expectancy decreased in more than 900 counties—more than a quarter of the total. The U.S. no longer boasts anywhere near the world's longest life expectancy. It doesn't even make the top 40. In this and in many other ways, the richest nation on earth is not the healthiest.

Research indicates that high inequality reverberates through societies on multiple levels, correlating with, if not causing, more crime, less happiness, poorer mental and physical health, less racial harmony, and less civic and political participation. Tax policies and social welfare programs, then, take on importance far beyond determining how much income people hold onto.

The level of inequality we allow represents our answer to a "very important question," says Nancy Krieger, of Harvard University, and that is, "what kind of society do we want to live in?"

There are clear disturbing indicators from the research of Piff, Keltner and others, that the dominance of the wealthy, along with their apparent disposition for greed and unethical behavior, will feed the trend of income inequality, at the cost of well being for millions of Americans.

THE CRIME OF ALLEVIATING POVERTY: A LOCAL COMMUNITY CURRENCY BATTLES THE CENTRAL BANK OF KENYA

Ellen Brown; Global Research; Web of Debt

Former Peace Corps volunteer Will Ruddick and several residents of Bangladesh, Kenya, face a potential seven years in prison after developing a cost-effective way to alleviate poverty in Africa's poorest slums. Their solution: a complementary currency issued and backed by the local community. The Central Bank of Kenya has now initiated charges of forgery.

Complementary currencies can help eradicate poverty. Proving that may be difficult in complex economies, due to the high number of factors influencing outcomes. But in an African slum with little of the national currency available, supplying residents with an alternative currency has a positive effect that is obvious, immediate and incontrovertible.

This was demonstrated when Will Ruddick, an American physicist, economist and former Peace Corps volunteer, introduced a complementary currency into a Kenyan slum called Bangladesh, near the coastal city of Mombasa. Will's local development organization, Koru-Kenya, worked with over one hundred small business owners in Bangladesh, who agreed to give each other the equivalent of 400 shillings (about €3.5 or \$4.60) in mutual credit in the form of business vouchers called Bangla-Pesa. Half of the vouchers would be available for spending on each others' products and services, and half would be spent into the community on public projects such as waste collection and health services. Allocation decisions were democratic and transparent, and the new currency was backed entirely by the community's own resources and insured by a system of group guarantors, not by the Kenyan government or a development agency.

The project was launched on May 11, 2013. The immediate effect was an increase in sales of 22%. That meant increasing incomes and purchasing power by 22%. These exchanges were of goods and services that without the additional currency would have been thrown away or gone to waste, not because they were unmarketable but because potential customers did not have the money to buy them. Introducing Bangla-Pesa worked to move the economy forward at full capacity, connecting the community to its own resources when the only things lacking were those slips of paper called "money." A compelling video on the project is here.

The successful Kenyan experiment quickly earned endorsements from the United Nations, The Hague and the International Reciprocal Trade Association. Indeed, no other poverty alleviation or local governance program can compete with the cost-effectiveness of this approach, which is easily replicable in poor communities across Africa. The plan was to expand it to other villages in a democratic grassroots fashion so that it could provide a local medium of exchange for people throughout the continent. This would be done via mobile phones with a system provided by Community Forge, an organization based in Geneva that supports the development of community currencies worldwide.

But that plan was unexpectedly interrupted on May 29th, when Will and five other project participants were arrested by Kenyan police and thrown in jail. Besides Will, who is married to a Kenyan aid worker and is a new father, the others include local community business owners who are parents and grandpa

The police at first accused the group of plotting a terrorist overthrow of the government, claiming that Bangla-Pesa was linked to the MRC, a terrorist secessionist group. When that link was easily disproven, the Central Bank of Kenya was called in and charges of forgery were formally placed. Will and his fellow suspects have been released for now on a bail of EUR 5,000 and await trial on July 17th. If convicted, they face seven years in a Kenyan prison.

Despite these perilous circumstances, Will remains optimistic. "The exciting thing," he says, "is that these systems really do show a means of poverty reduction – and my hope is that after this case we'll be allowed to spread them to slums across Kenya. There have been years of precedent for Complementary Currencies as a solution to poverty, and today there is no doubting it."

Successful Precedents from Switzerland to Brazil

Complementary currencies are endorsed by many governments worldwide. The oldest and largest is the WIR system in Switzerland, an exchange system among 60,000 businesses – a full 20% of all Swiss businesses. This currency has been demonstrated to have a counter-cyclical effect, helping to stabilize the Swiss economy by providing additional liquidity and lending capacity when conventional credit for small businesses is scarce.

Brazil is a global leader in using the complementary currency approach for poverty alleviation. Interestingly, its experience began in much the same way as Kenya's: Brazil's most successful community currency, called "Palmas", was nearly strangled at birth by the Brazilian Central Bank. How it went from criminal suspect to official state policy is told by Margrit Kennedy and co-authors in *People Money*:

After issuing the first Palmas currency in 2003, local organiser Joaquim Melo was arrested on suspicion of running a money laundering operation in an unregistered bank. The Central Bank started proceedings against him, saying that the bank was issuing false money. The defendants called on expert witnesses, including the Dutch development organisation Stro, to support their case. Finally, the judge agreed that it was a constitutional right of people to have access to finance and that the Central Bank was doing nothing for the poor areas benefiting from the local currencies. He ruled in favour of Banco Palmas.

What happens next shows the power of dialogue. The Central Bank created a reflection group and invited Joaquim to join in a conversation about how to help poor people. Banco Palmas started the Palmas Institute to share its methodology with other communities and, in 2005, the government's secretary for "solidarity economy" created a partnership with the Institute to finance dissemination. Support for community development banks issuing new currency is now state policy.

The Legal Debate: Mutual Credit or Counterfeiting?

If the Kenyan court follows the example of Brazil, this could be the beginning of a promising new approach to poverty reduction in Africa. The Bangla-Pesa is backed by local resources, and the villagers were very happy to have it in order to move their products and buy the surplus of others within their community. Viewed as a case of counterfeiting, however, there is historical precedent for harsh punishment. In the mid-eighteenth century, when the Bank of England was privately owned and had the exclusive right to issue the national currency, counterfeiting Bank of England Notes was made a crime punishable by death. That was the era of Charles Dickens' *Tale of Two Cities* and *Bleak House*, when supplementing the national currency might have helped relieve mass poverty; but it was in the interest of the Bank to control the market for currency and keep it scarce, in order to ensure a steady demand for loans. When there is insufficient money in the system to cover the needs of exchange, people must borrow from banks at interest, ensuring the banks a handsome profit.

The converse is also true: when sufficient money is supplied to cover the needs of exchange, debt levels and poverty are dramatically reduced.

In this case, the physical Bangla-Pesa voucher looks nothing like the national currency, as it would need to in order to sustain a charge of forgery. The intent of complementary currencies, as their name implies, is not to imitate or compete with the national currency but to complement it, allowing for increased sales within the local community of existing goods and services that would otherwise go unsold. Today, the Bank of England itself acknowledges this role of complementary currencies.

The Bangla-Pesa experience demonstrates what policymakers often overlook: gross domestic product is measured in goods and services sold, not goods and services produced; and for goods to be sold, purchasers must have the money to buy them. Provide consumers with excess money to spend, and GDP will go up. (In Kenya, where nearly half the population lives in poverty and mass unemployment, increases in GDP reflect extractive practices rather than local conditions.)

The common perception is that increasing the medium of exchange will merely devalue the currency and increase prices, but the data show that this does not happen so long as merchandise and services remain unsold or workers remain unemployed. Adding liquidity in those circumstances drives up sales, productivity and employment rather than prices.

This was demonstrated in a larger experiment in Argentina, when the country suffered a major banking crisis in 1995. Lack of confidence in the peso and capital flight ended in a full-scale run on the banks, which closed their doors. When the national currency became unavailable, people responded by creating their own. Community currencies at the local level evolved into the Global Exchange Network (Red Global de Trueque or RGT), which went on to become the largest national community currency network in the world. The model spread throughout Central and South America, growing to seven million members and a circulation valued at millions of U.S. dollars per year. At the local government level, provinces short of the national currency also resorted to issuing their own money, paying their employees with paper receipts called "Debt-Cancelling Bonds" that were in currency units equivalent to the Argentine Peso.

Although these various measures increased the currency in circulation, prices did not inflate. To the contrary, studies found that in provinces in which the national money supply was supplemented with local currencies, prices actually declined compared to other Argentine provinces. Local exchange systems allowed goods and services to be traded that would not otherwise have found a market.

This salutary effect was also observed in Bangladesh. "With Bangla-Pesa," says Ruddick, "we've seen that a circulating community-backed interest-free credit is a low-cost, effective way to increase local liquidity and decrease poverty."

The defendants just need to prove that in court. A crowd-funding campaign is being used to raise the money urgently needed for their defense.

*Jamie Brown contributed to this article. Ellen Brown is an attorney, president of the Public Banking Institute, and author of twelve books, including *Web of Debt* and the recently-published sequel *The Public Bank Solution*. Her websites are <http://WebofDebt.com>, <http://PublicBankSolution.com>, and <http://PublicBankingInstitute.org>.*

DEBT IN A FREE ECONOMY

D. J. Webb; via Sean Gabb; Libertarian Alliance

Debt and debt collection are rising up the political agenda, and I think the issue is of central importance to understanding the British economy today. The banks have gained a centrality in life that they did not always have. It used to be possible to get paid in cash and handle most of your affairs in cash. Nowadays, financial products dominate the whole of the rest of the economy, and the burden of debt on UK consumers plays a large role in limiting any takeoff in private consumption spending that could produce a sustainable recovery. It is as if we only exist to service the banks.

The financialisation of the economy

Mortgages are the main form of debt in the UK, but they are now supplemented by huge student loans, which amount to a second mortgage. Add on credit card debts, payday loans, overdrafts and the like, and you have a highly dysfunctional economy, one where mass default on debt threatens to bring down the banks and cause a renewed sharp downturn.

How did we get here? Well, libertarians and/or their Thatcherite step-cousins have often seemed to support the financialisation of the economy—the running of the entire economy in the interests of financial services parasites—in the form of “encouraging home ownership” and “rolling back the state”. Home ownership is good (although the obsession with freehold property a debilitating factor in the economy), but by failing to draw a distinction between genuine productive activity and passive capital gains from site value increases as a consequence of social activity, libertarians have often seemed to argue that any increases in property prices are simply the free market, rather than a result of the hypertrophy of financial services.

John Stuart Mill believed in a land tax that could have restrained runaway land price inflation and limited asset price inflation that has pumped up the value of natural resources in the form of land, which is limited and is not the product of human labour. For this reason, I can only see as malignant a claimed form of libertarianism that sees average property prices in the UK (around £240,000) nine times the average salary (£26,000) as a natural result of a free market in property.

The arguments against unrestrained land price inflation are for another article. Focusing here on the problem of personal debt, individuals find themselves facing a huge lifelong burden if they are to buy somewhere to live. Renting is an insecure alternative owing to the effective unavailability of contracts longer than six months. In the UK, you cannot simply hand the keys back, as you will be pursued for any outstanding balance (probably including inflated repossession fees) for 12 years.

Property ownership is, of course, not a problem for libertarians. But personal debt at skyhigh levels is. Most people, once they have serviced the state (income tax, national insurance, council tax, the TV licence, and various forms of indirect taxation) and their mortgage have a surprisingly small proportion of their original salary left to spend on anything else. Of course, there are many people who have paid off their mortgages entirely, and maybe those people present some kind of hope for the British economy over the longer term, but for the young, who are the future of the economy, the situation is that the state plus property are likely to account for 60% or 70% of their salary.

The student loans problem is only just emerging as a significant issue, owing to the sudden surge in the size of the loans required to complete university. Once again, libertarians appear to have argued for the financialisation of higher education by calling for more market forces and less state spending in the tertiary education sector. Viewed in the round, the banks have merged with the state—a process made plain in the UK by the nationalisation of virtually the entire banking sector—and so I am not too sure that downsizing the state, but pumping up the size of the financial services industry was the right way to go about things here. Student loans are another millstone around the necks of the up-and-coming generation that will limit spending on everything else going forward.

Could libertarians have called for a rolling back of the state in a way that did not necessarily imply the explosion of financial services? Clearly, a form of higher education that you have to pay for upfront will require those without the money to take out loans. But the entire structure of the economy today is not consonant with libertarian principles. It was never the intention of J S Mill that the state should take 50% of GDP in taxation, and that after servicing such huge taxation demands people should then, on top of this, pay for their higher education via loans.

If the state spent just 10% of GDP and there was nothing in the way of taxation of personal incomes, people would probably have higher savings and a greater proportion of students and their families would have been able to pay for higher education with those savings. The entire structure of

personal finances would be different in a genuinely free economy. Instead what we have arrived at is state hypertrophy supplemented by financial services hypertrophy—justified, bizarrely, as some form of “rolling back of the state”.

I should state in passing here that libertarians need to give careful consideration to proposals for a slimming of the state that would result in an enormous expansion of financial services. Proposals for health insurance to replace state spending on healthcare strike me as possibly just another scam for the financial services industry. Health insurance seems the only alternative to the state, but the way it is implemented seems crucial to achieving a positive impact on the economy.

Personal debt products

Mortgages and student loans are, in fact, low-interest-rate debt. A more astonishing aspect of personal finances in the UK is personal debt products such as credit cards and payday loans. The interest rates on credit cards range up to (or can exceed) 30% a year, with a range of fatuous charges applied to boost the amount owed in certain circumstances. The recent advent of the payday loan sector has brought loans with an annual percentage rate (APR) of nearly 6,000% to the UK.

My immediate instinct as a libertarian is to ask why people should need these products. Clearly many people are facing difficulty in basic day-to-day managing in what is, on paper, a wealthy society. Libertarians used to believe that a free market for labour would, in the end, allow wages to reach a natural level: one that was high enough to allow for the bringing up of a family and for participation in social life in a normal way. Working-class wages need to allow for at least the renting of a property, the payment of gas and electricity bills, the raising of two or three children, the running of a car to get to work, food and clothing of a non-luxurious type, the purchase of basic furniture, and some entertainment activities.

It is clear that low-end wages do not allow for this at all. In fact, in London, at least, even professional salaries can see people struggle to pay for the basics, depending on the mortgages/rents to be serviced. Something unusual is going on. Firstly, the state has implemented long-term policies to boost land prices, increasing all mortgages and rents and making basic life more of a struggle than it was decades ago when land prices were cheaper in relation to incomes. Secondly, the merry-go-round has been enabled to continue via in-work benefits. As low-end salaries are not enough to fund any sort of life, those with children have been able to get Family Tax Credits and other benefits, ratcheting up the tax rates on everyone else while effectively subsidising landlords, the banks and employers of cheap labour. Thirdly, immigration has been used to distort economic signals and keep low-end labour cheap despite its huge disparity with living costs.

It is not surprise therefore that many working-class people need to access additional finance. With gas and electricity bills often over £100 a month—another mortgage in itself—payday loans can keep the lights on, although payday loans are designed to spiral rapidly out of any connection with the original amount owed. I think most libertarians would agree that a genuinely free economy would see people able to live a normal life based on unskilled labour. This presupposes an end to mass immigration and an end to the various schemes designed to prop up land values at the expense of labour and capital. For this reason, a view of personal debt that supposes moral flaws in the debtor would appear to me to be a naive and inaccurate understanding of the problem of debt today. The real problem is the skewing of the entire economy to the funding of the state, to financial services and to the interests of landlords and others who hope to passively benefit from property. These three things are in fact interlinked in the form of personal debt.

Moral hazard?

I think this is where libertarianism parts company with conservatism. Conservatives strongly believe that people should just pay their debts—they have a moral duty to do so—and it is just hard luck if they have contracted too many debts. From the point of view of libertarians, however, debt is a risk contract, like any other in the free economy. The banks hope to make money by lending, but the interest charged clearly reflects the fact that the extension of credit necessarily involves risk. A certain percentage of people will not be able to pay back their loans, and the more likely this is, the higher the interest rate demanded, as payday loans show.

From this point of view, while there is moral hazard in allowing people to evade their debts—after all, people should take responsibility for themselves—there is also a moral hazard in any attempt to ensure that the banks always get their money back. The banks can only make so much money on debt because they might not be able to collect all the sums owed. So the state should not step in with excessively aggressive methods of grinding down debtors to pay sums that logically should be written off. The risk is two-way, and so is the moral hazard.

Take for example the distinction between secured and non-secured loans. A non-secured loan has a higher interest rate, because the difficulty of collection is much higher. A secured loan is secured on a property, and can, in the end, be recouped by repossessing the property, depending on the vagaries of the trajectory of house prices, which are themselves manipulated by the banks. And yet we read that judges often allow “charging orders” to be placed on properties for non-secured debts of as little as £500, thus turning a non-secured loan into a secured one. This makes a mockery of the original contract, which provided for a high interest rate precisely because the debt was unsecured. Given the difficulty of selling houses in the current market in most parts of the country, a £500 charging order that the bank later uses to try to force the immediate sale of the house could result in losses to the householder of many tens of thousands of pounds, especially if the house has to be sold at auction.

There ought to be some kind of limit as to the types of actions that the state will make to enable collection of private debts—and placing charging orders on properties for small unsecured loans does not fall within this logical limit. One could argue that charging orders on second properties, or properties that are not main residences ought to be possible, and that charging orders on very high-value houses should also be possible, as no one absolutely has to live in a £1m house if he has debts. But someone living in an ordinary terraced or semi-detached house really ought not to see magistrates convert non-secured debts into debts secured on his residence. From the libertarian point of view, what is objectionable about this is that it overturns the original contract.

However, as stated above, whatever the terms of an original contract, a loan is a risk-based financial product, and nothing the state does should be designed to ensure that credit is always a one-way bet for the banks. Default on secured loans should lead to loss of the property—but not pursuit for 12 years for any balance deemed to be owing. This forms part of the related, but separate, libertarian argument against state policies designed to boost land values. By making all property loans non-recourse, as in the US, debt deleveraging is achieved more rapidly in a slump, thus allowing the economy and the property market to begin to grow after rapidly hitting rock bottom.

It is the collection of unsecured loans, including credit card debts and payday loans, that is the most controversial aspect in the UK, owing to the high interest rates, the panoply of fatuous charges levied, and aggressive debt-collection techniques. I have previously outlined a view of libertarianism that allows for some regulation—by statute, and not by regulatory body, to be enforced in the courts—to avoid a situation where the disparity of power between the individual and financial services companies allows for aggressive enforcement of debt peonage under the rubric of “the free market”. I am not in favour of constant such legislation, but I do favour some. The alternative would be to turn libertarians into a group of cheerleaders for the parasitical financial services companies.

There is a Code of Business Sourcebook (COBS) that governs contracts with banks, requiring, in vague language, that banks treat their customers fairly and handle conflicts of interests between themselves and customers fairly. The COBS retrospectively forms part of all contracts with financial services companies and can be enforced in the courts, although the judges’ perceptions of what “treating customers fairly” means may be difficult to discern in advance of court action. At best, COBS would give an activist judge a tool with which to strike down an “unfair” contract, but in practice most judges see their remit as participating in aggressive debt collection.

I don’t favour the COBS, because of its loose language, but would be happy to place a more tightly worded legal limit on interest rates—there need to be higher interest rates on risky loans, but a 6,000% APR strikes me as absurdly out of connection with any possible definition of a lawful contract. In order to allow space for interest-rate pricing of loans, I would see an APR within 100 percentage points of the Bank of England base rate as more than adequate for anything other than loan sharkery. Many financial services contracts also come with detailed terms and conditions including clauses that provide for unilateral variation of terms and conditions by the banks even after a debt has been built up. I cannot understand how this can be a lawful contract either. Allowing loan companies “continuing payment authority” to empty bank accounts at will—arrangements that can’t be cancelled—even where the amount owed is in dispute also seems to me to be, at best, theft. Apparently, the government is moving to force banks to allow customers to cancel continuing payment authorities. (The likely result is that savvy customers manage to cancel them, but uneducated, inept or mentally ill customers will not.)

Enforcing loan contracts

But apart from these specific points (stratospheric interest rates, unilateral variation of terms ex post facto, and continuing payment authorities), I do not see that courts should unpick contracts. However—and this is the key point—if you can’t afford to service a loan, you don’t owe it. Beyond a certain point, if the customer can’t pay, the bank has to accept that the risk they took on when extending the customer credit has materialised. They should write down the debt and move on to more profitable

business. This is the free market. This is what the risk of extending credit entails. This is the reason why the lending business is profitable in the first place, as interest rates are charged to reflect the degree of risk.

Libertarians do not support the welfare state, but people who are unemployed or living on income support are clearly living on the minimum the state sees as appropriate. Welfare benefits are not designed to cover the servicing of usurious historic debts. Anyone who has no other income than welfare benefits by definition cannot pay a penny towards any debts. Apparently, the courts will order £1 a month payments by people on benefits, but I wouldn't even support this much, as clearly the banks have been lending to the wrong people if they are chasing people living on social security. There should be no garnisheeing of benefits—and if the banks find that a problem, they should be more careful in their lending.

People in work are a better target for debt collectors, because they have incomes, and these incomes can be docked at source. The courts do order such arrangements, but I understand that magistrates will not allow so much to be docked that the debtor cannot afford basic living costs, although magistrates' definitions of those may vary. As far as I understand it, once the matter goes to court, the decision is out of the hands of the financial services companies, and the judgements handed down by magistrates may not always be as munificent as the banks hope, which is precisely how it should be.

The problem with debt-collection practices seems to relate to two things: 1) the manner in which debt-collection agencies demand money well before the debt has gone to court; and 2) the enforcement of judicial decisions by bailiffs. Debt is a civil matter—it has nothing to do with the police—and so debt-collection agencies whose chosen tactic is to phone twenty times a day threatening arrest are clearly hoping to frighten the least savvy customers into making payments they can ill afford. This is just demanding money with menaces—which is a crime—and I would argue in a free society any such threats should lead to the immediate extinguishing of the debt. More than one phone call a week strikes me as harassment—which is also a crime, and not a civil matter—and failure to abide by a customer's express wish to be contacted only in writing is also harassment. Customers at home rarely have phone-recording facilities, and so it seems to me to be appropriate for discussion of matters that have legal implications to be in writing only. Home visits by debt collectors who have no power of entry are also clear instances of harassment. While in a libertarian society, debts could be enforced by the courts, that is not the same thing as saying that harassment and demanding money with menaces should not be crimes in a free society. Ultimately, the spigot of debt needs to be turned off, and the labour market allowed to work properly again, so that people do not need to take out these financial products. So legislation in a free society that makes it harder to collect debt is simply a way to achieve that objective.

Bailiffs are another interesting area of law. It has become standard for bailiffs to use force to gain entry to properties—by putting their foot in the door and forcing the door open. While this is not legal, magistrates are, bizarrely, unwilling to accept that this is what has happened unless video evidence is available. (We are entitled to ask how this meets magistrates' duties to judge such cases on the balance of probabilities: the most charitable interpretation is that magistrates are too naive to realise that bailiffs regularly exceed their powers.) It seems to me to be fully within the scope of libertarianism to outlaw bailiff visits unless something unusual (pearls, gold bars, etc.) are known to be in the home. Given that people with incomes see their incomes garnished at source as the preferred and easier method of debt collection, a restriction on these aggressive types of debt collection will only affect those loans extended to people without proper incomes—people who the banks should not be lending to in the first place.

A non-debt economy

Some libertarians seem so pro-corporate in their thinking that they have forgotten the original reason why they supported a free economy in the first place. A particularly nasty example is an article in *The Spectator* by Steve Davies of the Institute of Economic Affairs, entitled 'Cracking down on payday lenders will hurt the poor' (see here). I'm not at all sure that Dr Davies is concerned about the poor. Debt peonage is not really what a free society is all about. I envisage a libertarian society more along the lines of people being able to earn enough money, and keep it, to live their lives without subsidising parasites of various descriptions. Payday lenders are among those parasites, as is the state. There is little difference between the financial services companies and the state today (this is really what "too big to fail" means). Davies writes:

Now we have a summit and a lot of public statements from politicians to the effect that the activities of payday loan companies are uncompetitive and against the public interest. This kind of policy agenda is wrong on a number of grounds. It would firstly be wrong in itself, as it would prohibit a

voluntary transaction between consenting adults that does not cause direct or immediate harm to anyone, and certainly not to third parties.

This analysis is wrongheaded, as direct and immediate harm is done to the borrowers, and the growth of such desperate forms of personal credit does cause harm to third parties. There is concern that such loans are a new ticking subprime debt bomb, and the mortgaging of the incomes of the poor to service loans that have grown 60-fold in a year does limit their private consumption spending, with an impact on all other providers of goods and services. Davies argues that payday loans are “almost always” paid off within two weeks, thus feigning ignorance of the fact that payday lenders finances depend on the continual rolling over of spiralling loans. He goes on to write:

Even more likely, the demand for these kinds of loans would remain but would now be met by truly unsavoury characters. If you want to help loan sharks and low life money lenders then restricting legitimate firms such as Wonga is the way to go.

Here, Davies appears to state that loan sharkery is “unsavoury”, but that payday loans are not loan sharkery... There is not a word in his article querying why people need to resort to such desperate loan products.

John Stuart Mill was against laws against usury. However, that is not to say that there should not be limits on the extent to which debt collection can be taken. While laws against usury are designed to protect only one party to a contract, state intervention to enforce onerous debts is an intervention that similarly attempts a one-sided protection of one party to a civil contract. J S Mill quoted examples in his Principles of Political Economy (see here) of usurious interest rates as high as 20% or 30%. However, we are in a totally different type of society, where interest rates range up to 6,000%, and the vigour of libertarians needs to be exerted, not to defend the right to extort very large sums from people who contract very small debts, but rather to reduce the size of the state such that people do not find the state the first charge on their income, forcing them to borrow at exorbitant rates of interest in order to purchase basic necessities. J S Mill did not live in a society where the whole of life had become dominated by the financial services industry, to the extent that the viability of capitalism itself has been threatened in recent years.

Even if it is not accepted that some controls are required—and I am not talking about preventing 30% interest rates, but 6,000%—the other suggestions I have made in this article may be sufficient to rein in the personal debt jamboree and thus allow a rebalancing of the economy towards proper production, investment and consumption.

ARE LITECOINS THE NEXT BIG THING?

Anna Irrera; Money Beat; via Activist Post

If the Winklevoss attempt to launch a Bitcoin ETF has made investing in this virtual currency a little too mainstream for your taste, there is no need to worry. The crypto community has it covered and is pumping up the next new thing: Litecoins.

Shares in CipherMine, a company that creates virtual currency Litecoin, soared 500% following their initial public offering on June 24 on a virtual stock exchange, LTC Global Exchange. Since launching less than a month ago, the UK-founded CipherMine has achieved a market value of around £500,000 (\$744,500).

CipherMine says its stellar debut is a sign that while Bitcoins are grabbing headlines, Litecoins are gaining traction. But what exactly are Litecoins and how different are they from Bitcoins?

Like Bitcoins, Litecoins are a virtual currency created online through a process known as “mining”.

Programers and companies such as CipherMine run software programs on high-powered computer systems to find new combinations of words and numbers that will unlock new coins. The number of coins that can be mined is capped at 21 million Bitcoins and 84 million Litecoins.

Kate Craig-Wood, CipherMine’s founder, explained: “It is because of this larger number that Litecoin is often billed as ‘silver’ compared to bitcoin’s ‘gold’.”

Prices of Litecoins against fiat currencies are determined by anonymous peer-to-peer trades on online exchanges. Unlike mainstream currencies, however, they are not linked to any government, so their value rests on a trust system between users. In other words, if people suddenly decide to stop using Litecoins, they will be worth absolutely nothing.

Currently, one Litecoin is worth around \$2.70. By contrast, after rising to a high of \$260 in April (and falling over 60% in a day), Bitcoins are now worth \$90 each.

Just like Bitcoins, Litecoins are stored in virtual wallets and can be used for purchases online. Unlike

their more popular older sister, however, fewer physical businesses accept them as a form of payment. So while Bitcoins will buy you a beer in select pubs in East London, it might be trickier to pay for a drink in Litecoins.

CipherMine started trading on the Litecoin Global Exchange on June 24 when 10,000 shares sold at 0.667 Litecoins each. Shares are today worth around four Litecoins each.

Read more over at Financial News.

POSITIVE MONEY BULLETIN EXTRACTS

Positive Money Team

An exciting new project has started! Did you know that there are at least 15 groups around the world campaigning to change the way money is created along the same or similar lines as Positive Money? It's a tricky task to get people to understand that the cause of the financial crisis and one underlying root cause of most of our social and economic problems lies in the way money is created. But fortunately, there is an international movement getting established.

International Movement for Money Reform

It would be hard to get any government to be a pioneer in money reform without something happening, or at least being discussed, around the world. So we believe that building an international movement is a critical step.

Some groups were established many years ago and have done a lot of research work already, some have had an appearance in the mainstream media, some groups are just getting started - but they all want to grow to big national movements and a strong and influential international movement.

Check out the website - you'll find the groups in Austria, Croatia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the USA.

Big thanks go to our fantastic volunteers Christine Delon and Matthew Parsons for setting up the website!

And how can you help?

If you are in UK, you have certainly at least one friend abroad who should learn about it. Just send him a short email. The text could be:

Hi, I support a campaign to fix the financial system called Positive Money. Now I found that there is a similar group in your country too. I thought you would be interested to learn about them - check this out: <http://internationalmoneyreform.org/>

If you are living in one of the 15 countries with an existing group - get in touch with them. All the groups have their hands full and would welcome your help. Your contribution can range from helping to raise awareness with your experience, ideas and comments, to your leadership or participation in the research or campaigning work.

Strategic Quantitative Easing

There are big challenges ahead for the new governor of the Bank of England, Mark Carney, who started on 1st July. The BBC states, "He does not have any miracle cures at his disposal"... But we believe he actually does! Cures that would create sustainable growth and jobs, boost productivity and boost exports, all without increasing the public debt.

The Bank of England has created £375 billion through Quantitative Easing (QE). The money created has strengthened bank balance sheets and boosted the stock market, but has had limited effect on the rest of the economy. But there's no reason QE can't be put to better use – some simple reforms proposed by the New Economics Foundation could allow the Bank of England to put the money directly where it's needed: building new homes, lending to small businesses and investing in green infrastructure.

A new report entitled "Strategic Quantitative Easing" published by the New Economics Foundation (nef) is calling for a strategic QE – investing in home building and energy efficiency, infrastructure and small business lending. If you have always wondered how exactly does QE work, and how it could work differently - this report will give you the answers.

Get a friend to fill in a survey

The New Economics Foundation's new report on QE has already been covered by the media and read by many policymakers. But Positive Money wants to make sure it reaches a wider audience – to explain why QE hasn't benefited the economy outside of financial markets, and why there's a better way to create money and get it into the economy. And that's where you could help.

We're trying to find the best way of explaining money creation and how it could be reformed to help the real economy instead of financial markets. Can you ask a friend who doesn't know about Positive Money or money creation to fill in this 8 question survey?

www.surveymonkey.com/s/QuantitativeEasing

Text you can use:

Hi, I support a campaign to fix the financial system called Positive Money. They're looking to find out what people outside of finance know about Quantitative Easing (which you may have heard about it in the news).

Could you help by taking 3 minutes to answer 8 questions too, it's important:

Upcoming Events

Chicago, USA, 19-22 Sept - 9th Annual AMI Monetary Reform Conference

The speakers are the main people on the front lines of monetary reform around the world. Here is the superstar line-up: Prof Joseph Huber, Dr. Michael Kumhof of the IMF, Prof. Kaoru Yamaguchi, Prof. Richard Werner, Prof. Nic Tideman, Prof. Steve Keen and others. Positive Money's Andrew Jackson may also be presenting in person - to be confirmed.

More from the Blog

Some Further Thoughts on QE

The Best Way to Save Banking Is to Kill It

Pensions Insight: Why money creation by the banks is bad news for pension schemes

Positive Money at Durham Miners Gala and Green Fair Sheffield

How do people understand Quantitative Easing – Survey Report

QE for jobs: conventional QE was implemented because of deficit phobia

The Secretary of State for Wales urged to open the debate on money reform and to support “QE for jobs”

Will there be enough credit in the Positive Money system?

Support Banking Reform motion at the Green Party conference – Vote in the Prioritisation Ballot

Resurgence: The Money Revolution

A Not-For-Profit World Economy Can Change the Monetary System

John Cochrane and the two account system

Using QE to rebuild the UK economy – the Canadian way

FT: Banish fractional reserve banking for real reform

Spending Review...no new ideas then

Monetary Reform, Government Spending and National Borrowing

Banks don't lend money

The Ecologist: Make money positive again

FT: Lunch with Sir Mervyn King

Who controls our money supply?

RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE EDITED BY;- FRANK TAYLOR, 2 CHURCH VIEW, ST GILES TERRACE. CHETTON, BRIDGNORTH, SHROPSHIRE, WV16 6UG; Tel; (01746) 789326

frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk