

RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE

A Journal of the Democratic Resistance

AUGUST 2013

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

**CHILD SAFETY AND THE DEATH OF DUE PROCESS
THE FREEDOM TO OFFEND?**

REVOLUTION ... AN INSTRUCTION MANUAL

Storm Clouds Gathering; via Critical Thinking

MOMENTOUS CHANGE ALMOST ALWAYS BEGINS WITH ... PEOPLE

John Pilger; via Dave Barnby

ALAN CLIFFORD – PERSECUTED FOR PREACHING THE BIBLE

Libertarian Alliance

**PAEDOPHILES ARE GIVEN 'FREE REIN' TO ABUSE ABROAD: JUST 50
ORDERS BAN OFFENDERS FROM TRAVELLING OVERSEAS**

Jack Doyle; MailOnline

**DO YOU MIND IF WE STORE YOUR DNA DATA AND SHARE IT WITH
EVERYBODY?**

Jon Rappoport; Activist Post

PIRATEBROWSER

via Activist Post

BEDROOM TAX & RENT STRIKE DEBT CANCELLED BY DRO - "LODGERS TO COST HB £3.4 BILLION PER YEAR MORE AND GET RID OF THE BEDROOM TAX

Steve Starlord/ Joe Halewood via Jimmy Devlin; North West Tenants

THE INTERNATIONAL FORECASTER; THE INFORMATION-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

James Corbett; corbettreport.com; via John Newell

EVOLUTION PUNISHES SELFISH PEOPLE, GAME THEORY STUDY SAYS

Shaunacy Ferro; Popsoci via Critical Thinking

BIG BROTHER WATCH

Nick Pickles

NEW IPHONES WILL COME WITH "BIOMETRIC KIT"

Activist Post

UNLATERABLE AT COMMON LAW

Kenn D'Oudney; Democracy Defined

FEMA DEMANDING 24 HOUR DELIVERY OF EMERGENCY FOOD RESERVES

Paul Joseph Watson; Infowars.com; via Stan Parr and John Newell

THE DNA NANOBOTS HAVE ARRIVED

Nicholas West; Activist Post

THE GREAT AMERICAN BUBBLE MACHINE

Matt Taibbi; Rolling Stone; via Critical Thinking

SOVEREIGN MONEY

Joseph Huber

GLOBAL LOOTING: THE NEW EU BAILIN LAW WAS PASSED 8 DAYS AGO DID YOU NOTICE?

John Ward; The Slog; via John Newell

THE BRADBURY POUND – IN ANTICIPATION OF ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

via Global Table

POSITIVE MONEY BULLETIN EXTRACTS

Positive Money Team

EDITORIAL

CHILD SAFETY AND THE DEATH OF DUE PROCESS

As it is an unusual subject for the Runnymede Gazette, readers might at first query the inclusion of the MailOnLine item on the 'child protection' measures proposed by Nicola Blackwood MP.

In fact the point is simple. The proposed orders will be obtainable merely on the basis of a 'suspicion'. No trial, sworn evidence, cross examination, right of defence or representation, or any adjudication by any jury is necessary.

It may be that in many cases such 'suspicions' are well grounded. But, as Shami Chakrabarti pointed out when interviewed by Channel 4, why, then, no arrest and trial?

On the other hand such 'suspicions' may be no more than tittle tattle, rumour, or supposition. In that case, the victim may face a long and costly and protracted legal battles (and how such orders can be challenged at all is unclear), which may well wreck careers, marriages, families and reputations. Many teachers, social workers and others in the public sector have already been put through just such a meat grinder.

THE CHIMERA OF 'PERFECT SAFETY'

The purpose of all this, ostensibly, is to create a 100% 'safe' environment for children. This 'safety' regime is to be administered by a bureaucracy which is expected to be omniscient, omnipotent and infallible.

The 'health and safety' agenda has become all-encompassing. When compulsory seat belts and helmets were first introduced, a few voices warned that this might all be the thin end of a very large wedge. So it has turned out.

But stuff happens and will always happen. A month ago 80 people on a Spanish train never reached their destinations. Every year 800 children die on our roads and ten times that number are injured. 'Perfect safety' is a chimera. Even if we stayed in bed all day that might induce death by embolism!

But perhaps it is a chimera with a deeper purpose. We already have vetting and barring, by which means an entire population are turned into criminal suspects until proven otherwise. Are whole families and neighbourhoods to be vetted whenever one of their number falls pregnant? Will, then, certificates be issued as to which families may keep their children and who is allowed to enter that family home?

Nowadays a high definition camera and microphone can be put into a device the size of a fingernail for the price of a few quid. Are, at some stage, parents to be required to have such devices in every room? Where is this road leading? The Scottish proposals, reported in the last RG, may give us a clue ... 24/7 surveillance of us all.

And it may also be useful to the powers-that-be, as we become ever more invested by multiple crisis, to see that the bonds of mutual trust which make civil society possible are dissolved and replaced by a mood of mutual fear, suspicion and paranoia.

THE SUPREMACY OF DUE PROCESS

When fixed penalty notices were introduced a few far-sighted people again warned of the thin end of a wedge. Again, it has turned out thus. Now we face a whole plethora of such extra-judicial penalties, as often as not administered by varieties of pseudo police who are not even sworn constables.

In the item on Alan Clifford (of which more anon in another context), a policeman, acting as prosecutor, judge and jury enters his home and offers an on the spot fine. Again, the same principle is at work as lies at the roots of Ms Blackwood's idea ... that suspicion is of itself sufficient and tantamount to conviction ... no other process necessary.

Such sirens should learn a little of the millennial struggle against arbitrary government and its inevitable corollary of Star Chamber 'justice' (Kenn D'Oudney's article is of direct relevance). The protections offered by the Magna Carta (especially articles #39 and #40) and the Declaration and Bill of Rights (#12) are explicit. Penalty and forfeiture (and loss of career, family and reputation are certainly forfeiture) without due process are void and unlawful. Such protections were put there for a purpose. Their removal leaves us all naked.

THE FREEDOM TO OFFEND?

Alan Clifford is a Christian minister of strongly conservative outlook. His blog will reveal items on Islam and homosexuality which might well offend certain people ... although at first glance his research seems well grounded within its own context. Yet is this any ground for the events described in the Libertarian Alliance item?

The apparent reason for the police action is that Mr Clifford published an item which would 'annoy or cause offence'. This, in turn, provided proof of 'hate'.

Those with rose tinted spectacles are sometimes prone to mythologise about British freedoms, including freedom of speech. History speaks otherwise. For centuries much religious comment was off limits, as was any comment which went outside closely drawn limits of criticism of crown or state. From the start of the American War of Independence to the advent of Parliamentary reform the country witnessed a fearsome struggle for such freedom, with gagging acts, the suppression of the correspondence committees, trumped up charges of sedition and treason and the infamous Six Acts of 1819. There has never been (unlike the US First Amendment; and even that is becoming increasingly problematic) any constitutional guarantee of such freedoms in any British charter.

But there has been a well established notion of the Public Peace, which dates back at least (in written form) to Article 12 of the Charter of Liberties of 1101. Under that rubric speech and expression only become actionable only if intended to breach that peace.

The Blair government changed all that. The snag (no doubt intentional) is that it introduced entirely subjective criteria. The threshold at which different individuals feel insulted, annoyed, harassed or threatened varies widely. As an exercise in passive resistance we might all consider phoning the police every time we feel offended or annoyed?

The child of this change has been the 'hate' crime. Now most of us think that 'hate' must involve the desire to inflict violence. The British are a phlegmatic lot. Although imbued with a strong sense of their superiority, they are not, by and large, big haters.

So 'hate' is so often a Straw Man. Wish you no harm, but don't much like you crime? Feel superior to you crime? Think some of your habits and/or practices are disgusting crime? Nothing against you, but do not wish to share your company crime? Doesn't quite hack it, does it?

No two human beings, even identical twins, are precisely 'equal'. The notion of 'equality before the law' does not mean that we are all the same. Rather than chasing the rigid conformity of 'sameness' in the name of 'equality', should not the first priority be to ensure that people of widely differing and often conflicting and contrary beliefs, outlooks, religions, creeds and lifestyles are able to cohabit the same space side by side without killing each other? The item on *Revolution ... An Instruction Manual* cites the 18th century Iroquois confederation as a thought provoking path as to how that might be achieved

Fundamental principles such as the right to due process, the notion of the public peace and equality before the law and the presumption of innocence, evolved from centuries of bitter experience. Who will stop the wrecking balls?

Frank Taylor

EPITAPH ON THE POLITICIAN HIMSELF

**Here richly, with ridiculous display,
The Politician's corpse was laid away,
While all of his acquaintance sneered and slanged
I wept: for I had longed to see him hanged.**

Thanks to Dave Barnby

REVOLUTION ... AN INSTRUCTION MANUAL

Storm Clouds Gathering; via Critical Thinking

Raised in the ethos of English understatement, it is not often that I would say that an item is truly mind-blowing.

This video, available on Utube at;- www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Zq4f6WYmHU certainly is.

It is an absolute must-view for all readers of the Runnymede Gazette. It encapsulates in 17 brilliant minutes all that is about.

Calling on such authorities as Gene Sharp and Gustave le Bon, the narrator sets out a plan as to why revolution is necessary, how it can come about, how it must be organised, and the dangers and pitfalls.

Here are a few samples;-

“Revolutions begin when you begin to say 'no' to those who have power over you”

“Without clear objectives, chaos usually ensues when the old order falls”

“There is nothing more dangerous than armed men with utopian dreams”.

So this revolution will be organised horizontally and non hierarchically, not vertically. It is about reaching a state where different systems can peacefully co-exist side by side. It marks that crucial delineation between leaders and rulers.

At least we can now start talking openly about a revolution of this type.

If you read no more of the Runnymede Gazette, I would ask that readers take time to view this item, and get back to me with their ideas and comments.

If you have any problems getting the item then get back to me and I will forward it to you.

Frank Taylor

MOMENTOUS CHANGE ALMOST ALWAYS BEGINS WITH ... PEOPLE

John Pilger; via Dave Barnby

I have known my postman for more than 20 years. Conscientious and good-humoured, he is the embodiment of public service at its best. The other day, I asked him, "Why are you standing in front of each door like a soldier on parade?"

"New system," he replied, "I am no longer required simply to post the letters through the door. I have to approach every door in a certain way and put the letters through in a certain way."

"Why?"

"Ask him."

Across the street was a solemn young man, clipboard in hand, whose job was to stalk postmen and see they abided by the new rules, no doubt in preparation for privatisation. I told the stalker my postman was admirable. His face remained flat, except for a momentary flicker of confusion.

In *Brave New World Revisited*, Aldous Huxley describes a new class conditioned to a normality that is not normal "because they are so well adjusted to our mode of existence, because their human voice has been silenced so early in their lives, that they do not even struggle or suffer or develop symptoms as the neurotic does".

Surveillance is normal in the Age of Regression — as Edward Snowden revealed. Ubiquitous cameras are normal. Subverted freedoms are normal. Effective public dissent is now controlled by police, whose intimidation is normal.

The traducing of noble words like "democracy", "reform", "welfare" and "public service" is normal. Prime ministers who lie openly about lobbyists and war aims are normal. The export of £4bn worth of British arms, including crowd control ammunition, to the medieval state of Saudi Arabia, where apostasy is a capital crime, is normal.

The wilful destruction of efficient, popular public institutions like the Royal Mail is normal. A postman is no longer a postman, going about his decent work; he is an automaton to be watched, a box to be ticked. Huxley described this regression as insane and our "perfect adjustment to that abnormal society" a sign of the madness.

Are we "perfectly adjusted" to this? No, not yet. People defend hospitals from closure, UK Uncut forces bank branches to close and six brave women climb the highest building in Europe to show the havoc caused by the oil companies in the Arctic. There, the list begins to peter out.

At this year's Manchester festival, Percy Bysshe Shelley's epic *Masque of Anarchy* — all 91 verses written in rage at the massacre of Lancashire people protesting poverty in 1819 — is an acclaimed theatrical piece, and utterly divorced from the world outside. Last January, the Greater Manchester Poverty Commission disclosed that 600,000 Mancunians were living in "extreme poverty" and that 1.6 million, or nearly half the city's population, were "sliding into deeper poverty".

Poverty has been gentrified. The Parkhill Estate in Sheffield was once an edifice of public housing — unloved by many for its Le Corbusier brutalism, poor maintenance and lack of facilities. With its Heritage Grade II listing, it has been renovated and privatised. Two thirds of the old flats have been reborn as modern apartments selling to "professionals", including designers, architects and a social historian. In the sales office you can buy designer mugs and cushions. This façade offers not a hint that, devastated by the government's "austerity" cuts, Sheffield has a social housing waiting list of 60,000 people.

Parkhill is a symbol of the two thirds society that is Britain today. The gentrified third do well, some of them extremely well, a third struggle to get by on credit and the rest slide into poverty.

Although the majority of the British are working class — whether or not they see themselves that way — a gentrified minority dominates parliament, senior management and the media. David Cameron, Nick and Ed Milliband are their authentic representatives, with only minor technical difference between their parties. They fix the limits of political life and debate, aided by gentrified journalism and the "identity" industry. The greatest ever transfer of wealth upwards is a given. Social justice has been replaced by meaningless "fairness".

While promoting this normality, the BBC rewards a senior functionary almost £1m. Although regarding itself as the media equivalent of the Church of England, the Corporation now has ethics comparable with those of the "security" companies G4S and Serco which, says the government, have "overcharged" on public services by tens of millions of pounds. In other countries, this is called

corruption.

Like the fire sale of the power utilities, water and the railways, the sale of Royal Mail is to be achieved with bribery and the collaboration of the union leadership, regardless of its vocal outrage. Opening his 1983 documentary series Questions of Leadership, Ken Loach shows trade union leaders exhorting the masses. The same men are then shown, older and florid, adorned in the ermine of the House of Lords. In the recent Queen's Birthday honours, the general secretary of the TUC, Brendan Barber, received his knighthood.

How long can the British watch the uprisings across the world and do little apart from mourn the long-dead Labour Party? The Edward Snowden revelations show the infrastructure of a police state emerging in Europe, especially Britain. Yet, people are more aware than ever before; and governments fear popular resistance – which is why truth-tellers are isolated, smeared and pursued.

Momentous change almost always begins with the courage of people taking back their own lives against the odds. There is no other way now. Direct action. Civil disobedience. Unerring. Read Percy Shelley – “Ye are many; they are few”. And do it.

John Pilger's new film, Utopia, will be previewed at the National Film Theatre, London, in the autumn. Visit his website at <http://johnpilger.com/>

ALAN CLIFFORD – PERSECUTED FOR PREACHING THE BIBLE

Libertarian Alliance

Note: The Libertarian Alliance fully supports Dr Clifford in his struggle for freedom of speech. People should be free to say anything that does not breach some private right.

POLICE INTERVIEW of Dr Alan C. Clifford, Norwich Reformed Church; Interviewing Officer: PC Arnold (PC1396) of Norfolk Constabulary; Location: Dr Clifford's home address; Date & Time: Saturday 17 August 2013 at 5.45 pm.

I was informed that a complaint had been made to the Police by the ‘chair person’ of Norwich ‘gay pride’ (Norfolk LGBT Project) about an e-mail sent by me on 29 July. This e-mail consisted of a report sent to editors and others of a Christian witness five of us made against the city-centre ‘gay pride’ demo of the previous Saturday, 27 July 2013. (Since their official pamphlet gave a contact e-address, I decided to include them on the larger list of recipients.) The ‘gay pride’ recipient (or another) found the e-mail's two attached leaflets offensive. These leaflets were ‘Christ Can Cure – Good News for Gays’ and ‘Jesus Christ – the Saviour we all need’.

PC Arnold said that there was reason to believe that I was chargeable with a homophobic incident, having communicated by electronic means something likely to annoy or cause offence. Accordingly, I had two options. I could admit I'd done wrong and pay an ‘on the spot’ fine of £90.00, or produce a signed statement in defence of our actions. I decided on the latter course.

PC Arnold proceeded to ask me a series of questions. Unfortunately, I was not permitted to make a photocopy of the statement I eventually signed (it then would be a document in the criminal investigation), so the following details from memory simply reflect the main points discussed.

Among other things, I was asked why I had sent this e-mail. Was it to annoy or cause offence? I said, “No. I was reporting to the ‘gp’ people our Christian complaint against the public display of their homosexual propaganda, which we find offensive.”

I was asked if I was aware that I'd committed a homophobic offence, as defined by the official police leaflet now presented to me: “Any incident which is perceived to be homophobic by the victim or any other person.”

I rejected the accusation, adding that everything depends on the meaning of ‘homophobia’. Since a ‘phobia’ (from Greek) is ‘a fear’, it does not mean ‘hatred’ in the now commonly-understood use of the term. I certainly fear the influence of homosexuality on society, but this should not be regarded as ‘hatred’ unless criticism is taken to mean ‘hatred’. I reminded the officer

that my leaflet was subtitled 'A Compassionate call to Christian Conversion'. Is that hatred? We don't hate these people. We love them and want to help them. So, even though the 'gp' people are upset, we are guilty of no crime.

I asked the officer that since we are offended by their public display of homosexuality, could we not have made a complaint to the police? He answered that we had such a right to complain.

I then explained that we were perfectly within the law regarding our criticism of homosexuality. Yes, the 'gp' people are upset by my leaflets but they contain nothing wrong where the law is concerned. I elucidated this point by quoting as follows:

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), in *Handyside v UK* (1976), made it clear that freedom of expression embraces not only information and ideas that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive, but also, '... those that offend, shock or disturb the state or any sector of the population. Such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no democratic society'.

Lord Justice Sedley, in *Redmond Bate v DPP* (2000), famously said that, 'Free speech includes not only the inoffensive, but the irritating, the contentious, the eccentric, the heretical, the unwelcome and provocative provided that it does not tend to violence. Freedom only to speak inoffensively is not worth having'.

Therefore we are persuaded that we are guilty of no crime.

I was asked if I wished to contact a solicitor. I said, "No, not at the moment."

PC Arnold then informed me that a senior officer would decide whether the complaint is sent to the Crown Prosecution Service. A decision on this should be made in about a week's time.

PC Arnold thanked me for my cooperation, and I thanked him for his courtesy, adding that as Christians we only wish to act with integrity in these matters. With a final 'thank you', I said, "God bless you."

PAEDOPHILES ARE GIVEN 'FREE REIN' TO ABUSE ABROAD: JUST 50 ORDERS BAN OFFENDERS FROM TRAVELLING OVERSEAS

Jack Doyle; MailOnline

There are 65,000 registered sex offenders in the UK, but only 50 orders to prevent them travelling abroad. In 2007 not one order was handed down by the courts

Britain's regime for controlling dangerous paedophiles is fundamentally flawed, a damning police review has concluded. It leaves thousands of serious sex offenders free to leave the country to abuse youngsters overseas.

There are some 65,000 registered sex offenders in the UK, but only 50 orders stopping such individuals travelling abroad have been obtained in the past five and a half years. Free to attack abroad: Paedophiles such as pop star Gary Glitter are largely free to travel abroad where they can attack again

Yet every year the Foreign Office is notified of dozens of alleged paedophiles arrested overseas for child sex offences. There were some 66 such arrests last year.

At the same time, the protection of children in Britain is 'compromised' by the system of court orders for child rapists and molesters, the report states.

Only 2,658 Sexual Offender Prevention Orders supposed to control dangerous paedophiles in Britain were imposed in 2011/12.

The review was commissioned by the Association of Chief Police Officers and written by a leading QC, Hugh Davies, and police experts. It found gaping holes in the regime for stopping paedophiles from travelling overseas.

Police can apply for a Foreign Travel Order to keep them in the UK, and anyone on the sex offenders' register must notify the police if they intend to go abroad.

But the report said the number of such orders was ‘absurdly small’ compared to the number of known sex offenders and ‘even the lowest estimates of extra-territorial offending by identifiable British nationals’.

Greater protection: In the wake of the Oxford sex ring ran by Mohammed Karrar, left, and Bassam Karrar, right, local MP Nicola Blackwood is pushing for new laws to safeguard children. It added that this ‘tends to demonstrate... that the orders are intrinsically flawed’.

In 2007 not one order was handed down by the courts.

The report said: ‘The UK’s ability effectively to police the conduct of high-risk sex offenders abroad is highly compromised. The irresistible conclusion is that serious sexual offending against children has occurred and is occurring in many jurisdictions in a culture of near impunity.’ The report is also damning about the Sexual Offender Prevention Orders which can be used to put strict controls on a sex offender’s behaviour in Britain.

But police can apply for an order only for someone who already has a conviction for sex crimes, and must show evidence of subsequent threatening behaviour – which is often hard to prove.

The report says the ‘fundamental flaws’ in the orders are ‘serious and in need of immediate remedy’. It adds: ‘The existing regime simply serves to compromise effective child protection.’ The report was uncovered by Tory backbencher Nicola Blackwood, who today launches a major campaign designed to fix flaws in child protection.

Nicola Blackwood MP is seeking to fix flaws in child protection

The Oxford West and Abingdon MP is demanding new laws to protect children in the wake of the Oxford sex ring scandal. Her Childhood Lost campaign is backed by leading children’s charities including Barnardo’s, the NSPCC and Save the Children.

Miss Blackwood is suggesting a new ‘Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Order’ which would consolidate all existing orders into one and be easier for police to obtain.

It would last five years and could be used on someone without a conviction if there was evidence of the danger they pose to children.

Miss Blackwood is also petitioning David Cameron to set up specialist child sexual exploitation centres and for new guidance for judges to ensure tough sentencing in child sexual abuse cases.

A Home Office spokesman said: ‘Whilst we have some of the toughest powers in the world to deal with sex offenders, we keep them under constant review, and will consider proposals like this.’ Cases which have caused alarm include that of Gary Glitter who was jailed in Britain in 1999 and listed as a sex offender for downloading child abuse pictures. Despite this he was able to travel to South East Asia. In 2005 he was arrested by the Vietnamese police and convicted of molesting two girls.

At the time critics raised concerns about the apparent ease with which Glitter was able to travel. A Sexual Offender Prevention Order could have restricted his movements, but was not imposed.

DO YOU MIND IF WE STORE YOUR DNA DATA AND SHARE IT WITH EVERYBODY?

Jon Rappoport; Activist Post

Helen Wallace, writing at Public Service Europe—“UK Building DNA database in the NHS ‘by stealth’:

“In April, the Caldicott Committee, including British government chief scientist Sir Mark Walport proposed new rules for data-sharing electronic medical records. What they failed to make transparent is that genetic information including whole genomes will be integrated into medical records in the future – as part of a plan proposed by the Wellcome Trust, of which Walport used to be director.

“The plan, which is backed by United Kingdom Prime Minister David Cameron, involves sequencing the DNA of everyone in England and adding this information as an attachment to each person’s medical file. The data will then be shared with commercial companies including private healthcare companies, the pharmaceutical industry and web-based companies such as Google; without people’s knowledge or consent... Following statistical analysis of stored data, risk predictions made using computer algorithms will be fed back to individuals telling them the diseases they are expected to develop in the future.

“It raises serious concerns about government surveillance because it amounts to building a DNA database in the National Health Service by stealth. As well as commercial companies, the police,

security services and government departments will be able to track every individual and their relatives. The data will be stored by the new Health and Social Care Information Centre and sold to private companies and government-run institutes worldwide – from the United States to China. Other personal records stored by the government, for example, from social care and education will be linked to people's electronic medical records and also shared in [the] future. There is also a danger that risk predictions will lead to stigma and discrimination from insurers and employers."

What's that? The overwhelming majority of DNA data doesn't prove useful in predicting, treating, or curing disease? Who cares?

Not a problem.

That's because a) the more basic purpose of the project is surveillance and b) the medical cartel is an expert when it comes to faking cures.

"Mr. Jones, from your DNA records, we see you're going to develop skin cancer in 10 years. We have medication for you. It'll greatly improve your chances of staying healthy (as long as you never leave your house and keep the shades down)."

It isn't enough to (mis)treat current illness. The medical boys and their pharmaceutical partners are eager to explore the market of not-yet disease.

Social scientists, software designers, welfare workers, patient advocates, and various other bogus experts will take on the challenge of handling people whose future illnesses are predicted. For example, "what can we sell these frightened people?" will rank high on the list of priorities.

"Ms. Smith, if you decide to go ahead and marry your boy friend, knowing he will develop crippling arthritis at age 40, you'll need extensive psychological counselling and training...we recommend a full four-year program leading to a degree in Victim Partnership."

As for surveillance and tracking, it's paradise for government snooping agencies and corporate contractors.

Let's say a thief breaks into a high-end jewellery store after hours and steals diamonds. Immediately, all samples of retrievable DNA found in the store are analyzed. The thief wore gloves, a mask, and was covered in six layers of clothing, from head to toe? Doesn't matter. DNA recovery is SOP.

A hundred different samples are collected in the store. They're run through a standard program and matched to the national DNA database. The names of potential suspects are flagged in files. Police interviews are conducted. The suspects are put on a watch list and their DNA signatures are moved to a priority category—which means more intense future tracking ... It's a party for the Surveillance State.

You apply for a job. In your interview, the human resources clerk tells you: "Sir, I see by your DNA file you were present at two crime scenes in the past three years. The bombing of a cruise ship and the theft of candy from a drug store. Any comment?"

"I didn't commit a crime! I was just there!"

"Well, those felonies remain unsolved. And I'm wondering whether you have a tendency to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. We call this condition Associative Propensity. The latest studies indicate 12 percent of population is afflicted. It's a negative classification that's predictive for workplace errors..."

In all this grinding machinery, the notion that your DNA somehow belongs to you and is private has gone the way of the dinosaur. If you think finding a map of your own DNA by way of a public search engine allows you to file suit, you're sadly mistaken. It's no more significant than finding your picnic photo posted on a Facebook page.

News headlines will undergo a revolution: "Movie star will become an alcoholic in ten years, doctors say." "Shocker: Secretary of Defense claims eating GMO corn changed his DNA profile, allowed him to avoid clinical depression."

If you think my extrapolations are too far-out, consider the fact that a recent analysis of hundreds of thousands of samples from diagnosed flu patients revealed that 84% showed no sign of any flu virus. Not only didn't these people have the flu, the idea that a flu vaccine could have prevented their illness is, a priori, completely absurd. But this doesn't stop the government from hyping the vaccine.

We're already in la-la land. And very few people care.

*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*

PIRATEBROWSER

via Activist Post

(Has anyone tried this out??? - Ed)

PirateBrowser - No more censorship!

PirateBrowser is a bundle package of the Tor client (Vidalia), FireFox Portable browser (with foxyproxy addon) and some custom configs that allows you to circumvent censorship that certain countries such as Iran, North Korea, United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Belgium, Finland, Denmark, Italy and Ireland impose onto their citizens.

This is how it looks like:

Download PirateBrowser

Version 0.6b

Magnet link

Torrent file

Self extracting archive

Checksums

md5: a23b66f7c3fdd5308fc729582a7c8101

sha1: 40ee38c8eb81d27e8cf4c385d5eccee68381f268

sha256: dfe1fd76870a89f7832a00d924ed0b32b1ff2f58c6c40899efe82773211f0713

sha512:

d188c26c71572c8be5c9b80958b71156ce7d4a652c355c85dc782f9ad999d8b57f3c5fde5a781366f4a
d5a80933c5f45a43a8bc101f081e1f17f6e69c4adccdb

FAQ

Does it make me surf the net anonymously?

No, it's not intended to be a TOR Browser, while it uses the Tor network, which is designed for anonymous surfing, this browser is ONLY intended to circumvent censorship. The Tor network is used to help route around the censoring / blocking of websites your government doesn't want you to know about. If you are looking for something more secure you may want to try a VPN like PrivacyIO.

Does this contain any viruses or trojans?

There have been no modifications to any of the packages used, no adware, trojans, toolbars, etc. This is simply a tool to help people get around censorship.

Getting Started

- 1) Download PirateBrowser and save it to your computer:
- 2) Run the downloaded .exe file. You may be prompted to verify the application, press "Run":
- 3) Select the desination folder and press "Extract":
(It will create a PirateBrowser folder in the path you assign)
- 4) Go to the new directory and run the "Start PirateBrowser.exe" file:
- 5) The application will start up. Once connected to the Tor Network the standalone Firefox browser will open up and you can start browsing:

TIP: If you want to create a icon on your desktop to start the PirateBrowser, you can right click on "Start PirateBrowser.exe", choose "Send to" and then "Desktop (create shortcut)".

BEDROOM TAX & RENT STRIKE DEBT CANCELLED BY DRO - "LODGERS TO COST HB £3.4 BILLION PER YEAR MORE AND GET RID OF THE BEDROOM TAX

Steve Starlord/ Joe Halewood via Jimmy Devlin; North West Tenants

(The Halewood piece at

*http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=npPlzXaXuM&feature=player_embedded from the
Anti-Bedroom Tax Federation Manchester launch event in Manchester is worth
watching. This item explores new methods of resisting the bedroom tax - Ed)*

I contacted TMBC months ago only to confirm what I already knew from my readings and this will not change until the introduction of UC this October. In other words taking in a lodger as a solution to the Bedroom Tax only becomes economically feasible from October, at least that's the way it appears on paper anyway.

In essence TMBC told me that if I take in a lodger I am only allowed to keep the first £20 and they take the rest off me in full. This differs only slightly from what Joe says. Perhaps TMBC were incorrect. Anyway TMBC treat income from a lodger as literally income for HB purposes and the same under their new draconian Council Tax Support Scheme (CTSS). However, it appears that it will not be so treated under UC. I was also told that I can charge a lodger anything I like but that TMBC will only pay the Shared Room Allowance rate which for Tameside is about £57pw. It varies across the country but is around the £60 mark in the Manchester area. Joe gives the national average as £65.79pw.

He is correct for the Inland Revenue too for I spoke with them months ago to confirm this. After all I am self-employed and in receipt of WTC. They told me that the first £4250 of unearned rental income is not treated as earned income, though as said it is definitely treated as earned income by the local authority.

The £57pw rent for a lodger is treated as income and fed back into the HB calculation such that one will now have to find a further £5 to pay as this is now deducted from one's HB on top of the Bedroom Tax deduction. As Joe says it isn't currently an economically viable option and I too am waiting to see how this will work out in practice from October 2013. I have wondered whether it will apply only to those people in receipt of UC? As a self-employed person in receipt of WTC and affected by the Bedroom Tax I will not be transferred across onto UC until about 2017. I wonder then whether I'll be able to take advantage of this option or not?

It is this kind of thing and much else I know/learned that I wish to share with others, and others no doubt will have ideas I can learn from too. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts and in collective action working together we can become a power to be reckoned with. I've tried to reach out and get people interested and active, to attend a meeting for sharing and organising purposes, but have so far been met with mostly apathy. My outreach difficulties are further exacerbated because the landlord holds all the data. New Charter know exactly who the 1,700 affected tenants are; and New Charter will not release this either. They will, of course, use the Data Protection Act as an excuse for not so doing.

TAMESIDE-WIDE RENT STRIKE;

I am proposing a Tameside-wide Rent Strike, and no doubt this idea is percolating into the minds of others and moving across the UK. I could go into the details but in essence if all 1,700 affected tenants refused to pay the Bedroom Tax for 1 year they will have almost but not quite

accrued sufficient rent debt for New Charter to begin legitimate eviction proceedings.

This they can only do if they precisely follow the rules and dot every i and cross every t. Only then can they successfully evict a tenant under the Ground 8 Rule of the Housing Act. A tenant cannot be evicted until they owe at least 8 weeks worth of rent. Assuming no other rental debt that will take just over 1 year to accrue for 1 bedroom excess, but 6 months for those with 2 bedrooms excess. Despite my comments here I would advise everyone considering this option to contact myself or the Citizen's Advice Bureau or both for clarification to ensure they don't come a cropper.

After 1 year New Charter will have rent arrears amounting to £1.2Million from the Bedroom Tax alone; an amount not to be sniffed at even by New Charter's multimillion pound standards. Money is one of the few things businesses listen to and this no doubt applies to New Charter. New Charter and Tameside Council should be standing shoulder to shoulder with tenants. This should apply equally to all social landlords in Tameside including Ashton Pioneer Homes. So lets not forget them and thereby let them off the hook!

I'm hoping for a sympathetic response from other tenants who can move into a small amount of arrears without incurring any problems, by say £10pw or a whole weeks rent. Thereafter simply continue to pay in full. New Charter can't do anything though this does depend on the tenancy agreement and length of tenancy, etc. Again some research is called for first. I am a transferred tenant, an Assured Tenant Plus equal to the Secure Tenancy of a Council Tenant. I have more rights than most. This option is not that viable at present for most HB is paid direct to the landlord. However, this will change in October with the introduction of the UC though it may be rolled out slowly, for HB will begin to be paid directly into the tenants bank account making it far easier to withhold rent. Of course, it is already predicted that many tenants will get into rent arrears as a matter of course, and through the Ground 8 rule be forced back onto direct rent payments. Still, though I am calling for a Rent Strike much of my work in this regard is being done for me by the introduction of the UC itself.

Thus does every cloud have a silver lining. Martial Arts as the art of turning the weapons of an adversary against them. Mental Self-defence. How to strangle a bureaucracy with its own red tape. A Scorpionic combination of Sun Tzu's 'The Art of War', Bruce Lee, Carl von Clausewitz's 'On War' & Machiavelli's 'The Prince'.

I hope this £1.2Million debt threat will get their attention and bring them to the negotiating table. If not then the debt will need to become a reality. I'm doing this myself! Up to now they are arrogantly dismissive of tenants being more concerned with the viability of the business itself caring little really about their tenants. After all the Board Directors, including the elected Tenant Directors are strangled by legal bureaucracy to act only in the best interest of the Company and not in the best interest of tenants. They are not the same! They are not identical! They exist to serve tenants do they not! Hence why I view an elected Tenant Director as a kind of Tenant Union representative. New Charter consider this anathema. And hence why my name never appears on the ballot paper because New Charter vet before the election! Look, you won't see my name on this years ballot paper! Of course, this year New Charter are trying to be clever by saying I cannot stand because I am in rent arrears - the Bedroom Tax! But in previous years they've used the usual lame excuse that I've brought the Company into disrepute, that I have a blog saying things about them that they don't like! So much then for free speech!

And the coup de grâce is that the tenant can effectively write-off the whole of this debt using a Debt Relief Order (DRO) which will cost just £90. The tenant pays £90 to clear the 8 weeks debt. Thus a £90 DRO cancels a debt of around $8 \times £85 = £690$, and that's just the Bedroom Tax. It will cancel many other debts too if one plays one's cards right, though some are exempt eg criminal fines. I will be using it to cancel my Water Bill and Council Tax too. One must wait until the Council take you to court first for then the full yearly bill becomes due and payable. Very useful that. One can also cancel all court and bailiff charges incurred so there's nothing to worry about.

So New Charter will get nothing while the DRO organisation will get something ie about 1/7th of the debt. It's then up to New Charter whether they will negotiate with tenants for a partial payment of say £90 to cancel the whole of the Bedroom Tax arrears or they will get nothing. It

won't work a second time though but it will do for now.

My current Council Tax debt for the current tax year including legal charges is £785. I am playing it canny in a number of ways using rules and regulations to my advantage. I'm not breaking the law or advising anyone to break the law. The only unfortunate thing about taking out a DRO is that it can only be done once every 6 years and applies to debts totalling less than £15,000. If one has other debts such that the amount is above £15,000 then bankruptcy is the better option which will cost about £500 to cancel. Still by using a DRO one can save money elsewhere for future Bedroom Tax and Council Tax payments because other unpaid debts are also cancelled. And it works well easily up to October 2013 when the lodger option apparently becomes economically viable. A cunning plan!

From my current plans I'll end up paying about £350 rather than £2450 covering 1 years Bedroom Tax and 2 years Council Tax saving me £2100 combined covering me until Spring 2015. In the Spring of 2014 the Bedroom Tax is zero and begins to build again for a year when I'll need to think of something else for 2015 if I'm to survive.

And then we have the overt politics. I intend standing in the Tameside Council elections next year, providing being in debt and/or having taken out a DRO does not invalidate my candidacy. It's not that I expect to win but I shall make political capital of it. I can even do same in 2015, but then I doubt there will be Council elections because it will be the General Election. Unfortunately the poor cannot afford to stand as an MP because a conditional returnable deposit of £500 is needed for the privilege. So much then for democracy. Another legacy of Thatcher! The condition is that one obtain I think 5% of the vote or it is forfeit/lost! So little democracy for the poor under Capitalism! And even if I did have the requisite £500, and assuming I could afford to lose it, I'd have no money for any kind of election campaign. Isn't life fair and just!

New Charter will be holding their annual Resident Showcase event at their HQ at Cavendish 249 on Saturday 21st September 2013 from 11am-3pm. I'll be there demonstrating with some newly designed Bedroom Tax leaflets. I hope I won't be there by myself this time!

This time by sending this email I will have broadcast my intentions well in advance and so New Charter will come to know of this pretty quickly. Last time I was silent and perhaps unexpected. This time no doubt New Charter will be expecting me. But so what!

Copied here straight from Joe Halewood's excellent blog. The green, yellow and purple highlights are mine. <http://speye.wordpress.com/2013/07/18/lodgers-to-cost-hb-3-4-billion-per-year-more-and-get-rid-of-the-bedroom-tax-yes/>

Lodgers to cost HB £3.4 billion per year more and get rid of the bedroom tax? Yes!

The coalition say one option to the social tenant hit by bedroom tax is to take in a lodger. Sod that is a typical first reaction as stranger danger immediately springs to mind, yet that is a stupid and superficial association as I explain below.

When we look at taking in a lodger we find that it is in the tenants best interest, in the social landlords best interest yet would cost the government up to £3.43 billion more in housing benefit.

The bedroom tax would then be negated for the social tenant and social landlord and the coalition would be well and truly f***ed.

Below I explain how you can have friends or family as a lodger and severely blow apart the bedroom tax and all the stress and grief that goes with it for the social tenant and the financial loss it means to the social landlord. It really is a case of taking in a lodger, from October when Universal Credit starts, will destroy the pernicious bedroom tax and reveal that the coalition does not know what it is doing.

If a social tenant does take in a lodger the social tenant becomes a private landlord and the lodger is a private tenant. Yes it sounds bizarre that a social tenant is also a private landlord but that is the legal effect of taking in a lodger.

The lodger by being a private tenant can claim Local Housing Allowance and so if all social tenants took in lodgers the HB bill would rocket – by £2.27 billion per year if all 660,000 bedroom tax affected households took in 1 lodger, and if you believe the coalition that there are 1 million

spare bedrooms in social housing paid for by HB then the HB bill would increase by £3.43 billion per year

The above figures are based on the national average LHA rate for a single room of £65.79 per week which is set out in the 2013/14 LHA rates figures published by DWP

The rules now and until Universal Credit begins make a lodger in financial terms unworkable as the first £20 per week is disregarded but after that each £1 charged in rent sees £0.86p taken off the benefit claimant meaning if £65.79 was charged for a single person then taking in a lodger now would see the tenant better off by £26.41 per week.

YET under Universal Credit regulations the social tenant can charge the lodger a million pounds per night and there is no effect on their existing welfare benefits.

An extreme example obviously but lets keep this at £65.79 as an average which would also mean no income tax implications either as you are allowed to charge £4250 per year or about £81.50 per week for renting out a room in your property tax free.

Here is how friends and family can be moved in and not fall foul of the HB regulations and thus claim housing benefit (LHA) of £65.79 per week which more than compensates for the bedroom tax average deduction of £14 per week.

Housing Benefit Regulations (HBR) have a definition of a “close relative” which in simple terms means that if you live at the property some close relatives are unable to claim HB such as brother or sister or son or daughter or step son or half brother but no more than that. So for example a cousin, a niece or nephew or grandchild can be a lodger in your property and legitimately claim and receive housing benefit. So could a non-relative and someone you know such as your friends son or daughter and the issue here is that the lodger is not a stranger, it is someone you know. Also the legal arrangement can be a week by week basis and ended by a simple notice to quit – in other words if it doesn't work out the arrangement can be ended very quickly indeed.

Let me really dumb this down.

A tenant, Mary, has an 18 year old son who is not working and has a non-dependant deduction from Housing Benefit. Her friend Joan who lives 2 streets away is in the same situation. Mary and Joan's kids grew up together, went to the same school and have been best friends since the age of 4. They are always in one another's houses and have been for 14 years when frequently Mary has picked up Joan's son from school and vice versa. Not a far-fetched scenario and one of many I could use.

Mary takes in Joan's son and Joan takes in Mary's son as lodgers. The two sons are eligible to claim housing benefit and so (a) Mary and Joan are happy as their income increases by more than the bedroom tax, (b) Mary and Joan's social landlord is happy as the rent is paid, and (c) the HB bill goes through the bloody roof as here we have 2 new HB claims which will have to be paid.

The above WILL happen of that I have no doubt whatsoever and it IS in the interests of social tenant and social landlord for it to happen.

The savvy tenant affected by the bedroom tax should now be looking at someone they know, a friend, a friends son or daughter or a non 'close relative' who can become their lodger from October and negate and mitigate the pernicious bedroom tax.

NOTES

The above may appear contrived yet is not contrivance (ie. fraud) under HB regulations.

Adult children often fall out with parents and go and live with their mates (and with NDDs and the bedroom tax and other austerity issues many adult children are being kicked out by their parents too.)

Do local councils have the resources to check 660,000 new additional claims – No!

Do local council HB forms ask anything other than are you a relative of the landlord? No they do not ask whether it is your mates mum as in the Mary and Joan scenario above

What is to stop adult children being 'sent' to live with gran and grandad so they can claim LHA in their own right as a lodger? Nothing

What is stop your niece or nephew who lives with your owner occupier brother from living with

a social tenant and thus claiming LHA – Nothing see HBR definition of a close relative below and if they are not on the list then they are able to claim LHA as a lodger. What is to stop a friend's son or daughter from becoming the social tenants lodger and thus claiming and receiving LHA? Nothing!

The HBR definition of a "close relative" from the Housing Benefit Guidance Manual 'Close relative' is defined in the regulations as • a parent, step-parent or parent-in-law • son, step-son or son-in-law • daughter, step-daughter or daughter-in-law • brother • sister • a spouse or partner of any of the preceding people

THE INTERNATIONAL FORECASTER; THE INFORMATION-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

James Corbett; corbettreport.com; via John Newell

Of all the things that President Dwight D. Eisenhower did during his years in office, it is for a single phrase from his farewell address that he is best remembered today: "the military-industrial complex."

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."

It is not difficult to see why these words passed so quickly into the political lexicon. Think of their explanatory power. Why did the US use inflated estimates of Russian missile capabilities to justify stockpiling a nuclear arsenal that was more than sufficient to destroy the planet several times over?

The military-industrial complex.

Why did America send 50,000 of its own to fight and die in the jungles of Vietnam, killing untold millions of Vietnamese (not to mention Cambodians)?

The military-industrial complex.

Why did the US use the public's fear and anger over 9/11 and a phony panic over non-existent weapons of mass destruction to justify the illegal invasion and trillion dollar occupation of Iraq?

The military-industrial complex.

Why did Nobel Peace Prize laureate Obama expand the fictitious "war on terror" into Pakistan and Yemen and Somalia, refuse to close Guantanamo despite his earlier promises to the contrary, commit US forces to "kinetic military action" in Libya without so much as seeking Congressional approval, and launch a new era of covert drone warfare?

The military-industrial complex.

When you think about it, it's rather remarkable that such a phrase was ever uttered by a President of the United States, much less a former five-star general. Could you imagine any modern-day President talking about something like the "military-industrial complex" and its attempted "acquisition of unwarranted influence" without immediately dismissing the idea as a conspiracy theory? Over the decades there has been much speculation about Eisenhower's use of the phrase, and what precisely he was warning against. Some have argued that the phrase was prompted by Eisenhower's discovery that the Rand Corporation was grossly misrepresenting the Soviet's military capabilities to John F. Kennedy, who ended up using the Rand invented (and completely fictitious) "missile gap" threat as a cornerstone of his 1960 presidential election campaign.

Whatever the case, it is perhaps time to revisit Eisenhower's most famous speech. What Eisenhower is ultimately describing is the rise of American fascism; the merger of government and corporate power. What term can better capture the nature of early 21st century American political life? Is there any longer any doubt that the military-industrial complex has reached its ultimate expression in firms like Blackwater (aka "Xe" aka "Academi") and its military contractor brethren? Is there any other word but 'fascism' to describe a state of affairs when a Secretary of Defense can commission a study from a private contractor to examine whether the US military should be using more private contractors, only for that same Secretary of Defense to leave office and become president of the company that conducted the study, only to leave that company to become Vice President of the US and begin waging a war that relies heavily on no-bid contracts awarded to that same company based on the recommendation that it made in its original study? Yet this is precisely the case of Dick Cheney and

Halliburton. It would be difficult to think of a more blatant example of the military-industrial complex fascism that Eisenhower was warning of.

But as it turns out, there was another warning about fascism embedded in that farewell address that has received far less attention than the 'military-industrial complex' formulation, perhaps because there is no catchy phrase to describe it:

"Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers."

Given that this warning came in 1961, before the age of communications satellites or personal computers or the internet, it was a remarkably prescient observation. If scientific research half a century ago was dominated by federal grants and expensive computer equipment, how much more true is that for us today, half a century later? So what is the problem with this? As Ike explained:

"Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

Here again the warning is of fascism. But instead of the military-industrial fascism that dominated so much of the 20th century, he was describing here a new fascistic paradigm that was but barely visible at the time that he gave his address: a scientific-technological one. Once again, the threat is that the industry that grows up around this government-sponsored activity will, just like the military-industrial complex, begin to take over and shape the actions of that same government. In this case, the warning is not one of bombs and bullets but bits and bytes, not tanks and fighter jets but hard drives and routers. Today we know this new fascism by its innocuous sounding title "Big Data," but in keeping with the spirit of Eisenhower's remarks, perhaps it would be more fitting to call it the "information-industrial complex."

The concept of an information-industrial complex holds equally explanatory power for our current day and age as the military-industrial complex hypothesis held in Eisenhower's time. Why is a company like Google going to such lengths to catalogue "and make freely available" all information on the planet?

The information-industrial complex.

Why do all major telecom providers and internet service providers allow back door access to American intelligence agencies for the purpose of spying on all electronic communications?

The information-industrial complex.

Why would a national security advisor openly muse about how the recent car crash that took the life of investigative journalist Michael Hastings may have been caused by a cyber attack which allowed a third-party to take control of the car's systems remotely by hacking into them?

The information-industrial complex.

The effects of this synthesis are more and more felt in our everyday lives. Every single day hundreds of millions of people around the world are interfacing with Microsoft software or Apple hardware or Amazon cloud services running on chips and processors supplied by Intel or other Silicon Valley stalwarts. Google has become so ubiquitous that its very name has become a verb meaning "to search for something on the internet." The 21st century version of the American dream is encapsulated in the story of Mark Zuckerberg, a typical Harvard whizkid whose atypical rise to the status of multi-billionaire was enabled by a social networking tool by the name of "Facebook" that he developed.

But how many people know the flip side of this coin, the one that demonstrates the pervasive government influence in shaping and directing these companies' rise to success, and the companies' efforts to aid the government in collecting data on its own citizens? How many know, for instance, that Google has a publicly acknowledged relationship with the NSA? Or that a federal judge has ruled that the public does not have the right to know the details of that relationship? Or that Google Earth was originally the brainchild of Keyhole Inc., a company that was set up by the CIA's own venture capital firm, In-Q-Tel, using satellite data harvested from government "Keyhole" class reconnaissance satellites? Or that the former CEO of In-Q-Tel, Gilman Louie, sat on the board of the National Venture Capital Association with Jim Breyer, head of Accel Partners, who provided 12 million dollars of seed money for Facebook? Or that in 1999, a back door for NSA access was discovered in Microsoft's Windows operating system source code? Or that Apple founder Steve Jobs was granted security clearance by the Department of Defense for still-undisclosed reasons while heading Pixar in 1988?

The connections between the IT world and the government's military and intelligence apparatus run deep. In fact, the development of the IT industry is intimately intertwined with the US Air Force, the Department of Defense and its various branches (including, famously, DARPA), and, of course, the CIA. A cursory glance at the history of the rise of companies like Mitre Corporation, Oracle, and other household electronics and software firms should suffice to expose the extent of these relations, and the existence of what we might dub an "information-industrial complex."

But what does this mean? What are the ramifications of such a relationship?

Although the signs have been there for decades, perhaps the most startling example of what lies at the heart of this relationship has been revealed by the whistleblowers at the heart of the National Security Agency, one of the most secretive arms of the American intelligence apparatus. While Edward Snowden has received the most attention with his recent PRISM revelations, much of the information about the NSA's ability to surveil all electronic communications has been revealed over the past decade by NSA whistleblowers like Russ Tice, William Binney, Thomas Drake and J. Kirk Wiebe, third-party contractors like Snowden and AT&T whistleblower Mark Klein, and independent journalists like James Bamford. Together, the story they tell is of a truly Orwellian society in which all communications are being captured and analyzed by the NSA, and, with the advent of facilities like the new data center in Utah, presumably stored indefinitely for use at any future time in any future investigation for any pretense by anyone with authorization to access that data. According to Snowden, this includes lowly third-party contractors like himself operating at NSA subcontractors like Booz Allen Hamilton in the vast (and expanding) private intelligence industry that has grown up around the information-industrial complex in the exact same way as private military contractors like Blackwater formed around the military-industrial complex.

In some ways, this information-industrial complex is even more insidious than its military-industrial counterpart. For all of the ills caused by the military-industrial complex (and there are many), at the very least it required some sort of excuse to drain the American people's resources, and its failures (like the Vietnam quagmire or the Iraq debacle) happened in the clear light of day. In the information-industrial complex, where vast spying programs happen in the shadows and under the cover of "national security" it takes whistleblowers and insiders willing to risk it all even to find out what is being done by these shadowy agencies and their private sector contractors. Even worse, the entire Orwellian spy grid is being run on the flimsiest of pretenses (the "war on terror") that has no defined end point, and "justifies" turning that spy grid inward, on the American people themselves.

Surely Eisenhower never envisaged the monstrosity that this information-industrial complex has become, but the foresight he saw in identifying its early stages over half a century ago is remarkable. The problem is that we are even further away from heeding the warning that he delivered in that 1961 address than the nation was at the time:

"It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system - ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society."

If only this was the rhetoric that was shaping today's debate on the issue, instead of the well-worn canard that we must "strike a balance" between freedom and security. Sadly, until such time that the National Security Act of 1947 is repealed and the cover of national security is lifted from the dark actors that populate this sector, the information-industrial complex is unlikely to be quashed-or even hampered-anytime soon.

EVOLUTION PUNISHES SELFISH PEOPLE, GAME THEORY STUDY SAYS

Shaunacy Ferro; Popsci via Critical Thinking

How long can you get ahead by screwing other people over?

Contrary to our Darwinian inclinations, evolution may not be as dog-eat-dog of a world as we thought it was. The selfish can survive for a while, but according to new game theory research, long-term survival requires cooperation.

Game theorists were taken aback last year when a paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences presented a new breakthrough strategy for the Prisoner's Dilemma, a classic

game theory situation that presents two prisoners with the opportunity to either cooperate or betray each other in exchange for lesser sentences, widely studied as a model for economics, psychology and evolutionary biology.

Using a strategy called zero-determinant, or ZD (meaning that in the mathematical model, the value called the determinant is set to zero), the paper argued that selfish players could be guaranteed to beat cooperative players, enforcing "a unilateral claim to an unfair share of rewards." Since the Prisoner's Dilemma is used to explain biological phenomena, it raised the question: Does evolution favour jerks?

Selfishness isn't evolutionarily sustainable. Michigan State University microbiology and molecular genetics professor Christoph Adami and his research associate Arend Hintze immediately had doubts about whether ZD strategies could prove that evolution favours the selfish over the cooperative. In a paper published today in Nature Communications, they argue that according to their simulations, ZD strategies aren't evolutionarily stable, and that eventually, selfish players would have to become cooperative to survive.

"We found evolution will punish you if you're selfish and mean," Adami said in a press statement, vindicating every 8-year-old with a schoolyard squabble. "For a short time and against a specific set of opponents, some selfish organisms may come out ahead," he explained. "But selfishness isn't evolutionarily sustainable."

That's because the selfish strategy only works when ZD players compete against players that aren't using the same strategy, and don't know that they're being manipulated. Against other ZD opponents, the strategy isn't viable, and so eventually, when the pool of players narrows to only ZD strategists, they need to adapt other strategies to win. According to Adami, "in the long run they would have to evolve away from being ZD and become more cooperative. So they wouldn't be ZD strategists anymore." I can't do justice to the researchers' complicated math here, but their methods are detailed in full in Nature Communications. (Open access!)

BIG BROTHER WATCH

Nick Pickles

The rule of law and David Miranda - why Schedule 7 matters

Lord Falconer, the former Attorney General who helped introduce the Terrorism Act 2000, has laid bare the increasingly clear case that the police acted unlawfully in detaining David Miranda under Schedule 7 of the Terrorism Act 2000.

"The Terrorism Act defines a terrorist as someone "involved in committing preparing or instigating acts of terrorism". Miranda is plainly not committing or preparing acts of terrorism."

At stake is not just a procedural check but the fundamental principle of the rule of law – namely, that the state will not use powers granted to it for reasons the democratically elected legislature has permitted. David Davis MP also notes that "If they suspected there was information, unique information carried by Mr Miranda that they could intercept and take away and therefore prevent it coming into the hands of terrorists, then you could understand that, although even then Schedule 7 was not designed for that and doesn't actually allow that."

We have highlighted a range of opinions, from all three parties, on why the use of Schedule 7's use in this case was unlawful.

New CCTV Code comes into force

On Monday the new Code of Practice for CCTV came into force, with Big Brother Watch appearing in the media throughout the day. Director Nick Pickles appeared on BBC Breakfast while Deputy Director Emma Carr was interviewed for Sky News, with the team being interviewed by local, national and international media 84 times on the issue.

The code is a step in the right direction towards bringing proper oversight to the millions of cameras that capture our movements every day. However, with only a small fraction of cameras covered and without any penalties for breaking the code, we hope that this is only the beginning of the process and that further steps will be taken in the future to protect people's privacy from unjustified or

excessive surveillance.

Tracking bins are rubbish: City of London

No sooner had the Sunday Times reported on our concerns about bins in London that record the details of nearby mobile phones than the City of London Corporation demanded the bins be shut down.

Our concerns led to the incident being reported to the Information Commissioner and we await their response, particularly given the rapid growth of technologies using wi-fi capability to track mobile phones. Bin snooping was one of our first reports and this incident shows how with modern technology the potential to grab data continues to run ahead of the law.

Blocking the Bard

As reported by the Daily Telegraph, this week the British Library's wi-fi blocked access to Hamlet on the grounds that it was violent content.

Over-blocking is an inevitable consequence of pursuing greater filtering of internet access and as the scope of content filtered expands, so will the collateral damage to legal content. Pursuit of "clean" or "safe" public wi-fi is an illusion, leading to parents having a false sense of security and expecting technology to fill the gap where parenting should be.

Investigators to be regulated

The Home Secretary has confirmed plans to regulate private investigators, including a new penalty for working as an unlicensed private investigator or supplying unlicensed investigators of a fine of up to £5,000 and up to six months in prison.

In our report earlier this year, we warned that private investigators were potentially being used to circumvent surveillance law by public authorities, and also identified their work as being a major threat to privacy where the information could be used in court if it had been obtained by improper means. We are pleased the Home Office has agreed with our recommendation to regulate private investigators.

Royston's Ring of Steel ruled illegal

The Information Commissioner has ruled on a joint complaint from Big Brother Watch, No CCTV and Privacy International, concerning the use of automatic number plate recognition technology in Royston.

In a victory for BBW and the other groups, our complaint was upheld and The ICO found that Hertfordshire Constabulary failed to carry out "any effective impact assessments" and that the system was "unlawful" as it breached the Data Protection Act, and that it was not justifiable for Hertfordshire Constabulary to log every vehicle passing through the town on its system.

This sends a clear message that the blanket logging of vehicle movements is not going to be within the law and it is now essential that the ICO ensures other police forces are abiding by the law.

Humphrey Nightingale writes to supporters

Humphrey Nightingale, father of Sergeant Danny Nightingale, has written to supporters about the family's campaign. He said: "We were all bitterly disappointed with the verdict last week. We were shocked to hear medical evidence from one of the world's foremost experts dismissed as 'spurious' and it was a kick in the teeth to hear Judge Advocate General Blackett attack our campaign."

NEW IPHONES WILL COME WITH "BIOMETRIC KIT"

Activist Post

The rumours are true. The new iPhone will have biometric features. The new operating system iOS7 for the iPhone 6 has been leaked for testing which revealed a fingerprint sensor and other biometric features. Located in a folder labeled "Biometric Kit", the fingerprint identification system is said to be used for unlocking the iPhone and for Apple products like iTunes.

Just about one year ago Apple bought fingerprint sensor technology company AuthenTec Inc for about \$356 million. At the time Reuters speculated that it would be used for "authentication" purposes:

Its fingerprint technology, used in mobile phones in Japan for authentication of mobile payments, could help Apple bring those services to markets such as the United States, where mobile-wallet services have been slow to catch on.

Other cell phone developers have used other biometric features in the past with mixed results:

Motorola released the Atrix 4G in 2011 which featured a biometric fingerprint sensor it claimed offered a level of security surpassing password or PIN locks. Customers reported mixed levels of success with the scanner, with many saying the sensor failed to recognise their fingerprint. Other digital security systems include the Samsung Galaxy S3's Face Unlock feature, also available on Google's Nexus 4, and in the future it's likely phones will unlock upon recognition of its owner's voice. (Source)

It's clear that biometric technology is becoming better and more prevalent. This is troubling for privacy considering the recent revelations that the U.S. government is using big tech firms to spy on all citizens, and the FBI is expanding its biometric database.

UNLATERABLE AT COMMON LAW

Kenn D'Oudney; Democracy Defined

(Edited from an item of correspondence - Ed)

Legem Terrae has a very specific meaning in our Constitution and law, and there is no relation in fact, history, Constitution, language or authentic (legitimate) law which "makes" legem terrae "mean" or "evolve" into "due process of law."

In addressing this issue, to begin with one has to know that the (real) Common Law Trial by Jury effectively curtails "arbitrary government administered with injustice" (definitive tyranny); it enables redress by cost-free private prosecutions by single or multiple plaintiffs and the bringing to justice of those responsible for such government crimes; and Constitutional Trial by Jury provides techniques applicable in the Annulment of unjust prosecutions and the Expunction of (unjust or unwanted) statutes...

Consequently, such being the fallibilities of mankind, in all times and places lawyers in the paid service of criminals who seek dictatorial power, attempt to produce crafty, mendacious schemes quietly to remove this Sovereign Power "to do justice" through Trial by Jury from the 'ordinary' people. Instead, they seek to establish Absolutism, despotic power in the hands of government (the executive, legislature and judiciary) by which to prevent the populace from deciding their laws and liberties for themselves.

What you have noticed is one of the interminable mendacious ploys fabricated by lawyers to conceal from the populace the illegal imposition then, as of today, of the despots' instrument of the trial-by-government-judge, illegally to replace the Constitution's installation of the People's Courts of the Common Law Trial by Jury as the sole legitimate Justice System. There is nothing new today about the lying techniques employed by such lawyers and judges in their lucrative participation in criminal government: they are incessant. For this reason people point out, "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

From the following information you will see how the modern lawyer is deliberately adopting an old mendacious ruse.

Extracted from: DEFINITIONS UNALTERABLE AT COMMON LAW.

(i) A 'constitution' is a code of laws and customs (legem terræ; the Law of the Land; common law; the Trial by Jury Justice System) established by the people of a nation (as distinct from government and/or bureaucrats) for the guidance and the legal and lawful control of its government, by which to preclude tyranny and lawlessness; a constitution may be amended only at the behest and by the active

participation of the great mass of the people (not by government); and, (ii) 'government' is comprised of the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. Being the legal means of controlling and limiting the power of government, a constitution is categorically not merely a document showing the hierarchical administration and departmental organisation of government, though it may also contain this.

[Quote ends.]

Legem terrae is the Common Law, the Law of the Land inscribed as the Common Law Articles of the virtually immutable 1215 Great Charter Constitution.

REFERENCES CONFIRMING LEGEM TERRÆ IS THE TIMELESS COMMON LAW IN THE 1215 GREAT CHARTER CONSTITUTION, MAGNA CARTA.

Sir Matthew Hale: "The common law is sometimes called, by way of eminence, *lex terræ*, as in the statute of Magna Carta, chap. 29, where certainly the common law is principally intended by those words, *aut per legem terræ*; as appears by the exposition thereof in several subsequent statutes; and particularly in the statute of 28 Edward III, chap. 3, which is but an exposition and explanation of that statute. Sometimes it is called *lex Angliæ*, as in the statute of Merton, cap. 9, *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*,' etc. (We will that the laws of England be not changed.) Sometimes it is called *lex et consuetudo regni* (the law and custom of the kingdom); as in all commissions of oyer and terminer; and in the statutes of 18 Edward I, and *de quo warranto*, and divers others. But most commonly it is called the Common Law, or the Common Law of England; as in the statute *Articuli super Chartas*, chap. 15, in the statute 25 Edward III, chap. 5 (4) and infinite more records and statutes." *Hale's History of the Common Law*, p. 128.

Crabbe: "It is admitted, on all hands, that it (Magna Carta) contains nothing but what was confirmatory of the common law, and the ancient usages of the realm, and is, properly speaking, only an enlargement of the charter of Henry I, and his successors." *Crabbe's History of the English Law*, p. 127.

Blackstone: "It is agreed by all our historians that the Great Charter of King John was, for the most part, compiled from the ancient customs of the realm, or the laws of Edward the Confessor; by which they mean the old common law, which was established under our Saxon princes." *Blackstone's Introduction to the (Great) Charters; Blackstone's Law Tracts*, p. 289.

Coke (a High Court judge): "The common law is the most general and ancient law of the realm. The common law appeareth in the statute of Magna Carta, and other ancient statutes (which for the most part are affirmations of the common law) in the original writs, in judicial records, and in our books of terms and years." *Coke's Institutes*, p. 115.

Coke: "It (Magna Carta) was for the most part declaratory of the principal grounds of the fundamental laws of England. They (Magna Carta and Carta de Foresta) were, for the most part, but declarations of the ancient common laws of England, to the observation and keeping whereof the king (the government) was bound and sworn." *Preface to 2 Coke's Institutes*, p. 3.

Nota Bene: To judge the law, i.e., its fairness, validity, applicability, and legal meaning (interpretation), the Jurors are the sole legal judges prescribed by constitution and common law. For example, see the following from Gilbert:

"This position" (that the matter of law was decided by the justices [judges], but the matter of fact by the pares [peers, i.e., jurors]) "is wholly incompatible with the common law, for the Jurata [jury] were the sole judges both of the law and the fact." *Gilbert's History of the Common Pleas*, note, p. 70; and "The Annotist says, that this [i.e., whether jurors reflect upon the question of law] is indeed a maxim in the Civil-Law Jurisprudence, but it does not bind an English jury, for by the common law of the land the jury are judges as well as the matter of law, as of the fact, with this difference only, that the judge on the bench is to give them no assistance in determining the matter of fact, but if they have any doubt among themselves relating to matter of law, they may then request him to explain it to them, which when he hath done, and they are thus become well informed, they, and they only, become competent judges of the matter of law. And this is the province of the judge on the bench, namely, to show, or teach the law, but not to take upon him the trial of the delinquent, either in matter of fact or in matter of law." *Gilbert's History of the Common Pleas*, p. 57.

See TRIAL BY JURY: Its History, True Purpose and Modern Relevance, by d'Oudney & Spooner, ISBN 9781902848723. Also see the constitutional, historical and law texts of Sir Matthew Hale, Crabbe, Palgrave, Kelham, Mackintosh, Millar, Coke, Gilbert, Hume, Turner, Hallam, Blackstone, Stewart, et al. Laurence,

From the above, note first that all statutes which seek to intervene in, "evolve" or amend the Constitution are void.

Being quoted by the lawyer is exactly such a premeditated illegitimate intervention in the

Constitution by a statute... With specious words, he is adopting the mendacity. This is an example of a statute being passed to overthrow the strictures of the Constitution governing the due process of law with ONLY the Common Law Trial by Jury Justice System for all causes, civil, criminal and fiscal. The lawyer is attempting to conceal the meaning and effects of losing the Constitution's legem terrae as the Supreme Law. The lawyer means STATUTE LAW* when he says, "due process became a fundamental concept and principle which has informed the development of the *law."

Trial by Jury is the central tenet and sole Justice System of legem terrae, the Law of the Land. Losing legem terrae means the loss of the Trial by Jury as defined and prescribed by the People's 1215 Constitution.

That lawyer's ploy of wording is itself an infraction of the Constitution and of the timeless, universally applicable secular moral principles of the People's Common Law. Its illegal intention is to "allow" politicians and judges arbitrarily to redefine "due process" according to statutes which reflect their caprice, venal intentions and deceptions; and to impose further statutes and judges' decisions which completely quash the Constitutional Sovereignty of the Juror in Trial by Jury to judge the justice of statutes and acts of enforcement, to vet, make (decide), enforce or ANNUL the law; annulling the prosecution of any statute in question.

The (genuine) Trial by Jury is the long-understood effective means for precluding arbitrary government imposed with injustice (tyranny). Trial by Jury is defined and prescribed by those timeless secular Common Law Articles in the 1215 Great Charter Constitution. As emphatically established by the constitutional, legal and historical authorities quoted above, legem terrae, the Law of the Land, is definitively and Constitutionally the Common Law at 1215.

Rather than the lawyer's duplicitous adoption of an illegal statutory usurpation upon the Constitution, legem terrae is comprised of the (pan-European) supreme law, code and customs of the People. Legem terrae was installed for all time (Constitutionally) into the 1215 Great Charter Constitution, Magna Carta, to guide and control government. This was achieved by the Great Charter's Restoration to the people of legem terrae's Trial by Jury Justice System as the sole legitimate means of law enforcement (as distinct from the trial-by-government-judge which had come to be forcefully imposed by the invasive, tyrannical Norman governments. Yet nevertheless, the Normans had previously adopted Trial by Jury, as did all the Gothic nations of modern Europe.).

Magna Carta of 1215 was a direct rejection by the populace of the then government's misappropriation of the Justice System and its tyrannical implantation of the wholly corrupt, ex parte (one-sided) primitive tyrannical system of trial-by-judge. In order to achieve similar Restoration nowadays, informing enough of the people about their own Common Law -- legem terrae -- is the first object of this Educational Campaign.

FEMA DEMANDING 24 HOUR DELIVERY OF EMERGENCY FOOD RESERVES

Paul Joseph Watson; Infowars.com; via Stan Parr and John Newell

(As so often written in the American context, this may present further evidence of the manner in which the oligarchs are tooling up. But what is happening on this side of the Atlantic, or don't people research such matters here?)

Feds preparing for calamity?

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is contacting storable food suppliers requesting immediate delivery of food reserves within a 24 hour period, increasing suspicions that the federal government is accelerating its preparations for social disorder or an environmental calamity.

FEMA recently contacted My Patriot Supply, a provider of bulk food reserves, requesting "immediate delivery" of truckloads of food within a 24 hour period. Instead of soliciting for the food in the normal manner via the Federal Business Opportunities website and thereby saving money, FEMA is now directly contacting suppliers in order to secure overnight deliveries of bulk food. The snapshot above shows one of the emails My Patriot Supply received from FEMA.

While it's certainly not unusual for FEMA to be buying storable food, the rushed manner with which the federal agency is now conducting such business has raised a few eyebrows, prompting the owner of My Patriot Supply to ask, "Why the sudden sense of urgency? What do they know that we do not? I'm not one to cry that the sky is always falling, but when DHS/FEMA make a move to quietly buy up emergency food supplies and ask how much we can ship within 24 hours...I think this is far enough outside the realm of what is "normal" to beg some questions," remarked the company's owner.

"In recent years the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has been regionalizing disaster supplies and rapidly procuring hundreds of millions of ready-to-eat meals, blankets, and body bags. Coupled with the Department of Homeland Security's suspiciously massive purchases of ammunition, firearms, and riot gear, it is becoming increasingly clear that the U.S. government is positioning itself in advance of an as of yet unknown widespread calamity," writes Mac Slavo.

Indeed, FEMA is not the only branch of the Department of Homeland Security demanding the immediate delivery of provisions within as quick a time frame as possible.

As we highlighted back in May, the DHS itself released a market survey asking companies if they were able to provide 2 million rounds of ammunition within a 30-60 day period. "If you were awarded a contract for some of the calibers listed above, submitted a production lot of one million rounds and that lot or portion of the lot was not accepted, would you be able to replace that order with an additional one million rounds within 60 days?" the survey asked.

Similar to how the DHS' huge bullet purchases over the last 18 months have caused shortages in ammunition, bulk food reserves are also becoming more scarce as a result of massive FEMA stockpiling, prompting concerns that "something is ready to pop off."

Although FEMA is now purchasing storable food in quantities amounting to \$1 billion dollars a year, individual Americans who follow their example by stocking up with bulk food buys are simultaneously being labelled as potential terrorists by the federal government.

As we reported last year, a flyer aimed at Military Surplus stores produced under the auspices of the FBI's Communities Against Terrorism project, encourages owners to report people who "make bulk purchases of items to include...meals ready to eat".

According to the flyer, the FBI advises store owners to demand ID's from all new customers, as well as asking them questions about their purchase and being aware of "suspicious statements".

Paul Joseph Watson is the editor and writer for Infowars.com and Prison Planet.com. He is the author of Order Out Of Chaos. Watson is also a host for Infowars Nightly News. Read more: <http://bob-mitchell.blogspot.com/#ixzz2bM2ke8z9>

THE DNA NANOBOTS HAVE ARRIVED

Nicholas West; Activist Post

(Is this horrifying idea fact or fancy? - Ed)

Columbia University creates DNA robots that find and target cells for medication.

The Human Body Version 2.0 project features none other than arch-Transhumanist Ray Kurzweil as its main proponent. The goals have been openly stated for some time:

"In the coming decades, a radical upgrading of our body's physical and mental systems, already underway, will use nanobots to augment and ultimately replace our organs. We already know how to prevent most degenerative disease through nutrition and supplementation; this will be a bridge to the emerging biotechnology revolution, which in turn will be a bridge to the nanotechnology revolution. By 2030, reverse-engineering of the human brain will have been completed and nonbiological intelligence will merge with our biological brains.

In fact, the reverse engineering of the human brain has already been announced to be well under way via new microchips and accompanying software. And, while full nanobot rewiring of the brain is not

expected before 2020, Phys.org is reporting that our DNA has been successfully targeted by nanobots "for drug therapy or destruction."

From science fiction horror, directly to the human body, the nanobots are no longer speculation. Also unlike science fiction, they won't arrive via immediate worldwide takeover -- they are already here, and will be introduced incrementally according to Kurzweil:

"It will be an incremental process, one already well under way. Although version 2.0 is a grand project, ultimately resulting in the radical upgrading of all our physical and mental systems, we will implement it one benign step at a time. Based on our current knowledge, we can already touch and feel the means for accomplishing each aspect of this vision. (emphasis added)"

Now researchers from Columbia University are announcing a fleet of molecular nanorobots that can deliver drugs to specific cells and also identify certain genetic markers by using fluorescent labeling. After such identification, a chain reaction can be initiated:

On cells where all three components are attached, a robot is functional and a fourth component (labeled 0 below) initiates a chain reaction among the DNA strands. Each component swaps a strand of DNA with another, until the end of the swap, when the last antibody obtains a strand of DNA that is fluorescently labeled.

"At the end of the chain reaction—which takes less than 15 minutes in a sample of human blood—only cells with the three surface proteins are labeled with the fluorescent marker. Naturally, this type of targeted therapeutic approach could prove beneficial, as the researchers highlight -- especially for cancer treatment which sweeps up healthy cells along with malignant ones, very often doing more harm than good (if one were to choose the establishment medical route)."

This is always how new technologies are sold to the public, however, and it would be naive not to consider the darker applications as well.

Direct brain modification already has been packaged as "neuroengineering." A Wired article from early 2009 highlighted that direct brain manipulation via fiber optics is a bit messy, but once installed "it could make someone happy with the press of a button." Nanobots take the process to an automated level, rewiring the brain molecule by molecule. Worse, these mini droids can autonomously self-replicate, forcing one to wonder how this genie would ever be put back in the bottle once unleashed.

Here is one scenario offered by Kurzweil for how these nanobots could enter our bodies:

"A significant benefit of nanobot technology is that unlike mere drugs and nutritional supplements, nanobots have a measure of intelligence. They can keep track of their own inventories, and intelligently slip in and out of our bodies in clever ways. One scenario is that we would wear a special "nutrient garment" such as a belt or undershirt. This garment would be loaded with nutrient bearing nanobots, which would make their way in and out of our bodies through the skin or other body cavities. (emphasis added)"

That might seem to offer a level of participatory choice -- to wear or not to wear the garment -- but Kurzweil reveals that the nanobots will eventually be everywhere:

"Ultimately we won't need to bother with special garments or explicit nutritional resources. Just as computation will eventually be ubiquitous and available everywhere, so too will basic metabolic nanobot resources be embedded everywhere in our environment."

Despite the benign language of futurists, we know that a concerted effort is already underway to manage and predict human behavior for a whole range of potentially anti-human applications. As our free will is also targeted like the cells of our body -- for drug therapy or elimination -- ethical concerns must be voiced loud and clear. Scientists seem content with opening Pandora's Box, then worrying about negative consequences later ... and that is only if we assume that their intentions are benign from the beginning. One should take time to examine the history of military experimentation on human populations to see all of this through a very different lens.

At the very least, instead of the fully realized vision of Human Body 2.0, this might be Big Pharma 2.0 -- a new phase where conventional drugs are incrementally replaced by nanodrugs and nano-fleet delivery systems. The funding is already there, and a massive amount of money is waiting to be made. Here again, for those who might only see the bright side to this technology, we ought to question who is really in control of it.

Source:

<http://phys.org/news/2013-08-dna-nanorobots-tag-cellular.html>

<http://www.nature.com/nnano/focus/dna-nanotechnology/index.html>

<http://www.nature.com/nnano/journal/v8/n8/index.html>

THE GREAT AMERICAN BUBBLE MACHINE

Matt Taibbi; Rolling Stone; via Critical Thinking

From tech stocks to high gas prices, Goldman Sachs has engineered every major market manipulation since the Great Depression -- and they're about to do it again

The first thing you need to know about Goldman Sachs is that it's everywhere. The world's most powerful investment bank is a great vampire squid wrapped around the face of humanity, relentlessly jamming its blood funnel into anything that smells like money. In fact, the history of the recent financial crisis, which doubles as a history of the rapid decline and fall of the suddenly swindled dry American empire, reads like a Who's Who of Goldman Sachs graduates.

Invasion of the Home Snatchers

By now, most of us know the major players. As George Bush's last Treasury secretary, former Goldman CEO Henry Paulson was the architect of the bailout, a suspiciously self-serving plan to funnel trillions of Your Dollars to a handful of his old friends on Wall Street. Robert Rubin, Bill Clinton's former Treasury secretary, spent 26 years at Goldman before becoming chairman of Citigroup — which in turn got a \$300 billion taxpayer bailout from Paulson. There's John Thain, the asshole chief of Merrill Lynch who bought an \$87,000 area rug for his office as his company was imploding; a former Goldman banker, Thain enjoyed a multi-billion-dollar handout from Paulson, who used billions in taxpayer funds to help Bank of America rescue Thain's sorry company. And Robert Steel, the former Goldmanite head of Wachovia, scored himself and his fellow executives \$225 million in golden-parachute payments as his bank was self-destructing. There's Joshua Bolten, Bush's chief of staff during the bailout, and Mark Patterson, the current Treasury chief of staff, who was a Goldman lobbyist just a year ago, and Ed Liddy, the former Goldman director whom Paulson put in charge of bailed-out insurance giant AIG, which forked over \$13 billion to Goldman after Liddy came on board. The heads of the Canadian and Italian national banks are Goldman alums, as is the head of the World Bank, the head of the New York Stock Exchange, the last two heads of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York — which, incidentally, is now in charge of overseeing Goldman — not to mention ...

But then, any attempt to construct a narrative around all the former Goldmanites in influential positions quickly becomes an absurd and pointless exercise, like trying to make a list of everything. What you need to know is the big picture: If America is circling the drain, Goldman Sachs has found a way to be that drain — an extremely unfortunate loophole in the system of Western democratic capitalism, which never foresaw that in a society governed passively by free markets and free elections, organized greed always defeats disorganized democracy.

The bank's unprecedented reach and power have enabled it to turn all of America into a giant pump-and-dump scam, manipulating whole economic sectors for years at a time, moving the dice game as this or that market collapses, and all the time gorging itself on the unseen costs that are breaking families everywhere — high gas prices, rising consumer credit rates, half-eaten pension funds, mass layoffs, future taxes to pay off bailouts. All that money that you're losing, it's going somewhere, and in both a literal and a figurative sense, Goldman Sachs is where it's going: The bank is a huge, highly sophisticated engine for converting the useful, deployed wealth of society into the least useful, most wasteful and insoluble substance on Earth — pure profit for rich individuals.

The Feds vs. Goldman

They achieve this using the same playbook over and over again. The formula is relatively simple: Goldman positions itself in the middle of a speculative bubble, selling investments they know are crap. Then they Hoover up vast sums from the middle and lower floors of society with the aid of a crippled and corrupt state that allows it to rewrite the rules in exchange for the relative pennies the bank throws

at political patronage. Finally, when it all goes bust, leaving millions of ordinary citizens broke and starving, they begin the entire process over again, riding in to rescue us all by lending us back our own money at interest, selling themselves as men above greed, just a bunch of really smart guys keeping the wheels greased. They've been pulling this same stunt over and over since the 1920s — and now they're preparing to do it again, creating what may be the biggest and most audacious bubble yet.

If you want to understand how we got into this financial crisis, you have to first understand where all the money went — and in order to understand that, you need to understand what Goldman has already gotten away with. It is a history exactly five bubbles long — including last year's strange and seemingly inexplicable spike in the price of oil. There were a lot of losers in each of those bubbles, and in the bailout that followed. But Goldman wasn't one of them.

BUBBLE #1 The Great Depression

Goldman wasn't always a too-big-to-fail Wall Street behemoth, the ruthless face of kill-or-be-killed capitalism on steroids — just almost always. The bank was actually founded in 1869 by a German immigrant named Marcus Goldman, who built it up with his son-in-law Samuel Sachs. They were pioneers in the use of commercial paper, which is just a fancy way of saying they made money lending out short-term IOUs to smalltime vendors in downtown Manhattan.

You can probably guess the basic plotline of Goldman's first 100 years in business: plucky, immigrant-led investment bank beats the odds, pulls itself up by its bootstraps, makes shitloads of money. In that ancient history there's really only one episode that bears scrutiny now, in light of more recent events: Goldman's disastrous foray into the speculative mania of pre-crash Wall Street in the late 1920s.

Wall Street's Big Win

This great Hindenburg of financial history has a few features that might sound familiar. Back then, the main financial tool used to bilk investors was called an "investment trust." Similar to modern mutual funds, the trusts took the cash of investors large and small and (theoretically, at least) invested it in a smorgasbord of Wall Street securities, though the securities and amounts were often kept hidden from the public. So a regular guy could invest \$10 or \$100 in a trust and feel like he was a big player. Much as in the 1990s, when new vehicles like day trading and e-trading attracted reams of new suckers from the sticks who wanted to feel like big shots, investment trusts roped a new generation of regular-guy investors into the speculation game.

Beginning a pattern that would repeat itself over and over again, Goldman got into the investment trust game late, then jumped in with both feet and went hogwild. The first effort was the Goldman Sachs Trading Corporation; the bank issued a million shares at \$100 apiece, bought all those shares with its own money and then sold 90 percent of them to the hungry public at \$104. The trading corporation then relentlessly bought shares in itself, bidding the price up further and further. Eventually it dumped part of its holdings and sponsored a new trust, the Shenandoah Corporation, issuing millions more in shares in that fund — which in turn sponsored yet another trust called the Blue Ridge Corporation. In this way, each investment trust served as a front for an endless investment pyramid: Goldman hiding behind Goldman hiding behind Goldman. Of the 7,250,000 initial shares of Blue Ridge, 6,250,000 were actually owned by Shenandoah — which, of course, was in large part owned by Goldman Trading.

The end result (ask yourself if this sounds familiar) was a daisy chain of borrowed money, one exquisitely vulnerable to a decline in performance anywhere along the line. The basic idea isn't hard to follow. You take a dollar and borrow nine against it; then you take that \$10 fund and borrow \$90; then you take your \$100 fund and, so long as the public is still lending, borrow and invest \$900. If the last fund in the line starts to lose value, you no longer have the money to pay back your investors, and everyone gets massacred.

In a chapter from *The Great Crash, 1929* titled "In Goldman Sachs We Trust," the famed economist John Kenneth Galbraith held up the Blue Ridge and Shenandoah trusts as classic examples of the insanity of leverage based investment. The trusts, he wrote, were a major cause of the market's historic crash; in today's dollars, the losses the bank suffered totalled \$475 billion. "It is difficult not to marvel at the imagination which was implicit in this gargantuan insanity," Galbraith observed, sounding like Keith Olbermann in an ascot. "If there must be madness, something may be said for having it on a heroic scale."

SOVEREIGN MONEY

Joseph Huber

(This would appear to be a new site for those who want to get more deeply into the subject of monetary reform. It contains an impressive reading list from some key names, Robertson, Zarlenga, Werner, and Huber himself. Looks good! - Ed)

Papers and Manuscripts... on the transition to sovereign money in a new currency system

Introduction and summary of *Creating New Money. A Monetary Reform for the Information Age* by James Robertson and Joseph Huber.

- Here is how James Robertson introduced the subject in his > *Alternative Mansion House Speech*, London, June 2000.
- Here is how Joseph Huber presented the subject in a paper given at the Forum for Stable Currencies, House of Lords, June 2001 > *Seigniorage Reform and Plain Money*.
- Another document on this > *Plain Money. A Proposal for Supplying the Nations with the Necessary Means in a Modern Monetary System*.
- *The Positive Money Proposal*, by Andrew Jackson, Ben Dyson and Graham Hodgson, as of 2 April 2013, for the time being possibly the best and most concise outline of monetary reform.
- *Explaining Monetary Reform - Presenting the American Monetary Act*, brochure by Stephen Zarlenga, American Monetary Institute.
- *Sensible Money* paper on *Resolving the Eurozone Debt Crisis. A Guide to Full-Reserve Banking in the Eurozone* (Note: The term full-reserve banking here denotes plain sovereign money in a modern currency system, not 100% reserve).
- Richard A. Werner, *How to End the European Financial Crisis - at no further cost and without the need for further political changes*, University of Southampton, CBFSD Policy Discussion Paper No. 3-12.
 - Richard A. Werner > *How to Turn Banks into Financial Intermediaries and Restore Money Creation and Allocation Powers to the State*, University of Southampton, CBFSD Policy Discussion Paper No. 3-12.
- Stephen Zarlenga on > *The Need for Monetary Reform*, American Monetary Institute.
- Here you can download > *Money and Macroeconomic Dynamics, an accounting system dynamics approach to explaining the effects of a sovereign-money system, part IV*, by Kaoru Yamaguchi, professor of economics and system dynamics, Japan.
- Mark Pash, Chairman of the > *Center for Progressive Economics*, Encino CA, stresses diversification with regard to the channels and purposes how new sovereign money is put into circulation. Here is his paper > *Monetary Reform - The Big One*.
- Ron Morrison on introducing sovereign money through > *Genuine Banking Reform*

Towards a Twenty-First Century Banking and Monetary System. Submission to the Independent Commission on Banking, 39 pages, 2011.

by Ben Dyson (*Positive Money*), Tony Graham, Josh Ryan-Collins (*New Economics Foundation*) and Richard A. Werner (*University of Southampton*).

A compact presentation of the British monetary reform approach.

Note: Even though the authors used the term 'full-reserve banking' at the time, this is definitely not a 100%-reserve approach, but a plan for fully liquid sovereign money beyond reserve banking, thus a new currency approach, not a bank-liability system anymore.

A New Currency System for the UK according to Positive Money. The Positive Money System (2013) in plain English, 28 pages more technical, 35 pages, by Andrew Jackson, Ben Dyson and Graham Hodgson.

Mission Statement of monetative.de in

> English > Spanish > French > German > Italian

Neo-Austrians between Gold Standard, 100% Reserve, and Free Banking

The Neo-Austrian School and New Currency Theory share a similar criticism of fractional reserve banking.

Strangely enough, the problem is blamed on government and central banks rather than the banking industry.

The Neo-Austrian idea of money and banking reform then is free banking, i.e. a system without legal-tender laws and central banks, on the basis of a return to a 100% gold reserve. This appears to be quixotic, but is a revelation to others.

Here are > Notes on the occasion of reading Huerta de Soto, a main proponent of the Neo-Austrian School. - Or > download here as a PDF.

Congressman Dennis Kucinich, Ohio, on monetary reform

"It is incumbent on central banks to prevent the growth of dangerous bubbles". Dean Baker, Centre for Economic and Policy Research, Washington

Banking Reform by Positive Money:

GLOBAL LOOTING: THE NEW EU BAILIN LAW WAS PASSED 8 DAYS AGO....DID YOU NOTICE?

John Ward; The Slog; via John Newell

Revealed: official details on how the EU will steal from us

Are you a citizen with rights, or just a helpless crustacean?

Three beaming eurocrats - Barroso, Van Rompuy and Lithuanian Dalia Grybauskaite - emerged triumphant from a session two days ago, in which they mapped out the biggest bank heist in world history. This is to put flesh on the eurozone law hastily passed on August 1st (while EU citizens were on holiday) to deal with the inevitability event of a bank collapse. Under this draft proposal - which many expect to be applied to the entire EU - no depositor big or small will in future be able to feel safe with money deposited in a bank. The Slog now calls for those who represent us, across the entire cultural spectrum of European society - to do something.

In a barely read piece a month ago, the International Business Times reported on the rapidly drafted new EU law for "overhauling its policy on how banks receive bumper bailouts". Be aware: this is an EU move, not a eurozone move: it is already law (it passed on August 1st) and although for now it applies only to the eurozone, it is an EU law. Hardly anyone has commented on this, but the approach being taken matches word for word the 3-card trick George Osborne used six weeks ago when he said:

"In future, taxpayers will not be called upon to bail banks out. It will be down to the creditors and the owners".

The most remarkable example of double-speak to date, at the time I pointed out that creditors are taxpayers (they're account holders, simple as that) and so as the Establishments daren't ask us for higher taxes to bail out their mates in the banking system, they will take it via, if you like, Direct Debit. It is exactly the same principle of stealing the Troika wishes to apply to Greek private pension funds.

The initial piece at the IBT website noted that 'Eurozone leaders agreed upon the major policy shift and also confirmed that the new rules will help protect the taxpayer and move the burden of bailing out the banks onto shareholders and junior debt holders.' Again, more bollocks: how will ripping your money out protect you? And note - junior debt holders...aka, you and I.

But yesterday from the German site Deutsche Wirtschafts Nachrichten (German Economic News) came a piece reporting that all bets are off as far as the 'guarantee of all funds under €100,000' pledge is concerned. Under the current Lithuanian Presidency of Dalia Grybauskaite, the proposal as drafted - and almost entirely ignored by the Western media - states as follows:

* Treatment will not be the same regardless of size of deposit, BUT small account holders will have to wait up to four weeks to get their money... 'depending on how serious the insolvency is'. During that time, there will be a maximum withdrawal of €100-200 per day - again, perhaps less depending on the seriousness of the failure. (Based on the Cyprus experience, the haircut in the end will be at least 60%).

* The EU Parliament - allegedly - is demanding that deposits of €100,000+ euros should be confiscated within five days. (So much for MEPs offering us some kind of protection from the Sprouts).

* In the event of a banking collapse, all previous government commitments are null and void. The force majeure of "exceptional circumstances" can lead to ways round such pledges. Part of the new plan

suggests savers could also be subject to a 'penalty tax' if they have less than € 100,000 in the bank. (So much for Merkel's promise to the German people).

George Orwell could've dropped acid and still not come up with a scheme quite so assumptive and brazenly deranged as this one. It is based on the following insane principles:

1. Putting money in a bank makes every citizen a creditor of that bank, equally prone to confiscation in order to repay....who exactly? The answer is, other banks it owed money. So it's not really our money after all, it's the banking sector's money. After it's been taxed by the Government, despite the fact that we earned it...it's really all bankers' money after all. Unbelievable.
2. If we are prudent enough to keep money in smaller amounts in lots of accounts, we will have to pay a 'penalty tax' - well of course we will: I mean, given it's never our money really - we're just borrowing it, or something - then quite right too. And because it isn't really our money, we shall be given strictly limited spending money per day. The brass neck is beyond belief.
3. If you have been seditious enough in your life to actually make quite a lot of money legally, then within five days the money that was never really yours will be taken back by its rightful owners...the bankers....or the Government rescuing the bankers but without doing it in our taxes. Why five days - why not five seconds? I mean, it's their money: we were just earning it for safe keeping, right? Of course we were.
4. Anything is an exceptional circumstance if they say it is. Even the Nazis in 1933 had to burn down the bloody Reichstag to declare a State of Emergency. In 2013, it requires just one dumb, over-leveraged, f**kwitted bank to collapse under the weight of its CEO's ego, and we're all pauperised by Law.

I think the time has finally come when we must give our legislators and 'leaders' here in the UK a gigantic kick up the jacksy. And I think the time has come for every decent organisation to mobilise even Wayne and Waynetta to GTF off the sofa and start making it clear to the scheming Wankers of Westminster that we're not having any of this crap here in Britain.

As I tried to point out two years ago, this is no longer a political issue. This is a case of one simple rule by which decent citizens must abide: stealing things is wrong...especially when it's done to repair your own stupid decisions in the past.

These are the questions we should address to everyone supposed to represent us, starting today:

1. To German Sloggers, demand Angela Merkel make the safety of ALL EU citizens' bank money a solid Election pledge next month.
2. To the Christian, Jewish, Muslim and humanist leaderships of Britain: start an outcry in the media. Why aren't you giving your parishioners more support? Where is the outcry about pilfering from innocent citizens? Where is the condemnations of illegal, amoral confiscation?
3. To the anti-EU Conservative Right, to UKip and its leader Nigel Farage, to our MEPs - especially Dan Hannan: do you realise the delayed referendum on EU membership will come far too late to stop this? When are you going to start spelling this out to your supporters and media contacts that this is now a matter of citizen survival? Why hasn't there been uproar in the European Parliament about this? You guys talk a good game, but where's the line in the sand?
4. To the TUC: Your members are about to be fleeced by the Co-op's management, and stand to be ruined by the EU's ECB-driven policy of slashing both the wages and assets of the European workforce. Can we have less political point-scoring, and more ecumenical organising action?
5. To the Labour Party leadership: show that you truly are our friend in tough times. Stop doing bloody focus groups and poncing about between the lines of bland policy statements designed to make you look harmlessly vote-worthy. Come back off your holidays and take a stand - when are you going to start hounding Camerlot bigtime on this iniquitous policy? Or are you complicit in it? Please tell us.
6. To the whingers and it-won't-make-any-difference-it's-nothing-to-do-with-me brigade: sorry, but you just ran out of road. Like it or not, you're involved. Start a movement now to remove every penny of current account and deposit monies from the bank. Are you a live Homo sapiens, or a braindead lobster?

The Co-operative scandal is just the beginning. They are going to take our money and leave us all penniless....at their mercy. To combat this, we really don't need any slogan beyond this one:

THE BRADBURY POUND – IN ANTICIPATION OF ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

via Global Table

Countdown to 7th August 2014; 100th Anniversary of Historic Solution to end Britain's 'crisis', austerity & corruption

There is a deep malaise affecting our country – something is clearly not right. To catch a criminal, a good policeman will always tell you to follow the money and to ask, *cui bono* – who benefits?

The network of private central banks led by the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland, have taken control of the world's money supply to achieve global governance on their terms – hardly beneficial for the human race.

The way to 'stop and reverse' is to ask:

- * Why doesn't the British government through its Treasury issue debt- and interest-free money?
- * Why do our politicians go to private bankers who create money out of thin air – as figures on a computer screen?
- * When this 'money', or 'nothingness', is received by our government, why do we, as taxpayers, pay £50,000,000,000 interest a year? Austin Mitchell MP, Chairman of the Forum for Stable Currencies[1] has been tabling Early Day Motions since 2002 to this effect.

In the US, this principle – a sovereign nation's treasury issuing its own debt-free and interest-free money without going anywhere near the private central banks – was implemented by Abraham Lincoln in 1861 with his Greenback Dollars which secured the final victory for the North in the American Civil War.

Fifty-three years later, in August 1914 at the outbreak of the First World War, the British Government passed an Act allowing the Treasury to issue debt-free and interest-free money that became known as Bradbury Pounds.

"I have two enemies; the Southern army in front of me and the financial institutions in the rear. Of the two, the one in the rear is my greatest foe"

Abraham Lincoln.

The Bradbury Pound was an emergency measure brought in by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, David Lloyd George, to prevent a possible run on the banks, as people adjusted to the news about the outbreak of the Great War. To read the full story of this virtually unknown historical precedent, go to www.ukcolumn.org and click on the Bradbury Pound campaign logo. And an awesome historic 6,000 word article can be found under John Bradbury & Thomas Paine. For further information, please contact Campaign Director Justin Walker atjrgwalker@aol.com <http://www.forumforstablecurrencies.org.uk/>

POSTIVE MONEY BULLETIN EXTRACTS

Positive Money Team

Why do the rich just get richer and richer? Could it be that it has something to do with the fact that we have to rent our entire money supply from the banks that create it?

Did you know that in the UK alone, together we pay the banks £192 million in interest every single day?

New Video: Inequality - Why Are the Rich Getting Richer?

We depend on the money created by banks. But because the money is created when people borrow, someone, somewhere, has to pay interest on every pound created. In effect we are renting the money we need to run our economy from the banks.

And because the debt is held mostly by the bottom 90% and wealth is held mostly by the top 10%, paying this interest transfers money from the bottom 90% of the population to the very top 10%.

Please share this video - it's important

Money creation by the banks is certainly not the only reason for the staggering inequality we see in the world today, but it is an important factor that is rarely discussed. As long as we have to rent the money we use from the banks that create it, we'll have to keep paying this huge interest bill, and the gap between the richest and the rest of us will keep increasing.

There are ways to create money that don't depend on us all going into debt to the banks. Ways that would lead to less debt, and stop the gap between the richest and the rest of us getting even bigger.

Help us spread the word!

Send a short email with the link to the video to your friends - it's really important that we try and get more people involved if we want to bring about change. Example email.:

Hi there, I found this video very interesting, I think you will as well. It explains an important cause of inequality that you might not have heard of before.

<http://www.positivemoney.org/issues/inequality/>

Upcoming Events

Chicago, USA, 19-22 Sept - 9th Annual AMI Monetary Reform Conference, The speakers are the leading thinkers on monetary reform. 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 also Andrew Jackson from Positive Money.

More from the Blog

Is money creation making the rich richer?

Dave Fishwick creates banking history

10 Good Reasons for Monetary Reform

The Euro shambles would not have been as bad under a Positive Money system

New money should be directed to the real economy, not the financial sector

Sovereign Money – a new website on monetary reform

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