
Editorial

The Obama Danger

Some observers anticipated that he might take off his shoe and start pounding it on the podium, in imitation of Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchov's performance at the UN in 1960, so "in-your-face" was Barack Obama's assertion of his right to go to war in defiance of international law during his Sept. 24 speech to the UN General Assembly. Obama's repeated assertions of the alleged right to violate national sovereignty during that speech—through spying and various acts of war—should remind everyone of just how unstable the agreements for a peaceful settlement of the Syria crisis are, as long as this President is in office.

At times, the script appeared to come straight from former Vice President Cheney—we're "prepared to use all elements of our power, including military force, to secure" our core interests in the Middle East, Obama threatened. At others, it was a carbon copy of the prescriptions from that architect of the 2003 Iraq War Tony Blair, in asserting his alleged right to violate national sovereignty with acts of war, without authorization of the UN Security Council, and, although he didn't say it, the U.S. Congress.

The U.S. President's lying assertions that the shattered Libya is better off than it was before the invasion, and that it's an "insult to reason" to think the rebels used chemical weapons in Syria, underscore the danger of leaving decisions of war and peace to a man who's either off his rocker, pure evil, or both.

Some might dismiss Obama's UN assertions as pure bluster, an attempt to "save face" after having been boxed in by his own military, the Russians, and the overwhelming opposition of the U.S. population toward going to war. But in a world of ther-

monuclear weapons and seething tensions fed by an Empire determined to destroy nation-states and crush the world's population, such rhetoric itself could lead to miscalculations and set off an irreparable disaster.

There must be no time lost in finishing the job of neutralizing the power of this President by available constitutional means. A decisive blow against his controllers in London and Wall Street, with the imposition of Glass-Steagall, is one urgent measure to be taken. But there are others required as well.

Obama has made a declaration, before the entire world, of his right to launch aggressive war. Even his own military disagree. Former Defense Secretary Robert Gates was outspoken in a Dallas speech Sept. 18, saying that Obama's proposed military strikes on Syria would be like "throwing gasoline on an extremely complex fire in the Middle East." "Haven't Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya taught us something about the unintended consequences of military action once it's launched?" he asked.

Former CIA officer Philip Giraldi drew the appropriate conclusion in his Sept. 19 column "'I' Is for 'Impeachment.'" Giraldi identified two issues: Obama's leading the nation to the brink of war without the consent of Congress, and his authorization to arm the rebel groups in Syria, including enemies of the United States, i.e., al-Qaeda.

We can't afford to wait. Obama's stated intentions, as well as his previous actions, represent a clear and present danger to the welfare of the United States, and our Constitution provides the means to deal with them. When failure to act may mean nuclear war, all excuses must be put aside.