

*The Lawless State: The Crimes of the U. S. Intelligence Agencies [Morton H. Halperin, Jerry J. Berman, Robert L. Borosage, Christine M. Marwick] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE.*

The nuclear balance of terror made the president a literal arbiter of life and death. Thus the wartime powers of the president were never relinquished; the wartime institutions never dismantled. Intelligence activities born in total war were given permanent institutional homes. The postwar presidents claimed the power not only to define national security, but also to act "often in secret" to enforce it. As a result, a secret realm of government developed to watch and, if necessary, disrupt political opponents at home and abroad. Using secret intelligence agencies to defend a constitutional republic is akin to the ancient medical practice of employing leeches to take blood from feverish patients. The intent is therapeutic, but in the long run the cure is more deadly than the disease. Secret intelligence agencies are designed to act routinely in ways that violate the laws or standards of society. As long as an overwhelming consensus exists on who the enemy is, few are troubled by the incompatibility. Over time, however, the secret activities of the intelligence agencies inevitably become removed from the popular conception of what is necessary. Eventually the society disagrees about the nature of the enemy. At that point, those who lead the dissent become a threat to the intelligence agencies, an enemy to the secret definition of national security. In the s, the anti-Communist consensus amply supported the secret activities of the government. The unified enemy made resolute presidential activities at home and abroad popular with the vast majority of Americans. Those who disagreed were few, and were generally dismissed as dupes or fellow travelers, if not actual Communists. In this atmosphere, the activities and targets of the intelligence agencies naturally expanded as time went by. Similarly the FBI started with a mandate to monitor wartime sabotage, but quickly expanded that to include more and more of the politically active in its files. After the war, each successive movement for political change became a target for FBI surveillance or disruption: By , the FBI found it had a significant portion of the delegates to the national convention of the Democratic party under surveillance, and many of the organizations to which they belonged singled out for disruption. The cancerous growth of programs "in size, scope, and targets" often came in response to presidential urging. Lyndon Johnson urged the agencies to respond to urban disorders and the antiwar movement, and Richard Nixon increased the pressure, demanding that a range of political opponents be watched or harassed. Often the secret agencies would expand upon the vague directives that established their programs. The army was directed to prepare for policing American cities in case of urban riots. This directive was translated into a massive intelligence program that spied on thousands of civilians, including environmental, civil rights, and antiwar groups. Sometimes programs were initiated without the direct order or approval of the president or the attorney general. Although such programs may not have had the specific approval of a president, they seldom exceeded the official consensus on what needed to be done to political dissenters. Many of the programs involved illegal techniques or activities, or developed without legal authority. Internally, national security provided the absolution for law-breaking; higher orders provided the authority. Agents in the field rarely questioned their orders, and seldom survived in an agency if they did. Concern for illegality generally was expressed by increased secrecy. The FBI developed a special Do Not File file for illegal techniques such as break-ins, or highly questionable operations like bugging columnists Joseph Kraft in Europe. By the mid-sixties, the dangers posed by a permanent secret realm in a constitutional republic became apparent. The executive branch had developed a conception of national security that had little to do with defense of the country and security of the people. The debacle in Vietnam ended the consensus that had survived for over a decade. A growing number of people began to doubt the wisdom and question the authority of the president and his national security bureaucracy. President Johnson and President Nixon both accurately viewed the protests as a threat to their ability to act abroad, a challenge to their definition of national security. The secret intelligence agencies were marshaled to spy on and disrupt the anti-war dissenters. During the Nixon years, when a majority of the population opposed the war, the president and his secret police were at direct odds with most of the politically active citizenry. Under these conditions, programs

initially protected merely by secrecy had to be covered up by lies. As the covert activities of the secret agencies conflicted more and more with the views of the public, legislators and reporters began to inquire about different activities. Deception was the routine response to public inquiry. Helms had not been indicted for perjury because of the general feeling within the Justice Department that his duty was to lie. Nixon made the same transition from secrecy to lies in the attempt to avoid the Watergate probes. Exposure or the possibility of it moved the agencies to end some of their illegal programs. No internal control mechanism was so effective. Hoover also scuttled the Huston plan by reciting fears of its exposure. Exposure came because of the failure in Vietnam and the excesses of Richard Nixon; the policy consensus broke apart before the independent institutions—the press, the Congress, and the courts—had been entirely desiccated. The struggle to bring Richard Nixon to justice demonstrated what a close call it was. The investigation of the intelligence agencies reveals that the conflict is far from resolved. This book provides an account of the abuses of the secret realm of government. The activities described are all fully documented in official public sources. Our focus is on abuses and threats to the American constitutional system. We leave to others a full statement of the activities of these agencies and of the economic and political roots of presidential power on which their actions depend. The first part of the book describes the two major agencies and their principal activities—the CIA abroad and the FBI at home. The second part of the book reviews the activities initiated by each of the other agencies in response to the protest movement of the sixties. In each chapter, a brief background of the specific bureaucratic history of political spying is provided. This book concludes with a review of the controls and restructuring necessary if these agencies are to be curtailed in the future. This last part is most important, because the intelligence agencies are still engaged in many of the activities detailed in the text. Although the book deals in large part with the past—the history of programs of the secret realm—the abuses continue. In this the investigation of the intelligence agencies differs from the inquest into the crimes of Richard Nixon. The impeachment proceedings ended with the president resigning in disgrace, his aides and co-conspirators removed from office, many indicted and convicted. The investigations of the intelligence agencies have, thus far, provided no significant reforms. No legislation has yet been passed by the Congress to limit in law the activities of the intelligence agencies. The political struggle to control these agencies still lies ahead. Its outcome depends—as did the impeachment hearings—on the reactions of American citizens throughout the country. The question is whether or not the secret realm can be dismantled and curtailed, so that the political liberties of American citizens will be respected and the secret intervention of America abroad ended. If not, we may leave a legacy predicted by Malcolm Muggeridge when he wrote:

Chapter 2 : Lawless (film) - Wikipedia

The Lawless State was written in jointly by Morton H. Halperin, Jerry J. Berman, Robert L. Borosage, and Christine M. Marwick. It recounts abuses of power by the U.S. Government throughout the Cold War, and is concerned mostly with surveillance methods and overstepped boundaries.

A Libertarian View of the Status of Liberty. Today, in the land we like to think of as the most free on earth, government reaches into every level of our lives. It controls and it coerces, it bullies and it brags, it browbeats and it blusters. It grows and it grows, feeding without restraint on the energy, the talents, the hopes, the fears, and the futures of the people. Endless arguing about, or even rigorous voting for "better" government has not altered and can not alter the fact that it is the nature of government, the state itself, that has shown itself in such a dark light. For it is in the nature of the state and of government as it has developed to do all of the things that it now is doing "regardless of which partisans, which technicians, operate it at any given point. After each American election there are the weeks and months of elation in which partisans euphorically tell one another that "problems are going to be solved" by the "good" and "strong" and "wise" men about to take office. The losers, meantime, say just as flatly that the world is going to hell in a breadbasket. And very little changes. Each, rather, has driven the country toward more government and less liberty. Parties and promises notwithstanding, this is the way it is. To not recognize that one overpowering fact is to let the meaning of the entire political history of our time utterly escape you. The nature of the state, the growth of government has been unchanged by politicians. Too many Americans for too long have been diverted by the changes of faces and factions. They have permitted their attention to be diverted from the unchanging problem of government itself. To the extent that they continue to be so diverted, government has a free hand to continue its development toward despotism. Particularly now, with one more election and with one more chorus of paeans and complaints, one more magic-lantern display of changing images in an unchanging show, those who profess an interest in liberty need to turn away from illusions and shadows and look at the actual and concrete facts of government here and around the world. They need to ask not whether it is possible simply to tame government, or to make it more economical, or to make it more favorable to this or that ideology, class, or interest; they need to ask the most fundamental questions about government. What is its purpose? What is its limit? What is its legitimacy? What is its relation to liberty? Those who weigh the cost of government only in dollars will vote for the most economical government, the most efficient "perhaps not bothering to ask if that efficiency is in the service of or to the detriment of liberty. Those who assess the value of government only in terms of its output of "good" programs will vote for the most active government "perhaps not bothering to ask if the action serves the need or greed of some men, or the liberty of all. Others may measure government only by its arms and martial spirit, praising the way in which it guards the borders or the outposts but remaining curiously uninterested in the garrisons it may be building at home. Some will ask only that government benefit them, protect them, comfort them, preserve their status quo and suppress any who would disturb it. And they too will have forgotten to ask any question at all about liberty. Questions about liberty have, of course, long been most notably neglected by those who have called themselves liberals in America. One result has been that the entire liberal position now stands discredited and, even more humiliating to its leadership, hopelessly outdated and irrelevant. They too, more and more, ask simply who controls the government "our" guys or "their" guys rather than what we should do about government itself. It has become, as a result, a political truism of our time that the differences between the two major political parties are marginal at best. One editor recently pointed out that in terms of sheer differences of political approach there now is more difference between factions behind the Iron Curtain than between the major political factions in the United States. It is not altogether fanciful to say that the United States has, finally, become a one-party state. And it is merely common sense to observe that, beyond it all, government rolls along "widely accepted, widely supported, largely unquestioned as the father of us all, the focus of life, lever of all power. Riots in the streets may concern some. Riots on the campus may concern others. But it is the riotous, growing power of government gone wild that should preoccupy the serious and concerned friend of liberty in this land

once so hopefully dedicated to freedom. It is in that dedication, as a matter of fact, that may be found that inspiration to return to concern about government itself and not simply to its current cost or management. For in that dedication we can clearly see a time when men, serious men, were concerned very candidly not with who should run the government but with how to restrain, repress, and even eliminate government. They were concerned with purpose, not merely with program. The deepest concern then, as it should be now, was not the sort of law to impose upon citizens, not the sort of order to impose upon citizens, not the sort of privileges and prerogatives to bestow upon government, not the tasks to assign it or the titles to enhance it. The concern was to impose law upon government. It was to curb government; to cut it back and cut it down. The concern was liberty. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it. To the men who founded the United States, that Declaration was the essence of the law insofar as the state was concerned. There were among those men some, perhaps many, who had little sympathy for the state at all. They accepted it as a necessary evil. Others conceived it only as an evil and not actually necessary at all. All finally agreed, however, that they could live under or at least coexist with an agreement of government, an agreement of lawful government that established the sole function of government as in "securing" the "rights" of the people: Government would, in effect, be merely an instrument, voluntarily subscribed to, that would prevent anyone including governments from taking or abridging life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness. It has been the constant breach of that law that has marked the development of the state ever since then. It is the gathering momentum of more and more breakage of that law that marks the only crucially important political question facing Americans, or, indeed, people anywhere. This is no longer a problem of any one state. It is a threatening reality in all states, around the world. The Omnipotent State Government, gone wild in growth and its powers, has gone also above and beyond the law. Today it is widely accepted, as a matter of fact, that Government Is The Law. Just as a "divine" king once could say, "I am the state," governments today everywhere say they are the law, even that they are the people. Frank self-answers should be revealing. Do you feel that the state is more important than you are? Do you feel that the state should enjoy freedoms that you do not? Do you feel that the state should be able to rise above the law? Do you feel that you could not live unless the state protected you? Do you feel that you could not thrive unless the state nourished or subsidized you? Do you feel that service to the state is more desirable or more noble than service to your self, your family, your neighbors, or your own ideals? Do you feel that it actually is a privilege to pay taxes? Do you feel that since the government, the state, is more important than any one man, that every single man should be prepared to give his all, even his life, to or for his government? Do you feel that the state is something with a life and identity of its own, beyond the men who might hold office in it? Do you feel that "the government" and "the country" are the same? Do you feel that, when all is said and done, your life belongs to your government? Do you feel that your "rights" are given to you by government? Do you feel that, when all is said and done, if big problems are to be solved in this world that government will have to do it? The crucial separation between men today is not anything more or anything less than the separation between those who answer yes to those questions and those who answer no. The only important gradations in the thinking that separates men today will be found along a scale of how many yes and how many no answers are given. The demonstrated purpose of both major political parties, and including the new, conservative administration is yes to at least a majority of the questions. And it probably would be fair to say that the response of most Americans, sincerely and in heartfelt patriotism, also would be yes. That the so-called liberal response has been yes all along does not require exposition at this point. Readers of average care know this is true from a generation of reform-liberal, New Deal-type programs in which every action of government has been condoned and expanded. That approach is liberation; the liberation of people from political control rather than simply trying to advantage them by political favoritism. Conservative Contradictions Conservatives, it now turns out, have little to crow about either. They have howled at the expenditure of tax-taken money for welfare programs but have jumped to support vast outpourings of the same sort of money for the entire panoply of the military-industrial complex and the garrison state; many supported racial laws at the state level but wept when reverse-racial laws became Federal; many gleefully seek government subsidy and protection of

business even when they rail against government protection of unions; many ask tariffs to protect their particular interest; few object to farm boondoggling when it gives millions to a man with vast acreage, but many decry the support of another man with a small and unproductive plot. Of a sudden, as though smitten by righteous lightning, conservatives are discovering that government is good and big government is even gooder. Where is the conservative voice being raised to ask, of the new administration, that it use its every power not to "improve" government but to, quite literally, get it off the backs of the people altogether. Instead, the talk most popularly is of such things as "tax incentives," as though letting a man keep some of the money he has earned is an act of supreme wisdom and charity on the part of the government. Only those who, deep down, believe that the government actually does have first claim on everything legitimately, can find inspiration in a system that merely uses taxes to "pay off" this or that class or faction. Where, instead, is the conservative voice that says do not simply reform the tax system; replace it! There are few such voices to be heard. Ironically, only on the libertarian right and in some portions of the New Left or among true anarchists are there voices crying against not programs and not against personalities but against government itself. It is in this very context and against this very background, of the widespread acceptance of government as good, that liberty must beg, must implore all with some concern for her to pause, to reflect "ultimately, to resist. The Nature of Man Philosophically, the resistance to government has roots running to the very nature of man himself. There are questions to be asked, in care and conscience, on that score just as on the political score. Do you feel that your life is unimportant when compared to the lives of others? Do you feel that the noblest thing you could do would be to give your life for someone else? Do you feel that the value of each man is simply what "society" says it is? Do you feel that man actually is incapable, as an individual, of knowing what is right or wrong: Do you feel that the life of each individual person belongs in large part to society? Do you feel that individual men are nothing, but that "mankind" is everything? Do you feel that man is basically bad? Do you feel that your life is swept along, determined by invisible forces over which you have no control?

Chapter 3 : The Lawless State - LewRockwell

For the liberation of man from a lawless state. For, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

The crimes of the U. What is true for programs is also true for techniques: Even the secrecy that cloaks the intelligence bureaus is based upon a classification system established by executive order, without statutory basis. The intelligence agencies are assigned the responsibility for routine spying and political policing at home and abroad. Secrecy is necessary, for the primary function of the agencies is to undertake disreputable activities that presidents do not wish to reveal to the public or expose to congressional debate. The agencies also collect secret intelligence information, which helps to justify presidential power by providing it with a claim of special knowledge. The "mysteries of government" do much to still criticism of activities apparently beyond the comprehension of mere citizens or legislators. Perhaps the most important function of secrecy is to insulate the clandestine agencies from the civil society and government. Wrapped in a secrecy system fastened by security clearances, lie-detector tests, and classification markings, the officials of the secret bureaus develop a unique loyalty and allegiance to the agency. The Senate Intelligence Committee found that the intelligence agencies were a "sector of American government set apart. In the intelligence bureau, however, the monastic training prepared officials not for saintliness, but for crime, for acts transgressing the limits of accepted law and morality. The secret agencies of the president operated for some twenty-five years with few questioning their operations. The national consensus, founded on anti-communism and developed by periodic crises, supported a bipartisan foreign policy and a strong, active presidency. Few reporters, legislators, or citizens even attempted to strip away the veil of secrecy to expose the spy bureaus to review, and the few that tried, failed. In this, the intelligence agencies enjoyed the license of the secret police in a dictatorship: The national consensus, secrecy, and the mantle of the presidency enabled the covert bureaus to operate outside the normal checks and balances of the constitutional system, and above the law itself. For over twenty-five years, Congress simply abdicated its legislative and oversight functions. Perhaps the best example was provided by the late Senator Allen Ellender, a longtime member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which appropriated money to the CIA. I never asked to begin with, whether there were any funds to carry on the war. It never dawned on me to ask about it. Senator Leverett Saltonstall, for many years ranking Republican on the oversight subcommittee, summarized the widespread feelings on the Hill: Instead it is a question of our reluctance, if you will, to seek information and knowledge on subjects which I personally, as a member of Congress and as a citizen, would rather not have. It may be preferable for legislators to remain ignorant of activities that they dare not control, for in this way they avoid complicity in them. In any case, the Congress operated for twenty-five years in blissful ignorance, appropriating secret funds of untold amounts to the intelligence agencies without even knowing where the money was hidden in the general budget. Certainly at the height of the cold war, legislative approval for virtually any activity was available if requested. The fact that the agencies did not seek legislation to legitimate their activities indicates both their disdain for congressional authority and the desire of executive officials to claim exclusive monopoly over national security activities. The courts were no different from the Congress, for secret activities seldom came before them. No criminal prosecutions were brought, simply because no attorney general even considered trying to control the secret bureaus. If the counsel decided that CIA sources or methods would be endangered, the Justice Department would drop the case. Needless to say, the vast majority of cases involving CIA personnel were not prosecuted. No attorney general dared cross J. Edgar Hoover and investigate the bureau. Most important, they are inescapably political terms, requiring subjective political definition. Like all political decisions, the definition of the terms must be done publicly, with open discussion and debate. When the president and undercover bureaus are left to define the terms in secret, predictable abuses occur. Inevitably, presidents tend to equate dissent with subversion, and opposition to the president with opposition to the national security. As Tom Charles Huston testified: The risk was that you would get people who. Thus, every

postwar president used the clandestine bureaus to collect political as well as "internal security" data. The temptation was simply too great to ignore. Needless to say, the worst corruption came with the Nixon administration, when "national security" became part of the cover-up of the crimes of the president and his aides. The Nixon tapes provide the spectacle of the president, John Dean, and H. When the president asked what could be done if the break-in were revealed publicly, Dean suggested, "You might put it on a national security basis. Each secret bureau used its surveillance techniques to watch or harass its domestic critics. The IRS automatically institutes an audit of any public critic of the income tax, and sends informers to attend antitax meetings and take down names. Military intelligence agents were particularly concerned with critics of the military. Hoover was constantly directing the attention of his agents to critics of the bureau; name checks, field investigations, and often more would result. The bureaucratic corruption was the use of secret political intelligence for institutional or personal purposes. Hoover, for example, was the master of the implied blackmail. He kept in his private office hundreds of "OC" Official and Confidential files, which reputedly detailed the private lives of politicians and federal officials. Hoover no doubt reassured the young attorney general that not one word about the existence of these tapes need come out, as long as he, Hoover, remained in office. No doubt Kennedy complimented the director on his long and valuable service to his country, and assured him that his position was secure. Far more serious than these "routine corruptions" is the conflict that occurs over who shall define "threats" to the national security. The secret bureaus consider themselves the repositories of expertise on subversion at home and abroad; it becomes their duty to protect Americans-even against themselves-in a world far crueller than any citizen could imagine. As time goes on, the bureaus thus become less and less responsive to outsiders, whether legislators, cabinet officials, or citizens. Inevitably a gap widens between the practices of the covert bureaus and the beliefs of the citizenry. When the consensus supporting the old policy dissipates-as it did in the jungles of Vietnam and the suites of the Watergate-a crisis ensues. Thus, when the intelligence investigations started, the bureaus resisted, using every tactic of delay, obstruction, and obfuscation possible. The House committee was not alone. FBI Director Clarence Kelley was deeply embarrassed when his sworn testimony that the bureau had terminated all illegal break-ins in was proved wrong, and break-ins were occurring during his own tenure as director. It seems clear that veteran bureau officials were continuing the activities they considered necessary, without telling even their own director. Clearly as outsiders, the two might not recognize the need for such programs as well as intelligence veterans. Hunt would probably not understand the irony. In the s we were told that Communists used Aesopian language, infiltrated and disrupted political groups, subverted the free press and democratic process, and used "fronts" to mask their activities. Afraid of them, we have inevitably come to mirror our own image of them. To protect ourselves from the tyrannous, we have slowly built our own tyranny.

Chapter 4 : The lawless State: | CrusaderRabbit

The Lawless State has 7 ratings and 0 reviews: Published November 18th by Penguin Books, pages, Paperback.

This article was first published as *The Lawless State: A Libertarian View of the Status of Liberty. The Nature of Government*. Government has gone wild. Today, in the land we like to think of as the most free on earth, government reaches into every level of our lives. It controls and it coerces, it bullies and it brags, it browbeats and it blusters. It grows and it grows, feeding without restraint on the energy, the talents, the hopes, the fears, and the futures of the people. Endless arguing about, or even rigorous voting for "better" government has not altered and can not alter the fact that it is the nature of government, the state itself, that has shown itself in such a dark light. After each American election there are the weeks and months of elation in which partisans euphorically tell one another that "problems are going to be solved" by the "good" and "strong" and "wise" men about to take office. The losers, meantime, say just as flatly that the world is going to hell in a breadbasket. And very little changes. Each, rather, has driven the country toward more government and less liberty. Parties and promises notwithstanding, this is the way it is. To not recognize that one overpowering fact is to let the meaning of the entire political history of our time utterly escape you. The nature of the state, the growth of government has been unchanged by politicians. Only the politicians themselves have changed. Too many Americans for too long have been diverted by the changes of faces and factions. They have permitted their attention to be diverted from the unchanging problem of government itself. To the extent that they continue to be so diverted, government has a free hand to continue its development toward despotism. Particularly now, with one more election and with one more chorus of paeans and complaints, one more magic-lantern display of changing images in an unchanging show, those who profess an interest in liberty need to turn away from illusions and shadows and look at the actual and concrete facts of government here and around the world. They need to ask not whether it is possible simply to tame government, or to make it more economical, or to make it more favorable to this or that ideology, class, or interest; they need to ask the most fundamental questions about government. What is its purpose? What is its limit? What is its legitimacy? What is its relation to liberty? Others may measure government only by its arms and martial spirit, praising the way in which it guards the borders or the outposts but remaining curiously uninterested in the garrisons it may be building at home. Some will ask only that government benefit them, protect them, comfort them, preserve their status quo and suppress any who would disturb it. And they too will have forgotten to ask any question at all about liberty. Questions about liberty have, of course, long been most notably neglected by those who have called themselves liberals in America. One result has been that the entire liberal position now stands discredited and, even more humiliating to its leadership, hopelessly outdated and irrelevant. But the same is more and more true of those who call themselves conservative. They too, more and more, ask simply who controls the government "our" guys or "their" guys rather than what we should do about government itself. It has become, as a result, a political truism of our time that the differences between the two major political parties are marginal at best. One editor recently pointed out that in terms of sheer differences of political approach there now is more difference between factions behind the Iron Curtain than between the major political factions in the United States. It is not altogether fanciful to say that the United States has, finally, become a one-party state. Riots in the streets may concern some. Riots on the campus may concern others. But it is the riotous, growing power of government gone wild that should preoccupy the serious and concerned friend of liberty in this land once so hopefully dedicated to freedom. It is in that dedication, as a matter of fact, that may be found that inspiration to return to concern about government itself and not simply to its current cost or management. For in that dedication we can clearly see a time when men, serious men, were concerned very candidly not with who should run the government but with how to restrain, repress, and even eliminate government. They were concerned with purpose, not merely with program. The deepest concern then, as it should be now, was not the sort of law to impose upon citizens, not the sort of order to impose upon citizens, not the sort of privileges and prerogatives to bestow upon government, not the tasks to assign it or the titles to enhance it. The concern was to impose law upon government. It was to curb government; to cut it back and cut

it down. The concern was liberty. Ron Paul Best Price: That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it. To the men who founded the United States, that Declaration was the essence of the law insofar as the state was concerned. There were among those men some, perhaps many, who had little sympathy for the state at all. They accepted it as a necessary evil. Others conceived it only as an evil and not actually necessary at all. All finally agreed, however, that they could live under or at least coexist with an agreement of government, an agreement of lawful government that established the sole function of government as in "securing" the "rights" of the people: Government would, in effect, be merely an instrument, voluntarily subscribed to, that would prevent anyone including governments from taking or abridging life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness. It has been the constant breach of that law that has marked the development of the state ever since then. It is the gathering momentum of more and more breakage of that law that marks the only crucially important political question facing Americans, or, indeed, people anywhere. This is no longer a problem of any one state. It is a threatening reality in all states, around the world. The Omnipotent State Government, gone wild in growth and its powers, has gone also above and beyond the law. Today it is widely accepted, as a matter of fact, that Government Is The Law. Just as a "divine" king once could say, "I am the state," governments today everywhere say they are the law, even that they are the people. Each citizen can ask himself the most grave questions in this regard. Frank self-answers should be revealing. Do you feel that the state is more important than you are? Do you feel that the state should enjoy freedoms that you do not? Do you feel that the state should be able to rise above the law? Do you feel that you could not live unless the state protected you? Do you feel that you could not thrive unless the state nourished or subsidized you? Do you feel that service to the state is more desirable or more noble than service to your self, your family, your neighbors, or your own ideals? Do you feel that it actually is a privilege to pay taxes? Do you feel that since the government, the state, is more important than any one man, that every single man should be prepared to give his all, even his life, to or for his government? Do you feel that the state is something with a life and identity of its own, beyond the men who might hold office in it? Do you feel that "the government" and "the country" are the same? Do you feel that, when all is said and done, your life belongs to your government? Do you feel that your "rights" are given to you by government? Do you feel that, when all is said and done, if big problems are to be solved in this world that government will have to do it? The crucial separation between men today is not anything more or anything less than the separation between those who answer yes to those questions and those who answer no. The only important gradations in the thinking that separates men today will be found along a scale of how many yes and how many no answers are given. The demonstrated purpose of both major political parties, and including the new, conservative administration is yes to at least a majority of the questions. And it probably would be fair to say that the response of most Americans, sincerely and in heartfelt patriotism, also would be yes. That the so-called liberal response has been yes all along does not require exposition at this point. Readers of average care know this is true from a generation of reform-liberal, New Deal-type programs in which every action of government has been condoned and expanded. That approach is liberation; the liberation of people from political control rather than simply trying to advantage them by political favoritism. Conservative Contradictions Conservatives, it now turns out, have little to crow about either. They have howled at the expenditure of tax-taken money for welfare programs but have jumped to support vast outpourings of the same sort of money for the entire panoply of the military-industrial complex and the garrison state; many supported racial laws at the state level but wept when reverse-racial laws became Federal; many gleefully seek government subsidy and protection of business even when they rail against government protection of unions; many ask tariffs to protect their particular interest; few object to farm boondoggling when it gives millions to a man with vast acreage, but many decry the support of another man with a small and unproductive plot. Of a sudden, as though smitten by righteous lightning, conservatives are discovering that government is good and big government is even gooder. Where is the conservative voice being raised to ask, of the new administration, that it use its every power not to "improve" government but to, quite literally, get it off the backs of the people altogether. Instead, the talk most popularly is of such things as "tax incentives," as though letting a man keep

some of the money he has earned is an act of supreme wisdom and charity on the part of the government. Only those who, deep down, believe that the government actually does have first claim on everything legitimately, can find inspiration in a system that merely uses taxes to "pay off" this or that class or faction. Where, instead, is the conservative voice that says do not simply reform the tax system; replace it! There are few such voices to be heard. Ironically, only on the libertarian right and in some portions of the New Left or among true anarchists are there voices crying against not programs and not against personalities but against government itself. Conscience of a Conser Barry Goldwater Best Price: There are questions to be asked, in care and conscience, on that score just as on the political score. Do you feel that your life is unimportant when compared to the lives of others? Do you feel that the noblest thing you could do would be to give your life for someone else? Do you feel that the value of each man is simply what "society" says it is? Do you feel that man actually is incapable, as an individual, of knowing what is right or wrong: Do you feel that the life of each individual person belongs in large part to society? Do you feel that individual men are nothing, but that "mankind" is everything?

Chapter 5 : The CIA - at Home from the book The Lawless State The crimes of the U.S. Intelligence Agencies

The Lawless State - conclusion excerpted from the book The Lawless State The crimes of the U.S. Intelligence Agencies by Morton Halperin, Jerry Berman, Robert Borosage, Christine Marwick.

Deaver, the Nancy Reagan confidant. King, said Meese, would have opposed affirmative action as a violation of his ideal "colorblind" society He sparked a profound constitutional debate by arguing that Supreme Court decisions interpreting the Bill of Rights had violated the intent of the Founding Fathers. He sought to roll back the so-called exclusionary rule, which bars the courtroom use of evidence obtained without "reasonable cause. Is Meese a changed man, some wonder, or was he always the gladiator he seems to be now? After years of working in the wings of Reagan administrations in Sacramento and Washington, had he simply been waiting for the right moment to unsheathe his ideological weaponry? They show dead Iraqis, no problem but never Americans. THAT was a total false flag. This is radical Islam and we have a huge problem. The false flaggers are either govt assets or idiots. Radical Islam is the real deal. The cops are trying desperately to coverup the fact they killed a lot of hostages with their maniacal gunfire. Orlando Florida is not Fallujh in Iraq. We might have to guess on foreign soil, but in America where government is supposedly in control there are many facts which the government has total control over: Like the declaration of the time of death and the action that caused the deaths. All of the official actions or reactions of all the government forces, after they occurred, must be available to the public to confidently know: This is also the reason that crime scene photos must be taken and made available to prosecutors, if not the public, until decisions are made about what the hell really did happen. Someone decided to wait three hours and then go in and fire off hundreds of rounds. The band lead singer is dead. I could go on for pages. Radical Islam is not Adam Lanza All the facts must be given to the public and the world, so that those who failed in their jobs can be prosecuted to the fullest extent of all the settled-laws that were in place before Reagan and Meese decided to rearrange the facts on the ground to favor lawless government. Plus all the shadow-government games which this event could in some way promote.

California: The Lawless State. Democrats' new "sanctuary" law protecting illegal aliens went into effect on Monday.

The crimes of the U. Over the next seven years, the program conducted by this special staff, known as Operation CHAOS, spied on more than 7, American citizens and 1, domestic organizations. This was the most extensive, but not the first, CIA spying operation against Americans. For years the agency had been opening mail, burglarizing homes, wiretapping phones, and secretly watching the movements of unsuspecting individuals within the United States, all in violation of its legislative charter. Congress wanted to assure the public that this agency would not lead to the growth of a secret police. Responding to these suspicions, Dr. Vannevar Bush, an administration witness, explained that the agency was concerned only with intelligence "outside this country," and not with "internal affairs. Two years later, with the passage of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of , congressional apprehensions were again calmed by the assertion that the CIA had no jurisdiction within the United States, that it "has no connection with the FBI; it is not under the FBI, it does not do the same kind of work as the FBI. Because of the public uproar that would have ensued if the agency had openly expanded its domestic operations, the CIA wrote its own secret charter. Through internal directives, executive orders, and pacts with other government agencies, the CIA expanded its authority to operate at home so that it eventually encompassed activities that unquestionably violated the law, as well as its congressional charter. From the beginning, CIA justified its involvement in domestic activities in terms of supplementing its covert operations and intelligence gathering abroad. As was discussed in Chapter Two in detail, the CIA created an intricate system of front organizations and companies to provide cover for its clandestine work. It set up its own airlines and business firms, and formed dummy foundations to funnel secret money into domestic student groups, educational publications, and labor unions. Recruiting its agents from almost every sector of the private domain, the CIA turned students, missionaries, and journalists into spies abroad. The agency also used its authority to protect its "sources and methods" to justify spying on Americans in the United States. Nevertheless, the CIA got permission to deal with defectors and to gather foreign intelligence against selected persons and enterprises. Later, in its war against Fidel Castro, the CIA heavily infiltrated the Cuban community based in Miami, and created its own network of spies. For over a decade, beginning in , Cuban refugees were paid by the agency to spy on their neighbors, and report their findings to the CIA. One Cuban explained the operation as originally a counterintelligence effort, "but it soon became domestic snooping plain and simple. By , the CIA had become so intimately involved with briefing and debriefing its agents, and coordinating their activities within the United States, it created an extremely secret Domestic Operations Division. Explained in a classified document, the division was to "exercise centralized responsibility for the direction, support, and coordination of clandestine operational activities of the Clandestine Services conducted within the United States against foreign targets. Among its activities was the burglarizing of foreign embassies at the request of the National Security Agency. Not all CIA foreign-intelligence-gathering efforts on the domestic front were so clearly in violation of the law. Authorized in a secret directive, the service set up field offices around the country to gather foreign intelligence from willing and open sources. CIA agents would normally interview American businessmen, scholars, or even tourists after their return from travels abroad. Sometimes, however, when the agency learned of a trip to a certain country beforehand, it would approach the traveler in advance to request specific information to be investigated. In early , the service began to receive an increasing volume of reports on "black militant activity," and opened a new case on the subject. The ball was set in motion, and a few months later, Operation CHAOS requested DCS to expand its coverage to include all black militants, radical youth groups, radical underground newspapers, and deserter and draft resistance organizations. CHAOS also requested specific information from the DCS, such as background information on twenty-eight co-conspirators indicted in the Chicago riots, and full coverage of the legal proceedings of the trial. In light of its newfound capabilities, the Domestic Contact Service was transferred from the Intelligence Directorate to the Operations Directorate in . In early , Ramparts magazine had exposed CIA secret funding of the National Student Association, causing

acute embarrassment to the agency. In response, Ober was assigned to investigate members of the staff of the magazine and their friends, in an effort to discover any connection with hostile foreign intelligence agencies. By the time Ober began work at Operation CHAOS headquarters, he had already proved his credentials by indexing several hundred names of American citizens, and creating almost fifty files. From the beginning, the program was predicated on the belief that the foreign connection existed, and it was just a matter of finding it. CHAOS agents were to watch antiwar activists in their travels abroad for this purpose. The first action taken by the new Special Operations Group was to cable all CIA field offices abroad, outlining the need to keep tabs on "radical students and U. The agency thus monitored the overseas movements of countless antiwar activists as they traveled around the world, as well as ex-patriots. The CIA burglarized their hotel rooms and their homes, eavesdropped on their conversations and bugged their phones. The internal directives issued to provide "guidance" regarding who should be the targets for intelligence collection abroad reflected the confusion and frustration of the government effort as a whole. Field offices were instructed to look for connections between United States groups and "communist, communist front, or other anti-American foreign elements abroad. A November memo called on agents overseas to report on foreign relationships, which "might range from casual contacts based on mutual interest to clearly controlled channels for party directives. Two years later, a directive from Tom Huston, a White House assistant, explained that "support should be liberally construed to include all activities by foreign communists designed to encourage domestic groups in any way. The White House and the agency were grasping at straws. Enormous amounts of useless information were gathered because it was not clear when and how the intelligence might be used. Ober directed his agents to collect "any material, regardless of how innocuous the information may appear. To deal with this massive influx of material, from other agencies as well from as the CIA, the agency set up a highly mechanized system. By programming a specific name, an agent could instantly retrieve all cables, documents, or memoranda that even mentioned the target. In order to track political activists abroad, these agents went through a process of establishing their "credentials" within the radical movement in this country. During their training period, they would be extensively debriefed by their advisers, and CIA gained purely domestic information. In fact, so much reporting went on that one agent was likened to a "vacuum cleaner. In one instance, a CHAOS agent, on leave from his spying activities abroad, rejoined his unwitting friends in the radical community and reported extensively on their private lives and personal relationships. Spying on radicals in this country was also an incidental result of agents being trained by the CIA to penetrate foreign intelligence agencies, as part of a program called "Project 2. While abroad, these agents, although not specifically assigned to CHAOS, were valuable assets to the overall collection effort. As the purported expert on foreign ties to the American peace movement, the CIA prepared a number of major studies on the subject. One report, known as "Restless Youth," was a thick volume analyzing the international student movement, including a long section on the Students for a Democratic Society. The Domestic Contact Service also produced a series of reports, including one on the background of certain individuals who had accused the CIA of involvement in the assassination of the black leader Malcolm X. Ironically, all these studies concluded that the domestic dissent was a product of social and political conditions in this country, and not the result of an international conspiracy. As late as , when Operation CHAOS had grown to grand proportions, a report was issued confirming "there is no evidence. The program continued to expand its scope, not because its activities provided any leads, but in order to prove the opposite. Richard Ober explained the phenomenon: In its continuing search for that illusive connection, the CIA worked in concert with every intelligence agency of the federal government. Even friendly intelligence agencies of other countries were asked to assist. At times, the agencies even put pressure on each other to step up their activities against the peace movement. Helms, stressing the need for expanded coverage of the Soviet bloc, the New Left, and foreign agents, urged continued cooperation in gathering intelligence on "bombings, hijackings, assassination, and the demeaning of law enforcement officers. The CIA was well aware that it had violated its charter by becoming so intimately involved in the internal security apparatus of America. A cover letter from Helms to Henry Kissinger, accompanying the Operation CHAOS report "Restless Youth," warned that "this is an area not within the charter of this Agency, and I need not emphasize how extremely sensitive this makes the paper. As domestic operations expanded, there was

increasing discomfort among those being asked to carry them out. In fact, the reaction was so negative at times that CIA Director Helms was forced to send out a memo in calling for full support of the program, and assuring the stations that this was within the statutory authority of the agency. We also encountered general concern over what appeared to constitute a monitoring of the political views and activities of Americans not known to be or suspected of being involved in espionage. Agency officials, however, refused to acknowledge illegality either to the public or to their own personnel. Referring to the ban on the exercise of police and law enforcement powers, Helms declared, "We do not have any such powers and functions; we have never sought any; we do not exercise any;". Helms was later to refer to this public assertion in a talk given to his own employees, when he added, ". It had created personality files on over 13, people, including some 7, American citizens, and subject files on 1, domestic organizations. The CIA spied on the whole spectrum of peace activist and civil rights groups. Three hundred thousand names of American citizens were cross-indexed within agency files, and thousands of Americans were placed on "watch lists" to have their mail opened and their telegrams read. Operation CHAOS finally came to an end in , as part of the winding down of the massive surveillance programs of the late s and early s. In general, specific programs were ended either because public dissent was in fact subsiding, or out of fear that the programs would be exposed. In that order, the CIA is authorized to conduct clandestine operations to gather foreign intelligence information from foreigners in the United States, as well as Americans believed to be acting on behalf of a "foreign power. The most alarming charter given to CIA is the power to infiltrate, "for the purpose of reporting on or influencing activities," organizations primarily composed of foreign nationals. The obvious targets for such disruption are immigrant groups and foreign student organizations. Here for the first time, CIA is officially allowed to conduct covert operations in America. The agency still spies on Americans abroad, still accepts requests from the FBI to put traveling citizens under surveillance, and claims the right to wiretap and burglarize American homes and apartments overseas. The ban on domestic involvement remains inoperative.

Chapter 7 : Living in The Lawless State

Is the welfare state unconstitutional? On a proper understanding of the limited government created by our Constitution, the answer is yes. Does it follow that in opposing the present scope and.

Chapter 8 : Lawless | Definition of Lawless by Merriam-Webster

This article was first published as The Lawless State: A Libertarian View of the Status of Liberty. Volume IV, No. 4 in the National Issues Series of Politics, (Constitutional Alliance,). The Nature of Government. Government has gone wild.

Chapter 9 : The Lawless State | Mises Institute

Lawless is a American crime drama film directed by John Hillcoat. The screenplay by Australian singer-screenwriter Nick Cave is based on Matt Bondurant's historical novel The Wettest County in the World (). The film stars Shia LaBeouf, Tom Hardy, Gary Oldman, Mia Wasikowska, Jessica Chastain, Jason Clarke, and Guy Pearce.