

# Patriots Cannot Vote For Killer Obama

by EIR staff

Sept. 4—In two prominent op-eds, published in the second half of August, two prominent legal commentators from different ends of the political spectrum excoriated President Barack Obama for his crimes against the Constitution. Their message was clear: Anyone who votes for Obama is endorsing a killer.

## ‘A Limitless Presidency’

In the Aug. 17 nationalinterest.org commentary with the above title, former Reagan Administration official Bruce Fein, who had also called for the impeachment of George W. Bush, and has drafted articles of impeachment for Obama,<sup>1</sup> wrote a scathing column about the character of the Obama Presidency.

He wrote: “President Obama’s uncircumscribed power to kill through drone strikes sits alongside numerous other usurpations. He maintains that entrustment of executive power to the president in Article II crowns him with authority to commence war at any time, in any place, for any reason. He unilaterally initiated war against Libya in violation of the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution. And don’t expect Obama to seek congressional authorization, as required by Article I, section 8, clause 10, if he chooses to unleash war against Iran, Syria, Yemen, Mali, Pakistan, North Korea or China. Obama also insists that the so-called war against international terrorism is perpetual

and occupies every square inch of the planet where he may use military force....

“At home the president takes a blithe attitude toward the tradition of separation of powers. He invokes state secrets to block judicial redress for constitutional wrongdoing—for example, government-sponsored murder, torture, or kidnapping related to the war on terror. He issues presidential signing statements denying congressional authority to restrict his discretion in foreign affairs. In such matters, Congress has surrendered without a whimper because of party loyalties and a cowardly craving to escape accountability.”

Fein concludes with an assessment that parallels Lyndon LaRouche’s recent admonition that it is we, the American people, who are responsible for continuing to numbly sit under a sword of Damocles: “President Obama believes in secret government unaccountable to Congress, the courts, or the American people. If he announced he was suspending the Constitution and ruling by decree to defeat international terrorism, it wouldn’t be fanciful to predict that Congress and the American people would simply acquiesce like vassals. As the historian Tacitus observed, when Republics yield to tyranny, ‘the worst crimes are dared by a few, willed by more, and tolerated by all.’”



Center for American Progress/Ralph Alswang

*Bruce Fein: “President Obama believes in secret government unaccountable to Congress, the courts, or the American people.”*

## Obama Has ‘Crossed the Rubicon’

Approximately two weeks later, the more liberal legal scholar, Jonathan Turley, gave a lengthy interview to actor, producer, and screenwriter John Cusack, published on truth-out.org, in which he blasted the Obama Administration’s violations of the Constitution, and the acquiescence of most liberals to these crimes. The argument that Mitt Romney is “no better or worse” does not excuse the voter from voting for Obama, Turley argues.

“For many civil libertarians it is impossible to vote for someone who has blocked the prosecution of war

---

1. See [EIR](#), March 23, 2012.

crimes. That's where you cross the Rubicon for most civil libertarians. That was a turning point for many who simply cannot vote for someone who is accused of that type of violation."

The interview demonstrates that Turley was not just commenting, but forcefully asserting that Obama and his crimes cannot be tolerated. Turley was the attorney for ten Congressmen in their lawsuit to try to halt President Obama's illegal war on Libya.

Here are excerpts from the interview:

**Turley:** In fact, President Obama has not only maintained the position of George W. Bush in the area of national securities and in civil liberties, he's actually expanded on those positions. He is actually worse than George Bush in some areas.

**Cusack:** Can you speak to which ones?

**Turley:** Well, a good example of it is that President Bush ordered the killing of an American citizen when he approved a drone strike on a car in Yemen that he knew contained an American citizen as a passenger. Many of us at the time said, "You just effectively ordered the death of an American citizen in order to kill someone else, and where exactly do you have that authority?" But they made an argument that because the citizen wasn't the primary target, he was just collateral damage. And there are many that believe that that is a plausible argument.

**Cusack:** By the way, we're forgetting to kill even a foreign citizen is against the law. I hate to be so quaint...

**Turley:** Well, President Obama outdid President Bush. He ordered the killing of two U.S. citizens as the primary targets and has then gone forward and put out a policy that allows him to kill any American citizen when he unilaterally determines them to be a terrorist threat. Where President Bush had a citizen killed as collateral damage, President Obama has actually a formal policy allowing him to kill any U.S. citizen...

**Turley:** Indeed. I heard from people in the adminis-

tration after I wrote a column a couple weeks ago about the assassination policy. And they basically said, "Look, you're not giving us our due. Holder said in the speech that we are following a constitutional analysis. And we have standards that we apply." It is an incredibly seductive argument, but there is an incredible intellectual disconnect. Whatever they are doing, it can't be called a constitutional process.

Obama has asserted the right to kill any citizen that he believes is a terrorist. He is not bound by this panel that only exists as an extension of his claimed inherent absolute authority. He can ignore them. He can circumvent them. In the end, with or without a panel, a president is unilaterally killing a U.S. citizen. This is exactly what the framers of the Constitution told us not to do...

**Turley:** The greatest problem is what it has done to us and what our relative silence signifies. Liberals and civil libertarians have lost their own credibility, their own moral standing, with the support of President Obama...

Under international law, shielding people from war-crime prosecutions is itself a form of war crime. They're both violations of international law...

**Turley:** We appear to be in a sort of a free-fall. We have what used to be called an "imperial presidency."

**Cusack:** Obama is far more of an imperial president than Bush in many ways, wouldn't you say?

**Turley:** Oh, President Obama has created an imperial presidency that would have made Richard Nixon blush. It is unbelievable...

You have Obama doing the same thing that George Bush did sitting there like Caesar...

Throughout the interview, Turley paralleled the approach of Lyndon LaRouche, in directing much of his fire at the American people, particularly the liberal civil libertarian community, which has knuckled under to Obama's imperial Presidency. Attorney General Eric Holder defends Obama's violations of the Constitution, and "people have greeted this erosion of civil liberties with this collective yawn," Turkey concludes.



*Jonathan Turley: "We have what used to be called an 'imperial presidency.'"*