The multifarious methods of oppression employed by an imperial state would fill an encyclopedia. One general method is the control of language, and one sub-set covers rhetorical devices. A specific figure is euphemism, a powerful way of hiding folly and depravity. For example, our government has rebranded US state assassination as “high value targeting.” Dick

"I refuse to live in a country like this, and I'm not leaving"
Michael Moore
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RESISTANCE TO BIG BROTHER

Marc Rotenberg, president, and Khaliah Barnes, counsel, Electronic Privacy Information Center, respond to "End of Privacy" (July 8/15), urging resistance via the public comment on rule-making path required by the Administrative Procedure Act. Renewing its petition weekly and invites us to sign on: epic.org/NSApetition or #NSApetition. Don’t give up they urge.

RAY McGOVERN ARTICLE FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS AWARD
SNOWDEN//PLEASE READ & RESPOND::NSA Status

Sue Skidmore <suesactivism@mchsi.com>  Jul 21, 2013

Please read the info below & take action below the articles links.

If you're tired of hearing people around you ask: "why should I care about the government surveillance program?" With the weight of history behind him, Oliver Stone does an incredible job explaining why the government's "surveillance machine" should concern every American.
Watch the video below and if it moves you like it moved me, share it with your friends — it just might be time to reclaim our privacy. The video is at this link.
Retired CIA analyst Ray McGovern writes about Truth Teller Snowden.

Truth Teller Snowden Honored by Former Intelligence Officers | War Is A Crime .org

warisacrime.org

Sam Adams Associates for Integrity in Intelligence, an organization of former national security whistleblowers

TOP SECRET AMERICA REPORT:

https://www.facebook.com/TopSecretAmerica
http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/

Chris Hedges: Locking Out the Voices of Dissent
http://www.commondreams.org/view/2013/07/15-0

The corporate state’s quest to control all power includes using the military to carry out domestic policing, which is why I sued the president over Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act. It is imperative to defend, as the activists did in New York City, what freedoms and rights we have left. If we remain passive, if we permit the state to continue to use the law to take away our right of political expression, we will have no legal protection of resistance when we will need it most.

Snowden Nominated for Nobel Peace Prize
http://www.commondreams.org/headline/2013/07/15-3

Alfred W. McCoy: Surveillance Blowback: The Making of the U.S. Surveillance State, 1898-2020
http://www.commondreams.org/view/2013/07/15

Government Accountability Project: Snowden's Whistleblowing a Human Right
http://www.commondreams.org/newswire/2013/07/12-4

From Edward Snowden Isn’t on the Run...We Are by Subhankar Banerjee

When the animated debate—”Is Edward Snowden a hero or a traitor?” started, I wrote a piece urging to consider him not as a “hero” or “traitor” but “simply as a teacher—who provided knowledge to expose yet another aspect of the inverted totalitarianism that has been revealed since, there has been no public outrage against the government, in the US. The apathy that is astounding—a classic attribute of “inverted totalitarianism” that political philosopher Sheldon Wolin coined in his book, Democracy Inc.: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism. “Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism,” is a devastating critique of the contemporary government of the United States—including what has happened is not to disappear into history along with its classic totalitarian predecessors: Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and the possibility that the American people might pay attention to what is wrong and take the difficult steps of resistance, if we permit the state to continue to use the law to take away our right of political expression, we will have no legal protection of resistance when we will need it most.

Wolin’s is the best analysis of why the presidential election of 2008 probably will not do anything to mitigate our fate. This book demonstrates why political science, properly practiced, is the master social science. Wolin writes, “Our thesis ... is this: it is possible for a form of totalitarianism, different from the classical one, to evolve from a putatively ‘strong democracy’ instead of a ‘failed’ one.”
also populist, anti-elitist and only slightly represented in the Constitution of the United States. “Democracy,” he writes, “is about the conditions that make it possible for ordinary people to better their lives by becoming political beings and by making power responsive to their hopes and needs.” It depends on the existence of a demos—“a politically engaged and empowered citizenry, one that voted, deliberated, and defeated the elitism that was written into the Constitution. Chalmers Johnson on Our ‘Managed Democracy’ http://www.truthdig.com/arts_culture/item/20080515_chalmers_johnson_on_our_managed_democracy/

We need all our voices of conscience to rise in unison so that Edward’s Snowden’s courageous and immensely important revelations don’t get side stepped by the government, the corporate media, and by the right- and left-wing pundits. Beyond all the important things that Snowden’s leaks have revealed, there is something profound it has brought to light also—the folly of the human mind. by Subhankar Banerjee Edward Snowden Isn't on the Run... We Are The lessons of the US whistleblower in Anne Applebaum's Edward Snowden Isn't on the Run... We Are www.commondreams.org

First came the “shock and awe”: the revelations of massive spying by the US and British governments—on the people of the world. Then came the enlightened debate: Is Edward Snowden a hero or a traitor? Then arrived the Hollywood-style entertainment: Where is Edward Snowden going? (The Washington Post even...)

We must step up and speak out to preserve the 4th amendment. Please keep your attention on this--it affects us all.

NSA Sued Over 'Blatantly Unconstitutional Attack on Civil Liberties'

www.commondreams.org

A diverse coalition of groups represented by the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) has filed suit against the NSA unconstitutional collection of Americans' phone records.

Nozomi Hayase: Edward Snowden, True Hope for Change
http://www.commondreams.org/view/2013/07/16-9

Please join me in speaking out to protect our right to privacy. Are we going to control our government or is our government going to control us? It is Time to stop their smoke and mirror games. SEE BELOW:

From: Timothy Karr [mailto:tkarr@freepress.net]
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:03 AM
To: Sue Skidmore
Subject: NSA Status: Still Spying
Tell Your Members of Congress: Speak Out Against NSA Spying

Dear Sue,

The fight against the National Security Agency's spying schemes is gaining ground. Just this morning, the House Judiciary Committee held a hearing on the NSA's spying activities, with Rep. John Conyers standing up for our right to communicate in private.

Meanwhile, more than 550,000 people (including you!) joined StopWatching.Us — a coalition co-founded by the Free Press Action Fund — to demand that Congress investigate the NSA's sweeping surveillance programs.¹ Thousands attended rallies on July 4th to demand Fourth Amendment rights.² And a new poll shows a shift in public opinion, with more Americans saying the government has gone too far in restricting our civil liberties.³

Unfortunately, too many people in Congress have remained silent about the NSA's actions. We need your elected representatives to join our fight:

Let's Keep the Momentum Moving. Tell Your Members of Congress to Speak Out Against NSA Spying.

Minority House Leader Nancy Pelosi just wrote to the chairman of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to demand greater transparency and accountability from the secret FISA courts.⁴

And Reps. Conyers and Justin Amash recently introduced legislation to stop the NSA from vacuuming up the phone metadata of millions of Americans.

These efforts need widespread support to gain traction. We need your elected members to make some noise before Congress begins its month-long summer recess.

Take a minute to send this letter to your senators and representative. Tell them to speak out about the NSA's invasion of our privacy.

The Free Press Action Fund fights every day to protect your right to communicate in private. Please help us continue to protect this essential freedom.

Take action now. Get your members of Congress on the record before it's too late.

Thank you,

Tim, Josh, Candace and the rest of the Free Press Action Fund team

www.freepress.net

P.S. Please donate $15 or more to the Free Press Action Fund to reclaim our rights, our freedoms and our democracy. We don't take money from business, government or political parties and rely on the generosity of people like you to fuel our work. The


The Free Press Action Fund is a nonpartisan organization building a nationwide movement for media that serve the public interest. The Free Press Action Fund does not support or oppose any candidate for public office. Learn more at www.freepress.net.

Join us on Facebook and follow us on Twitter.
Free Press Action Fund Praises House Members for Choosing Transparency in Political Ads

June 20, 2012

Contact Info:

Jenn Ettinger, 202-265-1490 x 35

WASHINGTON -- On Wednesday, the House Appropriations Committee withdrew a measure that would have prevented the Federal Communications Commission from carrying out its new rule requiring broadcasters to put political ad spending records online, in favor of requiring the Government Accountability Office to study the issue.

The provision in the 2013 Financial Services bill removes an earlier measure that would have prevented the FCC from using federal funds to implement...
the online-posting rule. Broadcasters are already legally required to maintain data on political ad spending, but this information is currently maintained only in paper form at the TV stations themselves.

If signed into law, the draft appropriations bill would require the GAO to analyze the data kept by the FCC and the Federal Election Commission to determine whether there is any duplication of costs to maintain them. The GAO is also tasked with evaluating whether publishing the information on political ads will have any impact on pricing throughout the market. The GAO study is not expected to delay implementation of the FCC's rule.

Free Press Action Fund Senior Policy Counsel Corie Wright made the following statement:

"We are pleased that members of the Appropriations Committee have sided with the public and chosen transparency over secrecy, accessibility over inconvenience. The committee rightly abandoned an earlier measure that would have prevented the FCC from implementing these common-sense improvements.

"We thank Representatives Norm Dicks, Jose Serrano and Anna Eshoo for championing the public’s right to access information about the sources of political advertising on our nation’s airwaves. Voters deserve to know who is trying to influence their choice on Election Day, and the FCC's online political file rule will shine a brighter light on that process."
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Free Press Work

•
Internet Freedom

The open Internet is central to people’s freedom to communicate, share, advocate and innovate. But powerful interests want to censor free speech, block the sharing of information, hinder innovation and control how Internet users get online.

Media Consolidation
There are all sorts of benefits to a competitive media landscape. The more independent outlets a community has, the more different viewpoints will be presented on the air. But what happens when there’s no one left to compete?

**Public Media**

We can have an under-funded public media system that is vulnerable to constantly changing political winds, or we can aspire to a public media system that makes use of all available technologies to inspire, educate and inform.
Quality Journalism

The media landscape is changing dramatically, empowering more and more people to become media makers even as the traditional infrastructures that have supported journalism for years are eroding.

Transparency and Accountability
If you don't know how power works in this country — and you aren't allowed to see the financial interests that often lurk behind prominent political voices — it's next to impossible to make meaningful decisions at the polls.

**Money, Media and Elections**

**Public and Political File Inspections**

---

**Free Press on the Ground**

Free Press activists are amazing. They don’t just sign petitions ... they also meet with elected officials, attend rallies and campaigns with financial contributions.

**National Conference for Media Reform**

---

**Resist the Surveillance State**
Matthew Rothschild, with Amitabh Pal, “A State of Surveillance,” *Progressive* (August 2013). Every branch of government has buckled to the US National Security State, this “huge vacuuming up of our electronic communications with no predicate of criminal wrongdoing on our parts.” The hero of the story is Senator Russ Feingold, who was” the sole Senator to vote against the Patriot Act in October 2001.”--Dick


DAVE WEBB, “BIG BROTHER AND THE SECRET SECURITY STATE.” *SPACE ALERT!* (Fall 2013). US and UK collaboration in creation of a “global system of US espionage, war planning, and execution and general global hegemony” In the US it’s NSA’s Prism program; in the UK it’s the GCHO (Government communications Head Quarters); they join physically in UK at Menwith Hill in North Yorkshire, “probably the biggest NSA establishment outside the US.”

Don't Let NSA's 4th Amendment Violation Center Open in Utah!

RootsAction Team [info@rootsaction.org](mailto:info@rootsaction.org)

Actions, To: James R. Bennett Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:31 AM

What may be the largest building in the world, seven stories tall and containing enough computer space to store all of the Library of Congress.

Share this action on Facebook

Share this action on Twitter
times the size of the Pentagon[1], will -- if it opens -- serve only one purpose: to violate the Fourth Amendment.[2]

Tell Congress and the President not to open the Utah Data Center's doors.

This center sucks up data on our use of the internet, telephones, skype, emails, texts, credit cards, and financial, legal, travel, and health records.

Add your voice against this Orwellian monstrosity now!

The Bill of Rights was written by people who knew not to trust unchecked government powers. The Fourth Amendment reads:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Join with us in demanding the restoration of the Fourth Amendment and opposing the opening of the world's biggest building, dedicated to civil liberties abuses.

Please forward this email far and wide.

-- The RootsAction.org team

P.S. RootsAction is an independent online force endorsed by Jim Hightower, Barbara Ehrenreich, Cornel West, Daniel Ellsberg, Glenn Greenwald, Naomi Klein, Bill Fletcher Jr., Laura Flanders, former U.S. Senator James Abourezk, Coleen Rowley, Frances Fox Piven, and many others.

Footnotes:
1. Defense One: 7 Times Bigger Than the Pentagon
2. James Bamford: NSA Building Country's Biggest Spy Center

www.RootsAction.org

He was being less than "open and honest" with his spinning of the official line

Tue Aug 6, 2013 12:39 pm (PDT) . Posted by: "Mike Woloshin" mikewoloshin2002

Mike Woloshin, AMH-2, USN
In a July 24 Defense Department public affairs briefing, Pentagon spokesman George Little (shown) told DoD public affairs officers that they must increase and intensify their efforts to deal with bad news stories before the independent media and social media websites make them go viral on the Internet. (The DoD press story is here; the actual video recording of the press briefing is here.)

“When bad things happen, the American people should hear it from us, not as a scoop on the Drudge Report,” said Little, who, as assistant to the secretary of defense for public affairs, is the Pentagon’s chief spokesman. “We cannot hide our bad news stories,” Little also said. “Bad news gets out one way or the other and we must come to terms with telling bad stories as well as the good.” He also stated that commanders must be open and honest with the media, and should avoid “spin,” something he said he has no taste for.

All of which sounds very positive; open and honest is good, right? However, it was apparent from Little’s response to the first question from the assembled public affairs officers that he was being less than “open and honest” with his spinning of the official line on the NSA’s illegal spying on American citizens. Public affairs officer Johnson asked (about 23:00 on the video timeline) for an official “from the horse’s mouth” response as to how public affairs officers are supposed to deal with media questions about the spying/surveillance scandal.

In typical Beltway fashion, Little evaded the question with a non-answer answer that praised the NSA’s General Alexander for doing a good job (of lying to Congress and the American people). “General Alexander, I think, has done a very effective job in recent media interviews, and I think the more the NSA can talk about what it does that contributes to the
nation’s security, I think that will be helpful in informing the American people.... But there’s going to be light at the end of the tunnel, but it won’t be easy.... As long as we’re straightforward and accurate — I think that’s how we have to deal with the situation.”

General Alexander, of course, and virtually all of the Obama administration’s top intelligence officials (including Director of National Intelligence James Clapper and FBI Director Robert Mueller) have been repeatedly caught in lies, untruths, prevarications, and semantic dodges. (See here, here, here, and here.)

In a March 12 Senate hearing, DNI Clapper engaged in Clintonian semantic evasion and denial that most reasonable people would consider lying. Here is the relevant exchange with Sen. Ron Wyden:

SEN. RON WYDEN (D-Ore.): “This is for you, Director Clapper, again on the surveillance front. And I hope we can do this in just a yes or no answer because I know Senator Feinstein wants to move on. Last summer, the NSA director was at a conference, and he was asked a question about the NSA surveillance of Americans. He replied, and I quote here, ‘The story that we have millions or hundreds of millions of dossiers on people is completely false.’

“The reason I’m asking the question is, having served on the committee now for a dozen years, I don’t really know what a dossier is in this context. So what I wanted to see is if you could give me a yes or no answer to the question, does the NSA collect any type of data at all on millions or hundreds of millions of Americans?”

Director of National Intelligence JAMES CLAPPER:
“No, sir.”

SEN. WYDEN: “It does not?”

DIR. CLAPPER: “Not wittingly. There are cases where they could inadvertently perhaps collect, but not wittingly.”

SEN. WYDEN: “Thank you. I’ll have additional questions to give you in writing on that point, but I thank you for the answer.”

Subsequently, of course, it has been revealed that NSA has indeed been collecting data on millions of Americans. In a June 9 interview with NBC’s Andrea Mitchell, Clapper stated that his false response to Sen. Wyden was “the most truthful, or least untruthful” response he could give. He admitted he had engaged in deceptive semantics that some would describe as “too cute by half.” But there is really nothing cute at all about heads of very powerful spy agencies engaged in widespread violation of the rights of American citizens, while also violating the oaths they’ve sworn to defend the
Constitution — and lying about it to congressional oversight committees with clever semantics.

"Putting Out Mindless Propaganda"

During the DoD’s July 24 public affairs briefing, George Little also took a question from Staff Sgt. Hostutler, who asked him for help in changing the culture of the DoD’s public affairs leadership because she feels she is being tasked with “putting out mindless propaganda” that the American people no longer trust.

“It seems like we have this culture in our career to kinda glaze over these issues,” said Hostutler, “and put out this positive press — ‘No, our jets are fine’ — and so with the good and the bad, I don’t think the American people actually trust us to deliver accurate information.”

“Is there a plan to kinda change the way that we think?” Hostutler asked. “Because as it is, a lot of people, from what I can see, are going through — We’re putting out mindless propaganda — is what some of us feel that we’re putting out and what the American people feel that we’re putting out, so how do we change this?”

Little replayed the slick transparency/honesty/openness gambit:

This is a point of tension …"What is spin versus what is legitimate defense of your equities?” My perspective on this is that we should not think in terms of spin. I’m not a big fan of that word and it’s something I try to avoid…. But the way to get through such problems as the one you’ve just noted, I think, is to acknowledge when we’ve got a problem. It’s gonna get out, so let’s be straightforward about it. So, let’s be accurate, and let’s show a plan for how we’re going to get through the problem…. We have to tell it to the American people as straight as we can. If we try to avoid the problem, delay it, if we’re not up front, then that’s going to have a corrosive effect…. I don’t think in terms of spin, I certainly don’t think in terms of propaganda…. I think about our obligation, morally and legally to be accurate and to tell the truth.

Truth? Skeptics have good reason to doubt that Little is a reliable source of truth. Prior to taking his position as top "truth teller" for DoD, he held a similar position at the Central Intelligence Agency, as the agency’s director of public affairs. (Little makes reference to his CIA stint at the beginning of his July 24 briefing Q&A.) That was under CIA chief Michael Hayden, who had previously (1999-2005) served as director of NSA. While running NSA, Hayden had launched that agency’s massive illegal domestic surveillance program for President Bush. One of the first exposés in the major media of that unconstitutional Bush-Hayden-NSA program came in May 2006 with a detailed article by Leslie Cauley in USA Today.
Little was certainly aware of this high-profile media exposé of NSA’s abuse and false denials to Congress and the press. Prior to his CIA service, George Little was (according to his official DoD bio) “an intelligence community and business consultant with Booz Allen Hamilton,” the mammoth hi-tech consultancy with large contracts with the DoD and intelligence agencies. (Among other claims to infamy, Booz Allen Hamilton, reportedly, had a major role in developing NSA’s invasive PRISM surveillance program. Most recently, BAH has been noted as the former employer of NSA whistleblower/defector Edward Snowden.) It is altogether likely that the intelligence chiefs recently exposed lying to Congress and the press (Alexander, Clapper, Mueller, et al.) were coached by Little and/or some of his Booz Allen confreres.

During the course of his public affairs briefing, George Little said new approaches should include engaging more with nontraditional journalists such as bloggers and tweeters, who sometimes break news but also may report gossip and rumor. It might not be too cynical to translate this into: We need to do more to compromise and corrupt the alternative media and turn them into lap dogs the way we’ve successfully done with the MSM “journalists.”

Of course, DoD does not (as far as we know) have the billions of dollars of “Black Ops” funds outside of congressional oversight that CIA, NSA, and other intel agencies do. With its huge, unaudited slush funds, the CIA has been buying American journalists for decades. According to media insider Carl Bernstein (of Watergate, Pulitzer Prize, Washington Post, and All the President’s Men fame) over 400 American journalists — many of them very prominent — were working in various capacities for the CIA. That was back in 1977, when he penned his essay, “The CIA and the Media” for Rolling Stone magazine. Bernstein wrote:

In 1953, Joseph Alsop, then one of America’s leading syndicated columnists, went to the Philippines to cover an election. He did not go because he was asked to do so by his syndicate. He did not go because he was asked to do so by the newspapers that printed his column. He went at the request of the CIA.

Alsop is one of more than 400 American journalists who in the past twenty-five years have secretly carried out assignments for the Central Intelligence Agency, according to documents on file at CIA headquarters.

Further investigation into the matter, CIA officials say, would inevitably reveal a series of embarrassing relationships in the 1950s and 1960s with some of the most powerful organizations and individuals in American journalism.

Among the executives who lent their cooperation to
the Agency were William Paley of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Henry Luce of
Time Inc., Arthur Hays Sulzberger of the New York Times, Barry Bingham Sr. of
the Louisville Courier-Journal, and James Copley of the Copley News Service.
Other organizations which cooperated with the CIA include the American
Broadcasting Company, the National Broadcasting Company, the Associated Press,
magazine, the Mutual Broadcasting System, the Miami Herald and the old Saturday
Evening Post and New York Herald-Tribune.

By far the most valuable of these associations,
according to CIA officials, have been with the New York Times, CBS and Time Inc.

What Bernstein doesn’t mention anywhere in his
stinging critique is another all-important three-letter acronym that has played
the key role in the subversive CIA-Big Media collusion: CFR, for Council on
Foreign Relations.

This is no minor oversight. Virtually all the major
names he mentions in his 25,000-word article — Joseph Alsop, William Paley,
Henry Luce, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, C.L. Sulzberger,
Barry Bingham Sr., Philip Graham, Katherine Graham, Norman E. Isaacs, Philip L.
Geyelin, Sam Jaffe, Cord Meyer — are CFR members. As are/were hundreds of other
corporate Big Media journos and execs, over the past few decades: Tom Brokaw,
Diane Sawyer, Tom Braden, Michael R. Bloomberg, Barbara Walters, Andrea
Mitchell, Brian Williams, Judith Miller, Rupert Murdoch, Thomas L. Friedman, and
William F. Buckley — to name a few.

The top drawer slots at CIA have also almost always
been reserved for CFR members, going back to its earliest days, when it was
known as the OSS, under William J. Donovan (CFR). CIA directors who were/are
also CFR members include Walter Bedell Smith, Allen Dulles (a CFR founding
father), John McConne, Richard Helms, James R. Schlesinger, William E. Colby,
George H. W. Bush (the future U.S. president), Stansfield Turner, William J.
Casey, William H. Webster, Robert M. Gates, James Woolsey, John Deutch, George
Tenet, and Michael Hayden.

Admiral Chester Ward, a former judge advocate
general of the U.S. Navy, was for many years a member of the Council on Foreign
Relations, but subsequently became one of its chief critics when it became clear
to him that the organization was fundamentally subversive. According to Admiral
Ward, the goal of the CFR is the "submergence of U.S. sovereignty and national
independence into an all-powerful one-world government." Ward charged that "this
lust to surrender the sovereignty and independence of the United States is
pervasive throughout most of the membership."

This lust was especially clear in the case of
CIA/CFR/media doyen Cord Meyer, who was president of the United World
Federalists (which the CIA funded) and a lifelong avid advocate of world
government.
Another example was Tom Braden (CIA/CFR/columnist/newspaper publisher), best known for his seven-year stint as the liberal commentator opposite Pat Buchanan on CNN's Crossfire. During a September 15, 1983 episode of Crossfire, Braden was forced into making some surprising admissions concerning his work in the CIA funding communist, socialist, and subversive organizations. During debate with Scott Stanley, editor of American Opinion magazine and The Review of the News magazine (both forerunners of The New American), Braden admitted that the pro-communist National Student Association was actually “a CIA front” and that the CIA provided millions of dollars in funds to the Communist Party’s Daily Worker newspaper.

The CIA/CFR/Big Media collusion continues, which is why we are unlikely to see any serious pushback by the MSM journalists concerning the accelerating drive toward the Big Brother total surveillance state of the CIA/NSA/FBI/DOD/IRS/TSA/DHS. Any serious exposure and genuine opposition must continue to be mounted by truly independent media and patriot bloggers.

Related articles:

Who Lied? Mike Rogers, the NSA, and XKeyscore

DOJ Reports: FISA Court Approved Every Federal Surveillance Request

New DHS Domestic Terrorism Report Targets Millions of Americans

Profiling and Criminalizing Political Dissent

Do You Fit the Terrorist Profile?

Watching Your Every Move

Trading Freedom for Security

The federal government is remotely activating the microphones and ca

Tue Aug 6, 2013 12:44 pm (PDT) . Posted by:
"Mike Woloshin" mikewoloshin2002

Mike Woloshin, AMH-2, USN
ATKRON 86, onbd USS Coral Sea (CVA-43)
The federal government is remotely activating the microphones and cameras in Android smartphones and Windows laptops, according to a report published by the Wall Street Journal.

Citing a “former US official,” the Journal says court documents reveal that the FBI is using a variety of “hacking” tools to ramp up the scope of the surveillance of millions of Americans, keeping many unwittingly under the watchful eye of Washington.

When contacted by The New American, a media spokesperson for Google had no comment.

One of the Journal’s anonymous sources described a part of the FBI called the “Remote Operations Unit.” Agents in this specialized unit prefer, if possible, to install the remote control software by uploading to the target’s computer using a USB flash drive. When the g-men-come-hackers can’t get access to the target’s computer, they install the surveillance software over the Internet “using a document or link that loads software when the person clicks or views it.”

Readers should understand that it is not only possible for the federal government to listen to your conversations using the microphone in your Android smartphone and watch you while you sit in your own home on your own computer, but they do so regularly and can do so very easily.

Purportedly, the FBI has been using these methods of surveillance “for over a decade,” but their use has come to light only recently by way of “court documents and interviews” with people familiar with the programs.

The Journal relates one such document that shed
light on the computer and cellphone hacking methods used by the federal government:

Earlier this year, a federal warrant application in a Texas identity-theft case sought to use software to extract files and covertly take photos using a computer's camera, according to court documents. The judge denied the application, saying, among other things, that he wanted more information on how data collected from the computer would be minimized to remove information on innocent people.

This frightening remote control of computers and cellphones by federal agents is nothing new, however.

Just over a year ago, the Ninth Circuit of Appeals ruled federal snoops may use a cellphone as a microphone and record the conversations overheard even when the phone itself is not being used otherwise.

This baffling bit of judicial lawmaking came as part of the decision in the case of the United States v. Oliva, 2012 WL 2948542 (9th Cir. July 20, 2012).

For a bit of background, Oliva was convicted by a jury of drug-related crimes involving the distribution of methamphetamine, cocaine, and marijuana. He appealed a decision by a district court denying his motion to suppress evidence obtained from a series of electronic surveillance orders authorizing interception of communications over cellular phones associated with him and his alleged co-conspirators.

Oliva argued that the orders authorizing these wiretaps were not standard intercept orders and did not meet the “specificity” requirement of the applicable federal law.

In its decision, the Ninth Circuit has upheld the lower court’s ruling, essentially allowing the federal government to convert cellphones into “roving bugs” so long as the government makes it clear that it will be using the target’s cellphone in that manner. Notice, the Ninth Circuit — a court created under the authority granted to Congress in Article III of the Constitution — did not throw out the matter as a violation of the defendant’s Fourth Amendment right against “unreasonable searches and seizures.” Instead, it simply informed the government that it needs to get permission before doing so.

There are, of course, far-reaching implications of such a decision. As we reported last summer, a person will not know, and perhaps will never know, if he has been the target of surveillance on the part of the domestic spying apparatus. Assuming, as many a savvy American would, that the federal government is liable to eventually want to monitor and record your personal electronic communication, is there not an expectation that when the
cellphone is off the surveillance is suspended?

Not anymore. In the wake of the Ninth Circuit’s ruling in Oliva and in light of the testimony of the insiders interviewed by the Wall Street Journal, “roving bugs” have apparently become a potent weapon in the already impressive arsenal of the branches of the surveillance state.

Some of the dictum in the Oliva decision is almost as disturbing as the ruling itself. For example, in one part of its discussion of the various technological tools available to federal agents, the court describes how one such advance allows the agents to remotely upload software into a target’s cellphone that converts it into the “roving bug” mentioned above. Again, this sort of power is undoubtedly only the tip of the surveillance iceberg.

A person’s expectation of privacy when sitting at home talking to a friend is ridiculous in the face of the judicially upheld fact that government snoops may now use powerful surveillance technology to use your idle mobile phone as a very active mobile microphone or to use a laptop’s built-in camera to take pictures of any American at any time for any reason.

Now that it is indisputable that the courts, Congress, and the president have formed an unholy alliance bent on obliterating the Constitution and establishing a country where every citizen is a suspect and is perpetually under the never-blinking eye of the government, it would be well to remember the words written by Alexander Hamilton in The Federalist, No. 33. In that letter, Hamilton explained that acts of the federal government exceeding its constitutional powers and violating the inherent rights of the people are not law, but are “merely acts of usurpation, and will deserve to be treated as such.”

Joe A. Wolverton, II, J.D. is a correspondent for The New American and travels frequently nationwide speaking on topics of nullification, the NDAA, and the surveillance state.

The NSA's next move: silencing university professors?

A Johns Hopkins computer science professor blogs on the NSA and is asked to take it down. I fear for academic freedom
On 9 September, Johns Hopkins University asked one of its professors to take down a blog post on the NSA. Photograph: AP

This actually happened yesterday:

A professor in the computer science department at Johns Hopkins, a leading American university, had written a post on his blog, hosted on the university's servers, focused on his area of expertise, which is cryptography. The post was highly critical of the government, specifically the National Security Agency, whose reckless behavior in attacking online security astonished him.

Professor Matthew Green wrote on 5 September:

I was totally unprepared for today's bombshell revelations describing the NSA's efforts to defeat encryption. Not only does the worst possible hypothetical I discussed appear to be true, but it's true on a scale I couldn't even imagine.

The post was widely circulated online because it is about the sense of betrayal within a community of technical people who had often collaborated with the government. (I linked to it myself.)

On Monday, he gets a note from the acting dean of the engineering school asking him to take the post down and stop using the NSA logo as clip art in his posts. The email also informs him that if he resists he will need a lawyer. The professor runs two versions of the same site: one hosted on the university's servers, one on Google's blogger.com service. He tells the dean that he will take down the site mirrored on the university's system but not the one on blogger.com. He also removes the NSA logo from the post. Then, he takes to Twitter.

The professor says he was told that someone at the Applied Physics Laboratory, a research institute with longstanding ties to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, determined that his blog post was hosting or linking to classified material, and sounded the alarm, which led to the takedown request from the dean. He says he thought Johns Hopkins University, his employer, had come down "on the wrong side of common sense and academic freedom", particularly since the only classified material he
had linked to was from news reports in the Guardian, the New York Times and ProPublica.org – information available to the public.

Word gets around, and by late afternoon, the press starts asking questions. Now, Johns Hopkins is worried about how it looks in the media. The university bureaucracy scrambles the jets and comes up with a statement:

The university received information this morning that Matthew Green's blog contained a link or links to classified material and also used the NSA logo. For that reason, we asked professor Green to remove the Johns Hopkins-hosted mirror site for his blog Upon further review, we note that the NSA logo has been removed and that he appears to link to material that has been published in the news media. Interim Dean Andrew Douglas has informed professor Green that the mirror site may be restored.

So the university backs down, leaving many unanswered questions. Possibly, they will be addressed today. Here are some on my list:

Who was it in the Applied Physics Laboratory, with its close ties to the NSA, that raised the alarm about what a (very effective) critic of the NSA was writing ... and why?

Did that person hear first from the government and then contact the Johns Hopkins officials?

Why would an academic dean cave under pressure and send the takedown request without careful review, which would have easily discovered, for example, that the classified documents to which the blog post linked were widely available in the public domain?

Why is Johns Hopkins simultaneously saying that the event was internal to the university (that the request didn't come from the government) and that it doesn't know how the whole thing began? The dean of the engineering school doesn't know who contacted him about a professor's blog post? Really? The press office doesn't know how to get in touch with the dean? Seems unlikely. Johns Hopkins spokesman Dennis O'Shea told me this morning that university officials "were still trying to trace" the events back to their source. Clearly, there's a lot more to the story.

Matthew Green said the original request to take down his post could have referred to his Blogger.com site and the site hosted on Johns Hopkins servers. Since a request to unpublish your thoughts is one of the most extreme and threatening that any university can make of a faculty member, what kind of deliberation went into it? That Johns Hopkins backtracked so quickly after the press started asking questions suggests that the reasoning was pretty thin. But the request was momentous. These things don't fit together. What gives?

Dennis O'Shea told me the original concern was that Matthew Green's post might be "illegally linking to classified information". I asked him what law he was referring to. "I'm not saying that there was a great deal of legal analysis done," he replied. Obviously. But again: given the severity of the remedy – unpublishing an expert's post critical of the NSA – careful legal analysis was called for. Why was it missing?

In commenting critically on a subject he is expert in, and taking an independent stance that asks hard questions and puts the responsibility where it belongs, Matthew Green is doing exactly what a university faculty member is supposed to be doing. By putting his thoughts in a blog post that anyone can read and link to, he is contributing to a vital public debate, which is exactly what universities need to be doing more often. Instead of trying to get Matthew Green's blog off their servers, the deans should be trying to get more faculty into blogging and into the public arena. Who at Johns Hopkins is speaking up for these priorities? And why isn't the Johns Hopkins faculty roaring about this issue? (I teach at New York University, and I'm furious.)

Notice: Matthew Green didn't get any takedown request from Google. Only from Johns Hopkins. Think about what that means for the school. He's "their" professor, yet his work is safer on the servers of a private company than his own university. The institution failed in the clutch. That it rectified it later in the day is welcome news, but I won't be cheering until we have answers that befit a great institution like Johns Hopkins, where graduate education was founded on these shores.

And another thing: America's system of research universities is the best in the world. No one argues with that. It's one of biggest advantages this nation has. If it becomes captive to government and handmaiden to the surveillance state, that would be an economic and cultural crime of monstrous proportions. What happened to Matthew Green's blog post yesterday is no small matter.
The agreement for the US to provide raw intelligence data to Israel was reached in principle in March 2009, the document shows. (photo: James Emery)

The National Security Agency routinely shares raw intelligence data with Israel without first sifting it to remove information about US citizens, a top-secret document provided to the Guardian by whistleblower Edward Snowden reveals.

Details of the intelligence-sharing agreement are laid out in a memorandum of understanding between the NSA and its Israeli counterpart that shows the US government handed over intercepted communications likely to contain phone calls and emails of American citizens. The agreement places no legally binding limits on the use of the data by the Israelis.

The disclosure that the NSA agreed to provide raw intelligence data to a foreign country contrasts with assurances from the Obama administration that there are rigorous safeguards
to protect the privacy of US citizens caught in the dragnet. The intelligence community calls this process "minimization", but the memorandum makes clear that the information shared with the Israelis would be in its pre-minimized state.

The deal was reached in principle in March 2009, according to the undated memorandum, which lays out the ground rules for the intelligence sharing.

The five-page memorandum, termed an agreement between the US and Israeli intelligence agencies "pertaining to the protection of US persons", repeatedly stresses the constitutional rights of Americans to privacy and the need for Israeli intelligence staff to respect these rights.

But this is undermined by the disclosure that Israel is allowed to receive "raw Sigint" – signal intelligence. The memorandum says: "Raw Sigint includes, but is not limited to, unevaluated and unminimized transcripts, gists, facsimiles, telex, voice and Digital Network Intelligence metadata and content."

According to the agreement, the intelligence being shared would not be filtered in advance by NSA analysts to remove US communications. "NSA routinely sends ISNU [the Israeli Sigint National Unit] minimized and unminimized raw collection", it says.

Although the memorandum is explicit in saying the material had to be handled in accordance with US law, and that the Israelis agreed not to deliberately target Americans identified in the data, these rules are not backed up by legal obligations.

"This agreement is not intended to create any legally enforceable rights and shall not be construed to be either an international agreement or a legally binding instrument according to international law," the document says.

In a statement to the Guardian, an NSA spokesperson did not deny that personal data about Americans was included in raw intelligence data shared with the Israelis. But the agency insisted that the shared intelligence complied with all rules governing privacy.

"Any US person information that is acquired as a result of NSA's surveillance activities is handled under procedures that are designed to protect privacy rights," the spokesperson said.

The NSA declined to answer specific questions about the agreement, including whether permission had been sought from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance (Fisa) court for handing over such material.

The memorandum of understanding, which the Guardian is publishing in full, allows Israel to retain "any files containing the identities of US persons" for up to a year. The agreement requests only that the Israelis should consult the NSA's special liaison adviser when such data is found.

Notably, a much stricter rule was set for US government communications found in the raw intelligence. The Israelis were required to "destroy upon recognition" any communication "that is either to or from an official of the US government". Such communications included those of "officials of the executive branch (including the White House, cabinet departments, and independent agencies), the US House of Representatives and Senate (member and staff) and the US federal court system (including, but not limited to, the supreme court)".

It is not clear whether any communications involving members of US Congress or the federal courts have been included in the raw data provided by the NSA, nor is it clear how or why the NSA would be in possession of such communications. In 2009, however, the New York Times reported on "the agency's attempt to wiretap a member of Congress, without court approval,
on an overseas trip".

The NSA is required by law to target only non-US persons without an individual warrant, but it can collect the content and metadata of Americans' emails and calls without a warrant when such communication is with a foreign target. US persons are defined in surveillance legislation as US citizens, permanent residents and anyone located on US soil at the time of the interception, unless it has been positively established that they are not a citizen or permanent resident.

Moreover, with much of the world's internet traffic passing through US networks, large numbers of purely domestic communications also get scooped up incidentally by the agency's surveillance programs.

The document mentions only one check carried out by the NSA on the raw intelligence, saying the agency will "regularly review a sample of files transferred to ISNU to validate the absence of US persons' identities". It also requests that the Israelis limit access only to personnel with a "strict need to know".

Israeli intelligence is allowed "to disseminate foreign intelligence information concerning US persons derived from raw Sigint by NSA" on condition that it does so "in a manner that does not identify the US person". The agreement also allows Israel to release US person identities to "outside parties, including all INSU customers" with the NSA's written permission.

Although Israel is one of America's closest allies, it is not one of the inner core of countries involved in surveillance sharing with the US - Britain, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. This group is collectively known as Five Eyes.

The relationship between the US and Israel has been strained at times, both diplomatically and in terms of intelligence. In the top-secret 2013 intelligence community budget request, details of which were disclosed by the Washington Post, Israel is identified alongside Iran and China as a target for US cyberattacks.

While NSA documents tout the mutually beneficial relationship of Sigint sharing, another report, marked top secret and dated September 2007, states that the relationship, while central to US strategy, has become overwhelmingly one-sided in favor of Israel.

"Balancing the Sigint exchange equally between US and Israeli needs has been a constant challenge," states the report, titled 'History of the US – Israel Sigint Relationship, Post-1992'. "In the last decade, it arguably tilted heavily in favor of Israeli security concerns. 9/11 came, and went, with NSA's only true Third Party [counter-terrorism] relationship being driven almost totally by the needs of the partner."
In another top-secret document seen by the Guardian, dated 2008, a senior NSA official points out that Israel aggressively spies on the US. "On the one hand, the Israelis are extraordinarily good Sigint partners for us, but on the other, they target us to learn our positions on Middle East problems," the official says. "A NIE [National Intelligence Estimate] ranked them as the third most aggressive intelligence service against the US."

Later in the document, the official is quoted as saying: "One of NSA's biggest threats is actually from friendly intelligence services, like Israel. There are parameters on what NSA shares with them, but the exchange is so robust, we sometimes share more than we intended."

The memorandum of understanding also contains hints that there had been tensions in the intelligence-sharing relationship with Israel. At a meeting in March 2009 between the two agencies, according to the document, it was agreed that the sharing of raw data required a new framework and further training for Israeli personnel to protect US person information.

It is not clear whether or not this was because there had been problems up to that point in the handling of intelligence that was found to contain Americans' data.

However, an earlier US document obtained by Snowden, which discusses co-operating on a military intelligence program, bluntly lists under the cons: "Trust issues which revolve around previous ISR [Israel] operations."
The Guardian asked the Obama administration how many times US data had been found in the raw intelligence, either by the Israelis or when the NSA reviewed a sample of the files, but officials declined to provide this information. Nor would they disclose how many other countries the NSA shared raw data with, or whether the Fisa court, which is meant to oversee NSA surveillance programs and the procedures to handle US information, had signed off the agreement with Israel.

In its statement, the NSA said: "We are not going to comment on any specific information sharing arrangements, or the authority under which any such information is collected. The fact that intelligence services work together under specific and regulated conditions mutually strengthens the security of both nations.

"NSA cannot, however, use these relationships to circumvent US legal restrictions. Whenever we share intelligence information, we comply with all applicable rules, including the rules to protect US person information."

**See Also:** Read the NSA and Israel's 'M
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