



Unravelling the New World Order

*An Exposé of How Government, Religious, and Financial Insiders
Are Deciding Your Future*

Year End 2009/January 2010

OBAMA HANDS POLICE POWERS OVER AMERICAN CITIZENS TO INTERPOL

UNWO Editors

Just a few days after Christmas, the *Washington Examiner* reported that a new directive in the form of an Executive Order signed by Barack Obama “may be the most destructive blow ever struck against American constitutional civil liberties.”

Andy McCarthy at *National Review Online* writes that the Executive Order in question, amended by Obama on December 17, immunizes an international police force from the limitations that constrain the FBI and other American law-enforcement agencies and thus makes INTERPOL “immune from the restraints of American law.”

“Why?” McCarthy asks. “Why is it suddenly necessary to have, within the Justice Department, a repository for stashing government files (such as birth certificates, education records and so on) which, therefore, will be beyond the ability of Congress, American law-enforcement, the media, and the American people to scrutinize?”

Former U.S. Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, interviewed on the January 4 edition of “The O’Reilly Factor” on the Fox News Channel, had this to say:

“The President recently signed, very quietly, an executive order that basically releases INTERPOL from all American constraints. [The] Freedom of Information Act doesn’t apply. All the constraints that you, as an American citizen, could use against an American police force based on a recent Obama-signed Executive Order, give INTERPOL, which has relationships with Syria, with Libya, with Iran . . . it gives them all sorts of extra legality in the United States in a way that has never ever before been offered to INTERPOL, and I’m very curious why the President is doing this.”

Background

Under provisions of an executive order signed by President Reagan in 1983, there was a safety feature pertaining to INTERPOL, which provided that property and assets of INTERPOL remained subject to search and seizure, and its archived records remained subject to public scrutiny under provisions like the Freedom of Information Act. McCarthy points out that constraints of the Fourth Amendment, FOIA, and other limitations of the Constitution prevented law-enforcement and its controlling government authority from becoming tyrannical.

Now, however, the President’s order negates Reagan-imposed limitations on INTERPOL and grants to INTERPOL two key privileges:

#1: INTERPOL will now have the ability to operate within the territorial limits of the United States without being subject to the same constitutional restraints that apply to all domestic law enforcement agencies such as the FBI; and

#2: INTERPOL’s domestic facilities--including its office within the U.S.

Department of Justice--will be immune from search and seizure by U.S. authorities and from disclosure of archived documents in response to Freedom of Information Act requests filed by U.S. citizens.

Did you get that? *Obama has given an international law enforcement organization that is accountable to no other national authority the ability to operate as it pleases within America’s borders—and he has freed it from the most basic measure of official transparency and accountability: the Freedom of Information Act.*

Consequently, the U.S. will no longer have access to search INTERPOL property, assets or records in its possession; and the U.S. can no longer restrain INTERPOL through U.S. law. This also puts U.S. citizens at risk of prosecution by international tribunals such as the International Criminal Court.

What Does This Mean for America?

Essentially, Barack Obama on December 17 handed INTERPOL agents the right to operate as an untouchable police force with unquestioned, unrestrained authority inside the United States. INTERPOL can now operate with full diplomatic immunity outside the confines of the U.S. Constitution. That means they can investigate, interrogate, and arrest any individual they see fit—without the cooperation of the FBI or any state or local law enforcement. Furthermore, our courts and judges will have no recourse to stop INTERPOL from doing as they see fit with any U.S. citizen.

The amended E.O. 12425 appears to allow for the sealing of documents and the transfer of arrested prisoners to foreign countries to be tried in foreign courts under foreign or international law. As the Constitution indicates, the main task of the federal government of the United States is to protect the citizenry. It appears Obama intends something completely different.

There was no presidential statement or White House press briefing on this action by Barack Obama, nor has there been any significant coverage in the liberal media. All that can be found about it on the official White House Website is a December 17 announcement and one paragraph of text from President Obama's amendment of Executive Order 12425. It carried this innocuous headline: "Amending Executive Order 12425 Designating INTERPOL as a public international organization entitled to enjoy certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities."

If the potential abuses of so-called "hate crimes" legislation give you concern, then imagine a politically correct international police force with known ties to Muslim countries operating unchecked on our soil! While these international police are rounding up suspected terrorists, arms dealers, and international drug-ring hoodlums, might they also use their unrestricted powers to terrorize members of opposition groups exercising their (former) rights of free speech?

The current administration and radical members of the Democrat Party leadership have already demonstrated their contempt for opposition, and they appear eager now to adopt bolder measures to squelch it.

Behind the Rhetoric

It has occurred to this writer that the Christmas Day event, when the Nigerian panty bomber very nearly obliterated 300 human beings on an airliner over Detroit may have afforded Rahm Emanuel another "crisis" that (in his words) should not be "wasted." The obligatory press appearances by Obama and DHS officials Janet Napolitano and John Brennan—nearly two weeks after the event—seemed to be not so much opportunities to provide information as they were opportunities to convey the idea that fighting terrorism has become so complex and dangerous as to be unmanageable by our domestic law enforcement and security forces.

We wonder: Was this "post-panty bomber" rhetoric actually the groundwork being laid to rationalize a supranational police force that we "need" to help us connect the dots between CIA, FBI and DHS activities in the war on terror?

Remember: This is a war that the President, up until now, has been reluctant to acknowledge. But now, in the face of this latest crisis, he finds it expedient to acknowledge we are engaged in a complex, and extremely dangerous, global war. What a convenient rationale for imposing a ready-made police state!

One more question: *If President Reagan considered certain protections to be necessary for our national security* (see paragraph titled "Background" above), *what reason could Barack Obama now have for removing those protections?*