

Blair Up for Impeachment: Can Obama Be Far Behind?

by Nancy Spannaus

June 23—The crimes of the Queen’s poodle Tony Blair in lying to detonate the 2003 Iraq War began to catch up with him last week, when an outcry began in the British Parliament demanding his impeachment, an action which, in Britain, could lead directly to imprisonment. The implications of this action, by leading individuals in Great Britain, have huge portent for the fate of one of his leading chums in the United States, fellow royal stooge Barack Obama.

The sequence of events was rapid. On June 17, the senior correspondent of the *Daily Mail*, Simon Heffer, issued a call for Blair’s impeachment, based on the deaths of British soldiers and others, which his lies about the threat posed by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein to the West. That same day former Labour Party MP George Galloway, now representing the Respect Party in Parliament, formally initiated impeachment proceedings. The next day, June 18, Sir Peter Tapsell, a Tory, and the longest-serving Member of the House of Commons, confronted Prime Minister David Cameron during the Prime Minister’s Questions on what he called the “growing sentiment” that Parliament should exercise the “ancient but still existing power of Back Benchers to commence the procedure of impeachment” against Blair.

The rapid-fire actions, of course, have everything to do with the raging pace of the offensive by the bestial ISIS jihadis in Iraq, which the war launched by Blair and Cheney/Bush set the stage for, and which has the

immediate potential for accelerating the British Monarchy’s drive toward a thermonuclear confrontation between the U.S. and Russia.

Meanwhile, Barack Obama—whose foreign policy advisor in the 2012 election was Tony Blair—is proceeding to carry out his *next* impeachable crime, by committing the U.S. to taking military action in Iraq, another unconstitutional, undeclared act of aggressive war, and he is running into resistance from both sides of the aisle in Congress, as a number of votes in Congress last week show. Prominent commentators, including a key author of the War Powers Resolution of 1973, have begun to raise the specter of impeachment.

Obama, like Blair, is ripe for immediate impeachment, as the necessary road to saving the U.S., and preventing nuclear war.

Blair ‘Totally Responsible’

The impeachment motion against Tony Blair is deadly serious. Although no such parliamentary proceeding has succeeded in Great Britain since 1806, the procedure for doing so is still in the law. As journalist Heffer pointed out, Parliament need only set up a Select Committee of MPs to draw up the Article of Impeachment, which, if it were voted up in the Commons, would be provided to prosecutors to present to the House of Lords. A simple majority of the Lords could convict, and, Heffer said, “could, in theory, involve Tony Blair being sent to prison.”



LPAC

Mind-meld: With Blair facing impeachment for his part in promoting the lies that led up to the 2003 Iraq invasion, and Obama now on the edge of a new Iraq intervention, will they go down together?

Heffer outlines a set of devastating charges: “Did Mr. Blair know he was lying to Parliament when he presented the ‘dodgy dossier’—which argued that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction that could be deployed against the West in just 45 minutes—and therefore gain Parliament’s authority to go to war on the basis of a deception? . . . Is he therefore responsible for the 179 deaths of British service personnel, never mind the tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians who died in the conflict? And for the £9 billion it cost us?”

“Above all, has he damaged the interests of this country by creating long-term instability in the region because of a decision that was either criminally negligent or possibly taken on a fraudulent basis?”

Heffer concludes: “I suspect that as things worsen in Iraq—and they will—getting a majority in the Commons to impeach Mr. Blair might not be impossible. What the outcome in the Lords would be, when they decide on his guilt or innocence, would depend on the evidence. The public is crying out for that evidence to be heard. And impeachment is the right constitutional tool for a former Prime Minister accused of such behavior.” And if impeached, “we would finally know, once and for all, just what Tony Blair’s true place in history should be.”

Blair, the Queen’s prime minister from 1997 to 2007, was a leading force internationally for the policies which led to aggressive war, and depopulation wars, by NATO and coalitions of its members, against numerous nations, including Yugoslavia, Iraq, Libya, Syria, among others. His “rationale” came directly from the Crown’s policy of eliminating national sovereignty, as enunciated in his 1999 and 2004 speeches in Chicago in favor of eliminating the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, and launching the so-called Responsibility-to-Protect doctrine. In plain language, that policy dictates permanent barbaric war, and depopulation—as we see in Iraq, in particular, today.

The former prime minister, who, shamefully still holds the position of the EU’s ambassador to the Middle East Quartet, is passionately hated in Great Britain. The monarchy has continued to protect him in the Chilcot Inquiry into the lies he told to start the Iraq War, and Blair

has stonewalled on providing the documents on discussion between him and George W. Bush which prove that Blair and Bush (and Bush’s controller Dick Cheney) had agreed to proceed with the Iraq war regardless of any alleged weapons of mass destruction.

Exemplary of what evidence is available is the exclusive interview given to *Huffington Post UK* June 18 by Cambridge University professor George Joffe. Joffe is a former deputy director at the Royal Institute of International Affairs and an Associate Fellow the British military’s Royal United Services Institute, and was invited by Blair to 10 Downing Street in 2003 to discuss the potential ramifications of an Iraq invasion. “It was clear that the decision had already been made,” Joffe said.

Asked “if a line could be drawn between the decision to invade and occupy Iraq in March 2003, and the current ISIS-led insurgency,” Joffe replied, “Absolutely”; Blair and George W. Bush bear “total responsibility” for what is happening.

The Crown Policy: War and Genocide

Blair has, however, endlessly protested that the invasion of Iraq was the “right thing” to do, despite the falseness of the claim of weapons of mass destruction,

and, claiming credentials as an expert on Islamic extremism, denied that the crushing war that began in 2003 had anything to do with the current mayhem. His continuous, lengthy self-justifications have simply increased the rage against him.

Blair is on record as favoring a de facto global war against Islam. Of course, it is well-known that military action in the relevant nations will simply provoke retaliation, and further fighting—a 100-year religious war. But that doesn't bother Blair, since, *as a current member of the Queen's Privy Council*, he is bound to remain loyal to the Queen, and thus Her Majesty's expressed agenda of reducing the world's population to 1 billion or less. And the British are not only in favor of such a war, but their intelligence services have, for more than a century, been intimately involved in creating jihadi groups and sects that will make it happen.

Thus, Blair is fully in favor of Western intervention in the Iraq crisis today.

And so, of course, is his buddy Barack Obama, as well as George W. Bush's actual controller, Dick Cheney. Puppets for the Queen do as they're told.

Obviously, given the array of opposition which is being expressed in Great Britain against Blair, including an editorial in the June 19 *Financial Times*, the Empress's view is not monolithic in that country. Leading figures in many institutions and parties oppose a new Iraq war, and, as in the case of the British parliamentary vote against bombing Syria in the Fall of 2013, British action can have a significant impact on the entire trans-Atlantic region, including the United States.

Obama's Predicament

Which brings us to what's happening with the Obama Administration.

As the narcissistic British puppet he is, Barack Obama had no trouble at all announcing that he would be sending military advisors to Iraq, without bringing this de facto war policy to the Congress for a vote. I'll keep you posted, was basically the way Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell characterized Obama's message to the Congressional leadership, with whom he met June 18. Obama insists he does not even need to refer to the Authorization for the Use of Military Force as enabling his action. He, like Cheney and Adolf Hitler before him, asserts the *Führer Prinzip*—that the ruler has the inherent power to act as he sees fit. In his view, his role as Commander in Chief trumps the explicit statement in the U.S. Constitution that it is Congress,

and no other body, which has the authority to declare war.

Obama has gotten away with this unconstitutional policy of violating the Separation of Powers and the Constitution repeatedly, without being challenged effectively by Congress—so he figures he can do it again. But this time, it's not so clear he'll get away with it. Coming on top of the buildup of hatred toward his Presidency—within his party and Congress, as well as the population—Obama's actions may just backfire, just as Blair's crusade for continuous war is doing.

The day after Obama announced his deployment of advisors and plans to prepare for further military action, huge bipartisan sections of Congress carried out a significant revolt in defiance of a number of Administration policies, by attaching amendments to the 2015 Defense Appropriations bill. Two of them passed: first, an amendment prohibiting the transfer of man-portable air-defense systems (MANPADS) to Syria, sponsored by Michigan Democrat John Conyers and Florida Republican Ted Yoho—by a voice vote; second, an amendment introduced by Kentucky Rep. Thomas Massie to curb NSA and CIA surveillance, which gained a veto-proof majority of 293-123.

In addition, large contingents of Democrats voted for four amendments, introduced by Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.), against the Obama war policy. All aim at cutting funding for further military adventures by the Administration.

So far, of course, few Democrats—and none in Congress—have mooted impeachment of Obama. But some significant voices are being raised. Former Republican Congressman Paul Findley, a key author of the War Powers Resolution, who went against Nixon's veto threat to secure its enactment, on June 19 declared that "Just as with threats to attack Syria last year, an attack on Iraq would violate the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution. As with any President, he [President Obama] commits an impeachable offense if he does not follow the Constitution."

From the other side of the spectrum, Marjorie Cohn, a former president of the liberal National Lawyers Guild, laid out a clear case for saying Obama has violated the War Powers Resolution and the Constitution.

The responsibility, however, comes down to Congress itself. It takes just one member, as it does in Great Britain, to start the ball rolling on impeaching this President. Each day that goes by without it happening, puts mankind in increasingly mortal danger.