

New Directive allows the President to play dictator



The Bush administration has released a directive called the [National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive](#). The directive released on May 9, 2007 has gone almost unnoticed by the mainstream and alternative media. That may be on purpose, for the directive states that in case of a "catastrophic emergency", all power goes to the president. Preparations for a doomsday scenario?

In this directive, Bush declares that in the event of a "Catastrophic Emergency" the President will be entrusted with leading the activities to ensure constitutional government. The language in this directive would in effect make the President a dictator in the case of such an emergency.

So what is a "Catastrophic Emergency"? Any incident, regardless of location, that results in extraordinary levels of mass casualties, damage, or disruption severely affecting the US population, infrastructure, environment, economy, or government functions.

So what does this mean? This is entirely subjective and the directive doesn't provide any real concrete definition of what such an emergency would entail. The language written in the directive is disturbing because it doesn't say that the President will work with the other branches of government equally to ensure a constitutional government is protected. It says clearly that there will be a cooperative effort among the three branches that will be coordinated by the President. If the President is coordinating these efforts it effectively puts him in charge of every branch.

The directive defines "Enduring Constitutional Government" as the following: "Enduring Constitutional Government," or "ECG," means a cooperative effort among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, coordinated by the President, as a matter of comity with respect to the legislative and judicial branches and with proper respect for

the constitutional separation of powers among the branches, to preserve the constitutional framework under which the Nation is governed and the capability of all three branches of government to execute constitutional responsibilities and provide for orderly succession, appropriate transition of leadership, and interoperability and support of the National Essential Functions during a catastrophic emergency.

The problem is this: this directive is for a "catastrophic emergency", one far bigger than 9/11 or Katrina - we would hope, for as catastrophic as they may seem to be, they do not require the total abandonment of the normal functioning of government. The doomsday scenario hopefully required would transcend federal states borders, or would be one in which an entire state is completely taken out of the equation. 9/11 may seem to come close, but is still far removed; the explosion of an atomic bomb on US soil, such as in the TV series 24, might come closer, because of the threat of nuclear fall-out in nearby states, or if "the apparatus of state" would be disabled because of the location where the explosion occurred. A multiple set of atomic bombs going off would surely qualify for such a directive to take effect, or a chemical or medical crisis spanning the US.



All of these scenarios are unlikely to occur. The problem with unlikely scenarios, is that they are often engineered to occur, under the false flag method. E.g. a series of nuclear explosions go off across the US, as someone who has access to these wants them to go off, to bring about dictatorial rule in the US and/or achieve a political agenda abroad. Unlikely? Over the past few years, there has been repeated scaremongering about Al Qaeda planning just such an attack. And the question is always whether it is purely fear-mongering, or whether it is preparation for something to come.

Part of the 9/11 controversy hinges on the fact that the neoconservatives wanted to invade Iraq and Afghanistan (and several other countries), but noted that even if they were once again back in power, a paradigm shift needed to occur before the American public would approve. Then, within months of being in power, 9/11 happened - the paradigm shift was there. It was indeed too good to be believed and once the neocons Project for a New American Century was exposed, belief in the official line of 9/11 began to drop - and a population's trust in a nation's leader is totally disassociated from the truth; it is all about perception.

So that is the danger of this directive: a provision seems to have been made for a highly theoretical, unlikely event, that will likely never occur. But if the event would occur, the president will be a de facto dictator. The question is: would that be a good thing? That question, has not been posed to the US people. "The President" has decided he is the only man able to do what is required. If that president is George Bush, then judging from what happened on 9/11, it is highly unlikely he is the right man for that role.