

Maude Barlow On Canada's Water vs. George Bush/U.S.A.

How Water Has Become a National Security Issue

By Maude Barlow

Water has become a key strategic security issue for the U.S. government and that has some very concerned. It's a colossal failure of political foresight that water has not emerged as an important issue in the U.S. Presidential campaign. The links between oil, war, and U.S. foreign policy are well known. But water -- whether we treat it as a public good or as a commodity that can be bought and sold -- will in large part determine whether our future is peaceful or perilous.

Americans use water even more wastefully than oil. The U.S. relies on non-renewable groundwater for 50 percent of its daily use, and 36 states now face serious water shortages, some verging on crisis.

Meanwhile, dwindling freshwater supplies around the world, inequitable access to water, and corporate control of water, together with impending climate change from fossil fuel emissions, have created a life-or-death situation across the planet. Both Democrats and Republicans have emphasized loosening U.S. dependence on non-renewable energy resources in their platforms, but neither party gives significant air time to the threats posed by water shortages.

This is not to say that no one is paying attention. In fact, water has become a key strategic security and foreign policy priority for the United States government.

Cut Deals, Carry Water

Corporate interests have pursued schemes to privatize, commodify, and export water for decades. We have seen how this plays out in Canada. For instance, in the late 1990s, Sun Belt Water, Inc., sued the Canadian government under NAFTA because British Columbia banned water exports, preventing a deal that would have sent B.C. water to California.

Corporations have also made attempts to ship Canadian water as far as Asia and the Middle East, proposals that fizzled after fierce opposition from public citizens who were beginning to understand the dangers of permanently removing water from local ecosystems and placing it under corporate control.

Now the Pentagon, as well as various U.S. security think tanks, have decided that water supplies, like energy supplies, must be secured if the United States is to maintain its current economic and military power in the world. And the United States is exerting pressure to access Canadian water, despite Canada's own shortages.

Under the name, "North American Future 2025 Project," the U.S. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) brought together high level government officials and business executives from Canada, the United States, and Mexico for a series of six meetings to discuss a wide range of issues related to the Security and Prosperity Partnership, a controversial and tightly guarded set of negotiations to expand NAFTA. [See related story.]

"As ... globalization continues and the balance of power potentially shifts, and risks to global security evolve, it is only prudent for Canadian, Mexican, and U.S. policymakers to contemplate a North American security architecture that could effectively deal with security threats that can be foreseen in 2025," said a leaked copy of a CSIS background. On the agenda for one of two meetings in Calgary were, "water consumption, water transfers, and artificial diversions of bulk water" with the aim of achieving "joint optimum utilization of the available water."

The water and security connection deepens with the fact that Sandia National Laboratories, a vital partner with CSIS in its Global Water Futures Project, also plays a major role in military security in the United States. While Sandia is technically owned by the U.S. government, and reports to the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, its management is contracted out to Lockheed Martin, the world's biggest weapons manufacturer. Ralph Pentland, water consultant and primary author of the Canadian government's Federal Water Policy in 1987, believes that the purpose of these cross-border discussions is to secure sufficient water for Alberta tar sands production in order to ensure uninterrupted oil supplies to the United States.

Energy extraction would be far more attractive if a new source of water -- potentially from northern Canada -- could be brought to the tar sands through pipe-

lines or other diversions. As long as the water doesn't cross the international border, it is within Alberta's power to do this. These schemes to displace water from one ecosystem to another in the service of corporate profit are an environmental problem for the entire planet, which is another reason why water must form a crucial part of any progressive discussion around U.S. dependence on foreign energy resources.

Corporate interests understand the connection and are using it to make their case for private solutions to the water crisis. In language that will be familiar to critics who argued that the United States invaded Iraq not for democracy but for access to oil and profits for corporations, a 2005 report from CSIS's Global Water Futures project had this to say about water: "Water issues are critical to U.S. national security and integral to upholding American values of humanitarianism and democratic development. Moreover, engagement with international water issues guarantees business opportunity for the U.S. private sector, which is well positioned to contribute to development and reap economic reward."

Water for All

Clearly, the powers that be in the United States have decided that water is not a public good but a private resource that must be secured by whatever means. But there are alternatives. North Americans must learn to live within our means, by conserving water in agriculture and in the home. We could learn from the many examples here and beyond our borders -- from the New Mexican "Acequia" system that uses an ancient natural ditch irrigation tradition to distribute water in arid lands to the International Rainwater Harvesting Alliance in Geneva, that works globally to promote sustainable rainwater harvesting programs.

Conservation strategies would undermine the massive investment now going into corporate technological and infrastructure solutions, such as desalination, wastewater reuse, and water transfer projects. And conservation would be many times cheaper, a boon to the public but not to the corporate interests that are currently driving international water agreements.

At the grassroots, a global water justice movement is demanding a change in international law to settle once and for all the question of who controls water, and

whether responses to the water crisis will ensure water for the public or profits for corporations.

Ricardo Petrella has led a movement in Italy to recognize access to water as a basic human right, which has support among politicians at every level. The Coalition in Defense of Public Water in Ecuador is demanding that the government amend the constitution to recognize the right to water. The Coalition Against Water Privatization in South Africa is challenging the practice of water metering before the Johannesburg High Court on the basis that it violates the human rights of Soweto's citizens. Dozens of groups in Mexico have joined COMDA, the Coalition of Mexican Organizations for the Right to Water, a national campaign for a constitutional guarantee of water for the public.

The U.S. and Canada are the only two countries actively blocking international attempts to recognize water as a human right. But movements in both countries are working to change that. A large network of human rights, faith-based, labor, and environmental groups in Canada has formed Canadian Friends of the Right to Water to get the Canadian government to support a U.N. right-to-water covenant. And a network in the United States led by Food and Water Watch is calling for a national water trust to ensure safekeeping of the nation's water assets and a change of government policy on the right to water.

Such campaigns may have a fight ahead of them, but the vision is within reach: a United Nations covenant that recognizes the right of the Earth and other species to clean water, pledges to protect and conserve the world's water supplies, and forms an agreement between those countries who have water and those who don't to work toward local -- not corporate -- control of water. We must acknowledge water as a fundamental human right for all.

Maude Barlow wrote this article as part of *A Just Foreign Policy*, the Summer 2008 issue of YES! Magazine. Maude is the national chairperson of the Council of Canadians and author of *Blue Covenant: The Global Water Crisis and the Coming Battle for the Right to Water*.

Was Sex Criminal Paul Bernardo A Mind-Control Patsy?

Was Paul Bernardo a patsy, in that he was being led to do what he did. Was this just another mind-control operation? How come he belonged to the same phoney "Confederate Grand Lodge of Freemasons" as did Tim McVeigh, of Oklahoma City bombing fame? The ones behind the Bernardo-Homolka set-up were that same underworld drug mafia which includes undercover drug cops and politicians. Was the whole intent was to make snuff films for the perverse viewing pleasure of elite parties at a Manioulin Island hotel, and to embarrass the biological father, Bob Rae.

During Bernardo's trial, the judge ordered a media blackout on the trial. However, people were going to Buffalo NY, to read the details in the Buffalo newspapers. (They were permitted to re-enter Canada with one copy only!)

The *Buffalo News* revealed the reasons for the Canadian News blackout....there was virtually NO EVIDENCE AGAINST BERNARDO!!!! Moving up to Jan., 2008. Why were the original 24 dirty Toronto drug cops who were being investigated for corruption, eventually all released? Because the RCMP, who were doing the investigation, were ordered to drop it by the Department of Defense, Ottawa.

WAS ALL THIS, JUST LIKE 9/11, INTENDED TO BE MAINLY A MEDIA EVENT?

SHOCK and AWE, SHOCK and AWE!

On 6/14/08, George Freund <freund.gm@gmail.com> wrote:

In his books on the New World Order, Professor Robert O'Driscoll of the University of Toronto revealed the secrets of the kingdom. He stated the notorious killer and serial rapist Paul Bernardo was Bob Rae's illegitimate son. There was an obvious sweetheart deal accorded to two of Canada's most notorious killers, and a massive frame up job against a young university student named Robert Baltovich. He was framed in the murder of his girlfriend Elizabeth Bain. After many long years, he has been acquitted of the crime. However, the nefarious forces that perpetrated it are still in action.

At the time former Deputy Chief Reesor of the Toronto Police was the lead investigator while a Detective Sergeant. Certain evidence was buried like her being seen in the company of the Scarborough rapist, Paul Bernardo. Other eye witness testimony from a man seeing her be-

ing subdued in a car on the 401 was also not used. Reesor shot through the ranks after this imperial service. He retired shortly after this individual exposed these facts on 'A View From Space' AM640's conspiracy show par excellence.

Not to be left by the wayside, he was scooped up by Magna Corporation for a plum job as a reward for faithful service.

The 'power' establishment are deeply offended that a jurist has foiled many long years of work. In one of Toronto's most unexplainable homicides, two Rosedale boys were gunned down in the luxury SUV. Most media makes that sound like another random act of Toronto gun violence. There was one startling revelation however, the men were visiting the son of Ontario Superior Court Justice David McCombs who presided over the Baltovich case. That's quite a co-incidence.

In another co-incidence an off duty Peel Regional policeman was found dead in his car in an apparent suicide roughly four hours later. There will be no investigation. I suspect he shot himself. I would bet that there will be no ballistics check of his firearm and the bullets and shell casings left in Toronto. All the loose ends will be neatly tied up with a propaganda coup for Mayor Miller's anti-gun crusade. The NWO always seem to score on several fronts when they clean house.

Canada's greatest secret that Paul Bernardo is the former Premier's son will be swept under the carpet because mainstream media is not paid to handle the truth only to discard it.

BANG! BANG! YOU'RE IT!

Double Slaying 'Heartbreaking'

A source said the victims had been visiting a friend, the son of Ontario Superior Court Justice David McCombs, who recently presided over the Robert Baltovich case.

<http://www.nationalpost.com/related/links/story.html?id=586659>

Peel Region officer found dead in car

<http://news.therecord.com/News/Local/article/366875>

See more Bernardo Page 14

Crooked U.S. 'Fed' Stole Bank: Unfolding Financial Meltdown On Wall Street Toronto Financial Writers Hide This Story To Save Crooked Banking Institutions Of The United States

What's The Difference Between Lehman Brothers & Bear Stearns? Lehman's CEO Sits On the Board Of The NY Fed

By Dr. Ellen Brown

URL of this article: www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=9343

Global Research, June 15, 2008 webofdebt.com

An earlier article by this author ("The Secret Bailout of JP Morgan") summarized evidence presented by John Olagues, an expert in options trading, suggesting that JPMorgan, far from "rescuing" Bear Stearns, was actually its nemesis.

The faltering investment bank was brought down, not by "rumors," but by insider trading based on a plan drawn up much earlier. The deal was a lucrative one for JPM, handing the Wall Street megabank \$55 billion in loans from the Federal Reserve (meaning ultimately the U.S. taxpayer). So how did JPM get away with it? Olagues notes the highly suspicious fact that JPM's CEO James Dimon sits on the Board of the New York Federal Reserve.

In his latest post, Olagues discusses the fate of Lehman Brothers, the nation's fourth-largest investment bank and the next faltering bank expected to fail.² Unlike Bear Stearns, which got decimated by the JPM buyout using Federal Reserve money, Lehman Brothers is probably in line for a massive bailout from the Fed. At least, that's what its CEO Richard Fuld seems to believe. The June 4, 2008 *Financial Times of London* quoted him as stating, "The Federal Reserve's decision earlier this year to lend directly to investment banks should take questions about Lehman's liquidity off the table." Whether Lehman can come up with the "liquidity" to meet its debts is no longer an issue, because it expects to be feeding at the trough of the Federal Reserve, just as JPM did

when it bought Bear Stearns at bargain-basement prices. The difference between the two "bailouts" is that Lehman Brothers, unlike Bear Stearns, will actually get the money. Why is Fuld so confident of this rescue operation? Olagues notes that Fuld, like Dimon (and unlike Bear CEO Alan Schwartz), sits on the Board of the New York Federal Reserve.

A conflict of interest? It certainly looks like it. Indeed, Olagues points to a statute defining this sort of self-dealing as a criminal offense. 18 U.S.C. Chapter 11, Section 208, makes it a felony punishable by up

to five years in prison for members of the Board of Directors of a Federal Reserve Bank to make decisions that benefit their own financial interests. That would undoubtedly apply here:

"Fuld, at last count, owns 1.9 million shares of Lehman, 600,000 restricted stock units and 900,000 executive stock options. . . . Although Mr. Fuld sold over \$320,000,000 worth of stock at near all time highs in 2006 and 2007, received through the premature exercise of his stock options, he still has value in his present holdings of approximately \$100,000,000."

Likewise, says Olagues, "James Dimon holds almost 3 million shares of J.P. Morgan stock worth over \$120 million with taxes already paid and executive stock options equal in my estimate of another \$70 million. His dispositions of stock equaled \$140 million over the past few years." Olagues adds:

"Fuld, like Jamie Dimon, was at the luncheon on March 11, 2008 with Bernanke, Rubin, CEO of Citigroup, Geithner, President of the New York FED, Thain of Merrill Lynch, and Schwarzman. Some claim that the meeting was about Bear Stearns and how to handle the situation."

Needless to say, Bear CEO Schwartz was not invited to the luncheon. "Lehman Bros. is one of the original stock holders of the New York Federal Reserve Bank," Olagues observes. "Bear Stearns does not now have any ownership in the FED banks."

The luncheon was held two days before the April 14 collapse of Bear Stearns stock that led to the bank's demise. If the luncheon attendees were indeed discussing the Bear problem on April 11, testimony before the Senate Banking Committee in which the principals said they first heard of the problem on the

Ellen Brown, J.D., developed her research skills as an attorney practicing civil litigation in Los Angeles. In *Web of Debt*, her latest book, she turns those skills to an analysis of the Federal Reserve and "the money trust." She shows how this private cartel has usurped the power to create money from the people themselves and how we the people can get it back. Her eleven books include *Forbidden Medicine and Nature's Pharmacy* (co-authored with Dr. Lynne Walker and selling 285,000 copies). See www.ellenbrown.com and www.webofdebt.com.

As We Go To Press: JP Morgan's CEO Dymon admits the wealth gained from the "purchase" of Bear Stearns was worth a lot more than was originally conspired.

Sydney White Lectures 'Studies In Propaganda' Will Resume In Late September. Stand By As New Information Will Be Announced.

RIGHTS-US: Despite Legal Blow, Taser Use by Police to Expand

by Am Johal

NEW YORK, Jun 12 (IPS) - Taser International, the manufacturer of conducted energy weapons known as stun guns or Tasers, is once again implicated in deaths caused in part by deployment of the weapon.

This week, Taser International lost its first product liability claim in the United States. The courts ordered Taser to pay 6.2 million dollars related to the death of a California man who was hit multiple times with the weapon by police. Taser's stock dropped by 11 percent after the courts found that the company had failed to warn the police department that prolonged exposure to the device could increase the risk of cardiac failure. Taser International plans to appeal the decision.

"Certainly, this was a tragedy for the [Robert] Heston family as well as for the officers involved," Doug Klint, vice president and general counsel of TASER International, said in a statement. "We however do not feel that the verdict is supported by the facts including the testimony of the world class experts who testified on our behalf with scientific and medical evidence. Our commitment to continue to defend our life-saving products and to support law enforcement remains unchanged."

Human rights organisations such as Amnesty International have long argued that most of the deaths associated with Tasers are related to multiple uses or prolonged usage of the weapon on the same person. Since 2001, there have been over 300 deaths that Amnesty has studied where Tasers were involved -- a significant number involved either multiple uses or prolonged usage of the Taser. In over 20 of those cases, coroners have listed Tasers as the contributing factor. In only 10 percent of the cases was the Tasered individual actually carrying a weapon.

Dalia Hashad, director of Amnesty International's domestic human rights programme, told IPS, "Science paid for by Taser International should not be trusted. There is an open scientific question on the safety of this device. They are an unknown quantity in many areas and need to be studied further before they are unleashed on the public. We have to start talking about whether force is necessary or not in specific situations, rather than whether a gun or a Taser should be deployed."

Police forces in the United States and around the world have argued in favour of having access to the weapon as a way of reducing gun deaths in confrontations with a suspect.

This week, a 26-year-old Brooklyn man died after being Tasered by the Suffolk County Police Department in New York.

In an interview with IPS, Donna Lieberman, executive director of the New York Civil Liberties Union, said, "It's an eerie coincidence as

New York gets ready to deploy hundreds of Tasers without any hint of training and strict guidelines that would be essential before a man dies in Long Island after having 50,000 volts of electricity shot through him."

"This ought to give the NYPD reason to pause and drive home the critical message that these are potentially lethal weapons and are susceptible to abuse and deadly consequences as guns," she said. "There's a history of abuse all over the country, slick advertising and a tendency to portray Tasers as harmless."

"Tasers can be a less deadly alternative but not if they are deployed en masse, viewed as a safe technology and are misjudged as a harmless alternative -- we could see far more disastrous consequences in the future," she said.

Sgt. Jack Fitzpatrick, a detective and lieutenant in charge of the homicide division of the Suffolk County Police Department, told IPS that an autopsy and toxicology reports will be conducted and that the person in custody was trying to swallow a bag of cocaine. The man died later in hospital. Fitzpatrick said that he didn't have any evidence of excessive use by police related to Tasers nor was he aware of statistics related to income or the ethnicity of people who had been Tasered previously.

The death came a day before thousands of New York police officers were to begin carrying Tasers. The decision to expand Taser use was made at the recommendation of a Rand Corporation report written for the New York Police Department in January.

In a summary of the recommendations related to police training for the NYPD, the Rand report stated, "Analysis of the NYPD firearm-discharge cases and the experience of other police departments suggest that, if the NYPD had a broader deployment of a more robust less-lethal standoff weapon, such as TASER devices, it not only might prevent some incidents from escalating to deadly force but might also reduce injuries to officers and citizens alike, as has been the case in other departments."

"While the NYPD does provide pepper spray to all patrol officers and TASER devices to patrol supervisors on a limited basis, the authors recommend that the NYPD implement a pilot program that expands the current availability of TASER devices to all patrol officers in selected precincts," it said.

The report was heavily criticised by the NYCLU for failing to gather public input and for glossing over apparent racial disparities in the NYPD's stop-and-frisk practices.

"After police officers fired 50 shots at an unarmed Sean Bell and two other black men, Commissioner [Ray] Kelly promised a careful and independent study of police shooting practices. Today's report, however, completely ignores the issue of race in police shootings, leaving New Yorkers with no answers to many questions raised by the tragic Bell shooting," said Christopher Dunn, associate legal director of the NYCLU, in a statement at the time.

A spokesperson for the U.N. secretary-general was not aware of what the U.N. was currently doing to address the proliferation of Tasers at a global level, but stated that U.N. human rights institutions would be monitoring future developments.