



JOEL M. SKOUSEN'S

# WORLD AFFAIRS BRIEF

COMMENTARY AND INSIGHTS ON A TROUBLED WORLD

Weekly Email edition

March 31, 2006

## WHO PLANNED AND COORDINATED THE IMMIGRATION PROTESTS?

As Devvy Kidd from Newwithview.com reported, "100,000 criminals (illegal aliens, not immigrants) brazenly marched through the streets of Chicago without fear of being rounded up and deported. On March 17, 2006, an estimated 25,000 illegals from Ireland marched boldly in the St. Patrick's Day Parade in NY without fear of any enforcement of our immigration laws. I told my friends at the time: this unchecked in-your-face, 'we demand respect' display by illegals will embolden them to demand they be given a free pass and when that doesn't happen, it will reach the point of violence.

"On March 24, 2006, hundreds of high school students in LA walked out of their classrooms [*without consequences from school officials - ed*] to protest the newest piece of ... immigration legislation by the incompetent fools in Congress. Within hours, 15,000 criminals (illegals) were marching in Phoenix and roughly 10,000 in Georgia. On March 25, 2006, waving their Mexican flags chanting the same worn out 'racist' garbage and demanding their 'rights' 50,000 of these criminals marched in Denver, thousands in North Carolina and here in Sacramento. All because the House of Representatives has passed legislation that would make it a felony to be in the U.S. illegally."

Kidd went too far by calling all protesters criminals. Some were certainly legal, marching in support of the illegal aliens. But the tone of her warning is more than justified. This was a blatant defiance of law, and not one city, state or federal official acted to arrest and deport any of these protesters. I'll go a bit further and restate what I have said before: large scale protests are never spontaneous. They are planned, organized and funded by persons with motives. This is my analysis of those hidden motives:

By the size and coordination of all these protests, I believe these protests were planned and provoked by the same powers pushing Bush to create another amnesty law. Even the lack of response to an unscheduled and non-permit "parade" by local police had to be engineered. Orders have to be given to police to not enforce the law. William Gheen, President of Americans for Legal Immigration PAC, has announced that he is filing a formal complaint and calling for an inquiry by city officials in Charlotte, NC to determine why there were **no visible police officers** or security at a protest attended by thousands of illegal aliens in downtown Charlotte on March 25.

I suspected something **strange at the Congressional level** back in December when, after years of foot dragging, Congress suddenly passed a tough immigration bill that would make it a felony for illegal immigrants to be in the US, and would impose new penalties on employers who hire them. Actually, penalties are already on the books but are never enforced by any administration since their enactment, Democrat or Republican. In addition, the bill finally called for a 700 mile fence along one-third of the border's total length. Why only a partial fence? Currently only 80

miles are fenced near Tijuana and other border towns in Texas, and they are totally ineffective.

While I was happy to see a fenced wall being proposed, a **third of a wall is simply an inconvenience—not a barrier**. That told me the proponents weren't really serious about stopping the hoards pouring across the border nightly, but up to something else. What really seemed strange was the ease with which it passed, with no arm twisting by the Bush administration to stop it. Had Bush finally seen the light on illegal immigration? Not a all. What the administration did was allow a bill to be passed that would allow Republicans to pacify their constituents, and then use the "horrors" of the new law to incite the illegal aliens to protest. In turn, the protests, along with hand-wringing commentaries from pundits warning about violence if we don't help the illegals, will be used to pressure Congress to justify passing Arlen Specter's new amnesty bill—masquerading as a jobs bill. Now, we're back where the president's team wants us, and the fence will probably get axed in the process. Slick!

Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-CO) is one of the few Congressmen who understands the seriousness of the 20 million illegals in this country. He squared off against Sen. Specter on *This Week*, saying of Specter's legislation, "It's not deportation, it is amnesty ... and what it does is send a horrible message." Specter tried to claim that turning all the illegals into legal would help our security problem: "We have a national security problem ... We need to know who they (illegals) are and where they are." As if any real terrorist would submit to registration and background checks! Tancredo responded by saying this is a bad policy and that any bill granting jobs and citizenship to illegals is a "a slap in the face to every single person who has done it the right way."

## NO ACCOUNTABILITY FOR MERCENARIES IN IRAQ

Jay Price, of the UK observer rightly observed, "About 6,000 non-Iraqi security contractors are operating in Iraq. During nine months in 2004-05, contractors reported firing into 61 civilian vehicles; **no one was ever prosecuted**. In just seven cases were Iraqis clearly attacking – showing guns, shooting at contractors or detonating explosives. Security analysts say it is likely that such incidents are vastly under reported. Security contractors supporting the U.S. effort in Iraq regularly shoot into civilian cars with little accountability, according to a News & Observer analysis of more than 400 reports contractors filed with the government. There was no way to tell how many civilians were hurt, or how many were innocent: In most cases, the contractors drove away. No contractors have been prosecuted for a mistaken shooting in Iraq." That's because there is an unwritten promise of immunity with the insider corporations that get these contracts.

## NEW BUSH-BLAIR MEMO SINKS PRESIDENT'S CREDIBILITY

The New York Times got another convenient leak from the Brits this week detailing what went on behind closed doors between Pres. Bush and PM Tony Blair during their war planning session on Jan.

31, 2003. Reporter Greg Mitchell summarizes the contents: “The memo, written by Blair’s top foreign policy adviser David Manning, declares that the two leaders believed that ‘diplomatic strategy had to be arranged around the military planning.’ Among other things, the two leaders predicted a quick war and ‘manageable’ aftermath. Bush predicted that it was ‘unlikely there would be internecine warfare between the different religious and ethnic groups’ and Blair agreed. ‘The memo also shows that the president and the prime minister acknowledged that no unconventional weapons had been found inside Iraq.’”

The Times coverage then lands a bombshell: “Faced with the possibility of not finding any before the planned invasion, Bush talked about several ways to **provoke a confrontation**, including a proposal to paint a United States surveillance plane in the colors of the United Nations in hopes of drawing fire, or assassinating Mr. Hussein.” That’s what we call a conspiracy to get the US and Britain into war. The memo shows the men also admitting that finding WMDs was not necessary to justify the war.

White House press secretary Scott McClellan claimed this memo was “fully consistent” with what President Bush was saying before the war began. Here are the contradictions between Bush’s public statements and the memo, you decide:

On March 6, 2003 Bush said publicly, “I’ve not made up our mind about military action. Hopefully, this can be done peacefully.” The Manning memo has Bush telling Blair, “The start date for the military campaign was now penciled in for 10 March ... This was when the bombing would begin.”

On March 8, Bush told the public, “We are doing everything we can to avoid war in Iraq.” But, in the memo, Manning noted Bush suggesting a provocation: “The U.S. was thinking of flying U2 reconnaissance aircraft with fighter cover over Iraq, painted in U.N. colors ... If Saddam fired on them, he would be in breach.”

On March 17 Bush said, “Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war, and every measure will be taken to win it.” To Blair the memo recorded, “But [Bush] had to say that if we ultimately failed [to get a second U.N. resolution], military action would follow anyway.” This is just another confirmation of what we already know: The Bush team had decided even before 9/11 to attack Iraq and was simply filling in the provocations and justifications to make it happen.

### **BUSH LETS CHIEF OF STAFF RESIGN TO PLACATE CRITICS**

In order to avoid firing Karl Rove or Steven Hadley, as critics are demanding, Bush has sacrificed his long time Chief of Staff Andrew Card, who resigned this week. As the Philadelphia Inquirer said, “It’s questionable whether restive congressional Republicans will be satisfied by this move to the point where they will be eager to identify themselves as Bush loyalists as they run this year for reelection. They have long felt that this White House is too secretive – yet here is Bolten [*Josh Bolton, the newly appointed Chief of Staff – ed*], as described in a Business Week profile: ‘[H]is penchant for secrecy befits the son of a career CIA

officer.’”

The Wall Street Journal opined, “By itself, the switch to Mr. Bolten represents at most a mild change in a White House staff that remains unusually stable, and it isn’t likely to satisfy those who were seeking a broader shake-up.” But blogger Craig Crawford hit the nail on the head by saying that Card’s departure doesn’t help Bush because “he wasn’t the problem. Hardly the most powerful chief of staff in presidential history, Card was a glorified scheduler who took a back seat to Vice President Dick Cheney and his own supposed deputy, Karl Rove.” Right on target!

### **EDMUNDS AND LIBBY TRIAL JUDGE HIDES FINANCIAL INFO**

Buzzflash News reports this week, “Sibel Edmonds, former FBI Language Specialist and a whistleblower, filed a motion in D.C. Federal Court asking for recusal of Judge Reggie Walton from her pending case filed under the Federal Tort Claim Act. Walton is also currently hearing the perjury case involving I. Lewis ‘Scooter’ Libby, the former chief of staff to Vice President Dick Cheney, who is suspected of leaking the name of former CIA undercover operative Valerie Plame Wilson to the media.

“Edmonds’ motion for recusal is based on Judge Walton’s pursuit of secrecy in his required yearly financial disclosure by **redacting his entire disclosure statement**, his deference to secrecy in his rulings on Edmonds’ previous claims where he was the presiding judge, and the unusual operations of the case assignment system concerning Edmonds’ cases. The redaction of Judge Reggie Walton’s entire Financial Disclosure Statement appears to be in violation of the Ethics in Government Act. The Financial Disclosure Statement filed by Judge Reggie Walton in 2003 redacts all information except for the date of the filing and Walton’s name. This is highly unusual.” It is also illegal, but you can bet the judge won’t be called on it—he’s got a role to play in taking down Edmonds, and perhaps Scooter Libby (a show trial).

### **BUSH FLAUNTS LAW AGAIN IN SIGNING STATEMENT**

Charlie Savage of the Boston Globe is the main instigator of the rising concern over the President’s use of signing statements to flout any new law passed limiting his powers. Here are excerpts from his latest:

“When President Bush signed the reauthorization of the USA Patriot Act this month, he included an addendum saying that he did not feel obliged to obey requirements that he inform Congress about how the FBI was using the act’s expanded police powers. The bill contained several oversight provisions intended to make sure the FBI did not abuse the special terrorism-related powers to search homes and secretly seize papers.”

This was the supposed compromise provision that got concerned Republicans on board – and able to tell their constituents they had protected civil rights. Now the president effectively says, “I’m renegeing.” As Savage tells it, “But after the reporters and guests had left, the White House quietly issued a ‘signing statement,’ an official document in which a president lays out his interpretation of a new law. In the statement, Bush said that he **did not consider himself bound to tell Congress** how the Patriot Act powers were

being used and that, despite the law's requirements, he could withhold the information ... in a manner consistent with the president's constitutional authority to supervise the **unitary executive branch** [*code for "do-as-I-please" powers – ed*] and to withhold information." This is simply blatant abuse of power and Congress says nothing.

**Other examples:** "The statement represented the latest in a string of high-profile instances in which Bush has cited his constitutional authority to bypass a law. After The New York Times disclosed in December that Bush had authorized the military to conduct electronic surveillance of Americans' international phone calls and e-mails without obtaining warrants, as required by law, Bush said his wartime powers gave him the right to ignore the warrant law. And when Congress passed a law forbidding the torture of any detainee in US custody, Bush signed the bill but issued a signing statement declaring that he could bypass the law if he believed using harsh interrogation techniques was necessary to protect national security."

### **CHENEY CLAIMS POWER TO DECLASSIFY SECRET DOCUMENTS**

James Bovard reports, "Near the end of the softball interview on the Worthington shooting, Brit Hume asked Cheney: 'Is it your view that a vice president has the authority to declassify information?' VP Cheney replied: 'There is an executive order to that effect.' Why is Cheney claiming this? It's part of the legal strategy to save his former Chief of Staff Lewis Libby from prosecution for leaking the CIA status of Valerie Plame (even though the actual charge against Libby is about perjury). Libby is now claiming that he was 'authorized by his superiors' to leak the NIH documents to the press. His superior was Cheney."

The Executive Order Cheney refers to is number 13292, issued by President Bush just after the invasion of Iraq. It amends a Clinton executive order to expand the Vice President's prerogative to classify information. Cheney has a lot of secrets he holds and wanted the power to classify them without consulting others. But nothing in that order gives the VP powers to declassify secrets on his own authority. There is a set procedure for declassification, and it rightly forces any declassification attempt to seek the permission of the one who classified it or his successor. Cheney is distorting the truth, and seems to be getting away with it. We'll see if prosecutor Fitzgerald buys it.

### **SHOCK AND AWE PLANNED FOR IRAN**

I ran across a savvy commentary by Siddharth Varadarajan writing for The Hindu newspaper. After a long discussion about the US plans to go through the motions of international pressures and sanctions against Iran, he predicted that they would employ a Kosovo style attack: "If Iran were ever to commit this folly, the U.S. regime change plan will move swiftly into high gear. As and when force is used, it would likely be a Yugoslav-style prolonged air war aimed at targeting civilian and industrial infrastructure rather than an Iraq-style invasion."

I think he's right on the money. The US doesn't have the manpower for another idiotic invasion and occupation, but they can bomb the hell out of anyone they want—which serves their long

range purposes of antagonizing the world even better. As in Iraq, the decision has already been made, it's just a matter of going through the motions.

### **DEATH FOR MOUSSAOUI? WHAT ABOUT KHALID SHEIKH MOHAMMED?**

Here's the hypocrisy about the Moussaoui death penalty trial. If for real, he's a small-time player compared to the perpetrators of 9/11 tragedy. The US has in their possession the supposed "mastermind of 9/11," Mohammed, which they have never shown in public or attempted to bring to trial. Surely, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is worthy of a death sentence, but he isn't even prosecuted. Why? My analysis is that Mohammed, formerly of the Pakistani ISI is a CIA operative who ran the operation on behalf of the US, and is been held in protective custody (probably in a villa) in order to act as a continual source of leaks justifying the US position. Moussaoui is an Oswald-type patsy, involved in the operation, but outed when the FBI was called about his failed attempts to get jumbo jet simulator time. His testimony during interrogation are not selective leaks, but full blown disinformation. The recently released documents sound like they were written by US intelligence, not a the high strung, confused Moussaoui.

Moussaoui exhibits all the signs of someone drugged or under a bit of mind control – his irrational behavior in court, and his outbursts of confessions are very much unlike well trained terrorists of the real variety. Aicha el-Wafi, Moussaoui's mother, according to Yahoo News, believes her son "must have been drugged" when she saw him in court, "That is not Zachary," she declared. She should know.

### **AFGHANISTAN: RICE PRESSURES KARZAI TO DROP PROSECUTION AGAINST CHRISTIAN**

Sadly, this had nothing to do with protecting Christians from Muslim persecution. Under Sharia law it is a capital offense to renounce Islam in favor of Christianity. As Congressman Ron Paul said this week, "Our bombs and guns haven't changed the fact that the new puppet Afghan government still follows Sharia law. The same loyalty to Sharia exists in Iraq, where we're trying so hard to stabilize things. And all this is done in the name of spreading democracy."

In order to save face (and US support of the Karzai regime), the Afghan judge dismissed the case against Abdur Rahman who was being threatened with death for having converted from Islam to Christianity. According to the court, the apostasy charges were being dropped for "lack of evidence." Lack of evidence? How could that be? Rahman admitted openly that he was a Christian. When that fraud became obvious the government spokesman changed to the story that Rahman held foreign citizenship and was therefore outside the jurisdiction of the Afghan courts. That also doesn't wash. Try that excuse on the Afghan court if you get caught violating a local law.

This is all about saving the continued Afghanistan intervention from embarrassment, not to mention a sure-fire decline in public support for this phony "democratic" adventure. It had nothing to do with principle. Rahman is quickly being whisked out of country so the case will not arise again. Nothing is being said about the other estimated 10,000 Christians hiding out in the country. But, you can

bet Karzai will make sure none are publically prosecuted again.

## BIG INFLATION COMING

Freemarketnews.com reported this week that, “the federal reserve ordered two trillion dollars to be printed! ... Three separate sources in the U.S. Treasury have told me that this week, the federal reserve ordered TWO TRILLION dollars to be printed! The US Treasury is allegedly running printing presses 24/7 to accommodate that order. Treasury employees were specifically ordered not to talk about this to anyone because it could cause economic collapse.” That’s a bit inflammatory. Press officials are never supposed to tell how much money is being printed. Even another \$2 trillion isn’t going to cause a collapse, though it would and will eventually impact the value of the dollar. I’ve always said that the US has not yet used up all its power to inflate. I guess the PTB are starting in earnest. It is important to note that in response to growing dollar weakness, silver is at a ten year high and gold is nearing a 25 year high.

**Robert HcHugh** lets us in on what M3 was doing recently – and it was very inflationary. “M-3 has been launched into outer space, up another \$56.3 billion last week, up \$92.4 billion over the past two. This is some real horsepower. Over six weeks, the meaningless figure, ahem, is up \$177.8 billion. These annualized growth rates are 28.7 percent, 23.6 percent, and 15.3 percent respectively. Those are the seasonally adjusted figures. The raw, non-seasonally adjusted, figure is up \$293.3 billion over the past 12 weeks, on a pace to add 1.2 trillion in money to the economy ... That’s right folks – soon to be discontinued money supply data ALREADY showing annualized growth rates in excess of 28% – and the Fed would have us all believe that this is a non-event.”

The staff at Free Market News tried to imply a direct relationship between the decision to not report M3 money supply figures and this new print move. “The M3 was the amount of cash the government printed to put into circulation, propping-up the U.S. economy.” This is not true, specifically. M1 is the sum of currency that is held outside banks, travelers checks, checking accounts (but not demand deposits), minus the amount of money in the Federal Reserve float. M2 is sum of M1 plus savings deposits (this would include money market accounts from which no checks can be written), small denomination time deposits (less than \$100,000), and retirement accounts. M3 (discontinued) is M1 plus M2 plus the large time deposits (more than \$100,000), Eurodollar deposits, dollars held at foreign offices of U.S. banks, and institutional money market funds. Cash eventually shows up in all of these, but the significance of removing M3 has more to do with hiding the numbers of dollars outside the US where most inflation goes so as to deny currency traders a key piece of the data which helps evaluate the dollar versus other currencies. They have alternates, of course, but losing M3 was important. Congressman Ron Paul (R-TX) has introduced legislation to require the Fed to **resume reporting the M3 statistic**. Urge your Congressmen to support The Sunshine in Monetary Policy Act.

## ARGENTINE CORRUPTION–HOW IT WORKS

Investigative reporter Tony Pagliaro of Vcris.com has gone public with a blockbuster revelation that explains how Argentine president Nestor Kirchner garnered multiple millions from a public service salary barely reaching six figures. All Latin American

politicians become wealthy through corruption, and kickback is one of the prime ways to do it. Here is a major excerpt:

“Prior to suddenly becoming President of Argentina – with only 22% of total votes cast – Néstor Kirchner was the obscure Governor of the Province of Santa Cruz, deep in Patagonia. Santa Cruz is a large state with a small population of slightly over 200,000 people. It easily became Kirchner’s personal feud[al estate]. The recipe used is a simple and straight forward one ... For years it has been said that no public work contract was ever awarded in the jurisdiction of Santa Cruz had the respective contractor not previously agreed to pay a ‘kick-back’ to the local political elite, i.e. to the Kirchners themselves or to their local straw-men and cronies.

“When Néstor Kirchner unexpectedly became Argentina’s president in 2003 and the Kirchners therefore moved to Buenos Aires, Mr. Sergio Acevedo became Governor of Santa Cruz. Notwithstanding, Mr. Carlos Kirchner (brother of the President) was ‘suggested’ from the top as his Minister of Public Works and, certainly, was appointed as such. Thus the public works contracts area remained very close to the Kirchners eyes (and pockets and purses).

“In mid 2004, Acevedo (concerned with the situation) tried to replace Kirchner’s brother, forcing him out of his provincial cabinet, but immediately a strong and unequivocal warning came down from Buenos Aires, and Acevedo decided that Carlos Kirchner’s resignation was, then, not his priority. Out of the blue, however, Sergio Acevedo has just resigned. He is not any longer the Governor of Santa Cruz. What happened? According to the weekly ‘Noticias.’ Acevedo refused to pay back 30 million US dollars to the Kirchners. Said monies had been generated by recent public works awards. He clearly decided he did not want to be part of a growing ‘tsunami’ of corrupt deals that now surround the Kirchners, which, according to Elisa Carrió (the leader of the opposition party known as ARI), are run by Kirchner’s federal Minister of Planning and Public Works, Mr. Julio De Vido, a professional architect .

“Santa Cruz, with only 200,000 inhabitants, has a budget of 1.480 million dollars; federal funds [controlled by Kirchner’s Minister – ed] to finance public works for an additional amount of 600 million dollars; and savings of about 500 million dollars, invested between Switzerland and Santa Cruz. These last funds were recently investigated by a federal court for alleged corruption (commissions paid) in its placement abroad. The then acting federal judge declared that he had no jurisdiction over the issue and sent the case to be dealt with by the Santa Cruz judiciary. A judge in Santa Cruz has now closed the investigation. He is none other than Néstor Kirchner’s nephew and – curiously – he did not find any reason whatsoever to recuse himself from handling this hot case.

“The new Governor of Santa Cruz is, by the way, Carlos Sancho. As expected, he has close and obvious connections with President Néstor Kirchner. Sancho is the owner of the real estate firm where Máximo Kirchner, the only male son of Argentina’s President, works. A family feud[al estate], of course.

“As it has always been the case since populist Juan Domingo Perón created the political movement known as Peronism, its political structures are constantly flooded by all sorts of corruption

accusations. And unfortunately events seem to confirm that the corruption issue has become a gigantic challenge for Argentina. Even more, a political bomb that has already begun to tick.” [end Pagliaro quote]

### **NEW WAY TO DISARM OUR NUCLEAR MISSILES**

The Bush administration has hit upon a novel way to further disarm our nuclear arsenal of ballistic missiles without further concessions from the Russian (who never follow through with their part of the agreement anyway).

As the pro-Bush Washington Times reports, “The United States could use a force of intercontinental ballistic missiles with conventional warheads because nuclear weapons may not deter terrorists and rogue states, the general in charge of the U.S. Strategic Command says. Marine Corps Gen. James E. Cartwright told a Pentagon-sponsored missile defense conference on Monday that ‘An ICBM, however, can cover 6,000 miles in minutes and the technology for adding precision guided, **non-nuclear warheads is available now**, Gen. Cartwright said. And the warhead does not need to be high-explosive. Just the kinetic impact of a long-range inert warhead can cause tremendous damage because of the high speed. The warheads are accurate enough to land within 12 feet of the target. The conventional ICBMs are needed for the Pentagon’s new ‘global strike’ mission to attack terrorists, or those working on weapons of mass destruction, in addition to any nation states that the United State may confront in the 21st century, like China. ‘Do we want a capability that is non-nuclear? That’s the heart of the debate,’ Gen. Cartwright said.”

I wish there would be a debate about it, but I fear this will be approved by the Bush rubber-stamp Congress. Not only is this an **incredibly expensive** way to put a small conventional warhead on a target, but it is also non-reusable. We only have 500 Minuteman ICBM missiles left, and several hundred SLBMs. They could use up our entire arsenal of ballistic missiles just to deliver a few hundred convention explosions. We threw that many at Baghdad in a couple of days. I think they are cooking up more unilateral disarmament.

### **FBI INTIMIDATION OF FREE SPEECH**

FBI agents have intimidated people before – privately – to keep witnesses from testifying about what they saw. Examples of active federal cover-ups are many: TWA 800, JFK assassination, OKC bombing, 9/11, to name just a few. Now, a more public case is being aired:

In a joint statement by Common Cause President Chellie Pingree and League of Women Voters President Kay Maxwell, they charged that an FBI agent in Michigan contacted Pingree and tried to intimidate her into silence about her criticism of the president. He was acting in an official capacity, she said.

Pingree said, “Our country faces many serious threats to our security, but surely none of those threats come from Common Cause or the League of Women Voters ... It is troubling to think that the FBI would scrutinize my remarks about the Patriot Act at a public meeting organized by the League of Women Voters. Surely the FBI’s resources could be put to better use.” Not only

that, but it is illegal for federal agents to limit free speech, except in very limited cases of death threats against the president.

On March 14, Pingree participated on a panel on open government sponsored by the League of Women Voters where she made remarks critical of the PATRIOT ACT, raising privacy and secrecy issues act, and praising Senators John Cornyn (R-TX) and Patrick Leahy (D-VT) for their leadership on attempts to reform the act. A week later, Pingree said an FBI agent contacted the local League president, Susan Gilbert, to raise questions about Pingree’s published remarks at the panel.

According to agent Al Dibruto, Pingree’s comments on the USA PATRIOT Act were “way off base,” and that the League should have invited someone from the federal government to be on the panel to respond. Frankly, that’s all a matter of opinion, and not in any way of concern to the FBI. But, it’s a sign of things to come.

[END]