



WEEKLY PRINT EDITION

February 8, 2008

**REBELLION BREWING IN DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN RANKS**

The untold story emerging from the Super Tuesday primaries is not that McCain has the Republican nomination almost wrapped up, or that the Democrats are evenly split in their support for Obama and Clinton. The real story is that the manipulation of the election process has become so obvious to the thinking portion of each party that a latent rebellion is brewing. More and more people are cynical and angry over media bias, carefully timed big name endorsements that sway ignorant voters, and back room party deals (yet to come) that are specifically aimed at thwarting the ever-growing dissatisfaction of voters with the hollow promises of change. Those that spend a considerable amount of time pondering the issues and candidate positions (both real and feigned) are in the minority of each party. But, they are at least twice as active as passive and manipulated voters--and they don't like what they see ahead. Is this growing rebellion enough to stop the establishment process of limiting our choice to Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dum? Probably not, at least not yet, but dissatisfaction levels are growing so much that if the establishment forces John McCain and Hillary Clinton upon the nation, an independent challenge is probable. This week I'll talk about the options.

First, the big news in the aftermath of Super Tuesday is that runner-up Mitt Romney has decided to bail out of the race. Smart move, but very disappointing to his conservative following. He would have had to throw millions more at a campaign that could have only netted him, at best, an impassioned speech at the Republican Convention. By only suspending his campaign, he stops the bloodletting and still retains his 268 delegates to use at the convention and may still merit a spot for a major address. McCain has 703 delegates and Huckabee has 169.

Romney realized that the GOP establishment and media were out to get him (without knowing the real reason) and using Mike Huckabee to split his support base. He also knew from polls that a large portion of Huckabee's conservative Christian supporters harbored such virulent anti-Mormon feelings that they would have voted for McCain rather than Romney had their choice been restricted to the two. That's a scary commentary on how religious bias can arise to the point of rejecting a moral conservative who shares the same basic values, but not their specific brand of Christianity, in favor of a serial adulterer, chronic liar, and globalist insider--John McCain.

In any case, Romney was headed down the wrong path trying to out-Bush the warmongering John McCain. It's better for his legacy and his Church's reputation that he step down and not be the one who takes the world down the path to more war and an eventual New World Order--which Romney would have done had he continued to follow his globalist and mainstream advisors.

Like Woodrow Wilson, he would have eventually been forced to admit, **"I have unwittingly destroyed my**

**country... We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated governments in the civilized world--no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men."** Romney still has ambitions for another run at the presidency, but hopefully, before he goes down that path again, someone who knows the scope of the globalist agenda can straighten him out.

Before I continue my analysis of what the Republican hierarchy will do with Romney out of the picture, let me review the widespread dissatisfaction within both parties over the outcome of the primaries thus far. I'll begin by commenting on the political assessment of **Justin Raimondo** in his piece, "The Winter of Our Discontent," some of which coincides with what I have written in recent briefs [*My comments in brackets*].

"This is one election season in which the conventional wisdom is no sooner formulated than it is refuted by events: Hillary was 'inevitable' -- now she's content to hold her ground. Rudolph Giuliani was the 'frontrunner' in the national polls -- today he's a laughingstock, who earned the distinction of paying the most cash ever for a single delegate. As I put it at the tail end of last year, the theme of election season '08 is the collapse of the alleged frontrunners [*It is this disparity between the falsified standing in the polls of the "front runners" and their actual low levels of support that has led millions to suspect deliberate media manipulation--not to mention the obvious and systematic denial of media coverage for Ron Paul*]. "On the Democratic side, the big story is Barack Obama's strong challenge to the Clinton machine: coming on strong as the antiwar candidate, with ads that clearly pledged to get us out [*which he won't do*], Obama's momentum wasn't enough to overcome the determined rear guard action and racially divisive defense of the Clintonites, who pulled out all the stops and managed to hold on for dear life.

"On the Republican side, the fragmentation of the GOP continued apace, with the party apparently split along regional as well as ideological lines: McCain, while proclaiming himself the 'frontrunner,' won on both coasts [*but only in liberal states that will go Democratic in the actual election--so these wins by McCain will not translate into a Republican victory in November--as all the professionals know*], Romney took the Midwest, and the Huckster conned the South into giving him the nod [*because of the predominance of evangelical Christians who can't see past the Huckster's claim to "be one of them"*]. One has to note the weakness of Romney, who did well in caucus states [*Same for Ron Paul. In caucus states, only those active and knowledgeable about the political process participate, so it is NOT representative of an election where ignorant voters express their somewhat managed desires*], and in those regions where he had a personal connection (Massachusetts and Utah).

"This represents the fragility of the old GOP [*Grand Old Party -Republican*] establishment, which is backing Romney: like their candidate, they are out of ideas, and out of steam [This is where Raimundo shows his Left-leaning ignorance. The real GOP establishment is NOT backing Romney, but McCain. In reality, the GOP establishment has two very different components--one is the conservative side which thinks they are in charge (but aren't), and the other, a bunch of neocon globalists who do run the show. The naive side is the old Goldwater conservative establishment which is aged and dying out. They are economic conservatives anxious to protect their wealth, who congregate annually around the Council for National Policy's annual convention, but who are so anxious to maintain political power that they have endorsed the low road of compromise ever since the Reagan administration. They mostly come from mainstream Christian churches or evangelical denominations with big television-based ministries.]

*[These are the ones, thanks to one of their old line leaders Richard Viguerie, that are starting to realize they have been duped. Yes, many of these people back Romney because he is an outsider and does give the illusory promise of change. But these mainstream conservatives have always been suckers for the illusion of change--because they are so driven by picking someone who "can get elected." They have always looked down on Ron Paul for being too ideological and unwilling to compromise. These are those that have long been deceived by the new breed of GOP establishment leaders who actually run the show, and they are starting to realize that. Republican cheerleaders like Rush Limbaugh and Ann Coulter have for years believed they were accepted by the in crowd, but having come out for Mitt Romney, they suddenly found themselves on the outside. Now that Mitt is bowing out, I wonder where their support will go? Few of these types, I believe, will ever have the courage to actually fight against those in power and support a man of principle like Ron Paul. The globalist "wolves in sheep's clothing" like Dick Cheney and his CFR cohorts that surround the presidency are the ones truly in power--they are neocons, globalists, and co-conspirators with insider bankers and international corporations that are working for a much larger control system (the NWO). Fortunately their controlling hand is now showing more than ever].*

"The big story for the GOP is the persistence of Huckabee, whose surprising strength has knocked Romney flat on his back and pretty much out of the race [*It is not surprising at all, given the boost he got from the PTB. Huckabee, like McCain had nearly zero support until the media started to say he was on a surge, and hyped his Baptist ministerial credentials. This set off a wave of predictable religious fervor and support among those that held marked anti-Mormon beliefs. This was a planned strategy specifically aimed at denying Romney the nomination. No mainstream Republican like Huckabee without money or organization puts his hat into the ring without someone from the real GOP establishment putting the bug in his ear and promising support. Huckabee jumped into the race about 3 weeks after Romney announced his exploratory committee. The "Huck" was so overweight he looked like Howard Taft, and had to lose a hundred pounds before he dared make a public showing*]. What's significant,

however, is that McCain has so far failed to close the deal, and the party convention is shaping up to be little short of chaos [*Raimundo speaks too soon. Whether Huckabee bows out now and gives McCain a free ride or whether he stays in the race into the convention depends on how the PTB intend to use Huckabee. Huckabee is in their pocket and can deliver his delegates to McCain before or during the convention--just as Giuliani did. But, Huckabee may still be needed to keep the anti-McCain vote from going to Ron Paul. This is not chaos, but simply the best the manipulators can muster for now*].

"The same fate awaits the Democrats: it looks like the pledged delegates -- that is, delegates won fair and square in a primary -- are going in their majority [*only a slight lead at present. Clinton led with 739 to Obama's 700*] to Obama, while the 'super-delegates' -- party bigwigs appointed by the Powers-That-Be -- could give the nomination to Hillary [*While the Democrats appear to have a more democratic primary system, apportioning the number of delegates according the percentage won in each primary, the party hierarchy controls a whopping 400 extra delegate votes which is not bound by voter preferences in the primaries. These represent almost 40% of the total and have the power to determine the winner. Obama claims to have about a third of those committed to him, but there are no guarantees*]. This could set up a situation where the party Establishment defies the apparent will of the voters and crowns Hillary in a super-delegate 'coup.' One can almost feel the resentment, disappointment, and building anger that will rise up and smite the Democrats if and when this occurs [*This is the potential rebellion that is brewing if the PTB choose Hillary*]. The whole process then becomes a metaphor for the cause of widespread voter alienation -- the rise of a permanently-entrenched political class in America, similar to that which once wielded power in the former Soviet Union."

"Obama's amazing rise is due almost entirely to his position on the war: he wants out by the end of '08, and so do most Americans no matter which party they belong to... During his speech last night, it was Obama's lines about ending the war and bringing the troops home that brought the loudest sustained cheer: the crowd went wild. No, they weren't applauding the prospect of America's return to the wisdom of the Founders, who warned against foreign entanglements and dreaded the rise of a powerful military caste: Obama represents nothing quite as coherent as that..." Raimundo is, of course, referring to the Ron Paul position--the core principle of a non-interventionist foreign policy. Without that core principle, Obama will be forced to compromise due to the almost infinite ability of the black ops people in government to concoct a conflict or terror event that will produce a knee-jerk patriotic reaction forcing him to respond with force.

I think the Obama movement is representative of the dissatisfied half of the Democratic party who, despite their non-thinking penchant for socialist mandates, correctly want us out of this trumped up war. Those supporting Hillary range from the traditional union and welfare-dependent masses (including most Latinos) to the foolish women who are set on having "one of their own" in the White House. If the establishment persists on pushing Hillary toward the Democratic nomination, they are going

to face a real rebellion in the other half of the party. Probably only half of those anti-war Democrats will go back to Hillary as the "lesser of two evils,"

I expect fully a large number to rally around an independent candidacy--if one should be allowed to emerge. If it's Ron Paul, media coverage will be denied to keep his polling numbers low. As in times past, we may see the PTB run their own "independent" candidate to tip the balance one way or another. The PTB used Ross Perot to siphon off votes for George H. W. Bush in the 1992 election in order to get Clinton elected. In 2000 they used Ralph Nader to pull off nearly 4% of the vote that would have gone toward John Kerry.

If we pit Republican John (100 year war) McCain against Democrat Hillary (soft on the war) Clinton, there are going to be millions from the Ron Paul Right and the anti-war Democratic Left who will be looking for an alternative to vote for. That's a perfect opening for Ron Paul to mount an independent candidacy. He already has attracted a significant following from those on both the principled Left (sincere liberals who simply don't realize the hidden consequences of the government social programs they support) and the principled, constitutional Right, plus many independents.

Prediction: If Ron Paul agrees to continue the fight as an independent or Constitution Party candidate, he will draw votes away from the establishment Republican. While most conservatives will hold their nose and vote for McCain as the lesser of two evils (compared to Hillary) many of Paul's supporters have sworn never to throw their vote away on the "lesser evil" again--knowing that it makes things even worse. George Bush did much more damage than a Democrat could have done specifically because he convinced conservatives to go along. The PTB have a wealthy independent candidate Michael Bloomberg waiting in the wings, if necessary, to draw down more Democratic votes than Paul takes from the Republican.

Ron has told several people that he is very reluctant to run an independent campaign. In previous attempts it took a big toll on Ron's health due to the difficulty and expense of mounting a ballot access campaign in every state. However, never before has he had the millions of self-motivated followers that he has now. All he has to do is explain the petition process and it would get done--just like his magic fundraising days. The advantage of Ron Paul running on the Constitution ticket is that this party already is close to having ballot access in all 50 states. But, the downside is that Ron Paul is simultaneously running for Congress as a Republican and switching parties or dumping the GOP might jeopardize that election.

**A VIEW FROM THE PTB:** Let's look at the options from the view of the Powers That Be (PTB) based upon my general theory that these are globalists attempting to maneuver us into a New World Order through the vehicle of conflict--more wars of intervention and an eventual nuclear World War III.

First, they must ensure that they have an FDR type of war president that can steer American patriotism into supporting this next World War, to be done under the control of the UN. Technically, they don't have to have that person in office during the next 4 years because China

and Russia won't be ready to attack until at least the middle of the next decade. While FDR was a Democrat, he ran on Republican style principles in order to get elected. Hillary can't do that. That's why I believe they will try to get another Republican elected. Only a Republican can fully convince conservative Republicans to go along with the NWO and loss of national sovereignty.

It won't be an easy feat to convince Americans that our government wasn't at fault in this war. There will be even more evidence that we provoked this war. Like 9/11 many will suspect that our government was either complicit in covering for Russian and Chinese war preparations or guilty of gross malfeasance in not warning about it.

Second, as I have hypothesized before, in order to get a Republican war president elected (after the disastrous reign of George Bush), they need to put up a Democrat so disliked that he or she will drive many independents back to the Republicans. Hillary is capable of engendering those kinds of negative feelings. Obama is not, and that's why I think the establishment has always favored Hillary for the nomination but not to actually win.

Let's look at both sides of the Democratic coin. If Obama wins the Democratic nomination, there will be a significant amount of crossover from independents to the Democratic side in the general election because he promises to get us out of Iraq. There are even some Republicans that dislike McCain so much they would defect to Obama or not vote at all. Only a few have threatened to defect to Hillary. If Obama runs, there also won't be any anti-war backlash in the Democratic ranks.

They will control Obama if he wins the presidency, but it won't dramatically enhance the war agenda, unless they unleash another high profile terror attack. The PTB already have some strings attached to Obama having made him the recipient of various wealth enhancing deals--just like they did for the Bush and Clinton families. But with his fresh demeanor and youthful looks, Obama doesn't give the impression of an insider. He is electable as long as the unknown race factor doesn't play a larger role--an unknown at this point, even if people tell the pollsters it isn't a factor.

As for Hillary, no other Democratic candidate evokes so much bad feeling as she does. That's what the PTB are counting on to give a Republican a chance. However, that strategy is now decidedly compromised by the fall of Giuliani, who could have been sold to Americans as "America's Peace and Security Mayor." McCain on the other hand, has made so many warmongering statements that there will be almost no anti war independents crossing over to vote Republican. The establishment would have to run an independent liberal, anti-war campaign (via Bloomberg or Nader perhaps) in order to draw off votes from Hillary. Even though the establishment doesn't like dealing with Hillary (she thinks she really is in charge) if she did win the election, they could use it to generate a powerful Republican backlash four years later to elect the war president they want.

On the Republican side, McCain certainly could be the war president if he can be elected--which is no sure thing. Many old guard conservatives know how unstable McCain is. Jack Wheeler, the "Indiana Jones" of the old line conservatives has gone along with the neocon agenda now

for almost 20 years. But, he is seeing things a little differently now: "The number of fellow senators who think John McCain is psychologically unstable is large. Some will admit it publicly, like Thad Cochran who says, 'The thought of his being president sends a cold chill down my spine.' Others relate times when McCain screamed four-letter obscenities right in their faces in the Senate cloak room, like Dick Shelby, Rick Santorum or Jim Inhofe. 'The man is unhinged,' one senator told me. 'He is frighteningly unfit to be commander-in-chief.'" But, the public will never be allowed to hear these opinions-even from the Democrats.

With Romney bowing out, Huckabee and Ron Paul are still left to compete against McCain. The establishment doesn't want Ron Paul (and regularly makes no mention about him still being in the race) but it will be interesting to see where the conservative votes go in the remaining primaries now that Romney isn't competing--especially Texas, Ron Paul's home state. If Huckabee stays in the race it will be to keep those votes from going to Ron Paul. If Huckabee quits and endorses McCain, then Ron Paul gets a huge leg up in free media plus a speech at the convention. I don't think the PTB want that, so I think Huckabee will keep on.

McCain is shifting rapidly to the right (in rhetoric only) hoping to convince conservatives to back him. No one seems to be concerned that this is also "flip-flopping" -the derisive title they tagged Romney with, and if that still doesn't convince Republicans that McCain is now one of them, they might bring Huckabee on board as VP to sucker the Christians into voting for McCain.

Ron Paul has been hoping to garner enough delegates so that in a contested convention he might have some leverage. He has at least 42 and possibly more depending on the legal challenge his campaign is mounting in Louisiana where the state Republican leadership illegally allowed other candidates to qualify delegates after the deadline. According to the Paul official campaign site, "projections from last night's results at least 3 delegates were won in Alaska, 5 delegates were won in North Dakota, 9 delegates were won in Minnesota, and 4 delegates were won in Colorado." Ron also got 3 delegates in W. Virginia in a trade with Huckabee's forces.

However, with Romney pulling out, those votes could only be of use in a negotiation with Mike Huckabee against McCain. Since the Huckster is in league with the PTB to help get McCain elected, that is unlikely. It appears that McCain will easily win a majority of delegates before the convention, so there will be no brokered deals, and the Ron Paul strategy of having influence at the convention will not work. I wouldn't be surprised if the GOP denied him even the right to speak at the convention--due to his small base of support.

**Judging the Political Landscape:** One thing the Ron Paul campaign has done, besides **grow the movement**, is to give constitutional conservatives a **more realistic view of our potential support** among normal people. For years I have heard conservatives of liberty talk endlessly about "we" being the majority. That hasn't been true for a hundred years. The polling I did in the mid-1980s with the Viguerie group showed no more than 5% support for a strict

constitutional approach even among conservatives. That would be less than 2% of the nation as a whole.

Just walk down the street of any major city and see how many people you see who look like they would be our kind of "conservative of liberty". Not many, and if you start trying to talk to those people, you'll get a lot of blank stares and shrugged shoulders in response. Sadly, I think the votes Ron Paul is receiving (between 4-6%) are all we can realistically expect from a media reliant populace with little motivation to do their political homework. Even without the media blackout, I don't think our support levels would rise much above 10%.

The PTB, in my opinion, seem to be doing all they can--the economic crisis notwithstanding--to make sure people stay relatively untouched by it all, right up until the next war when it will be too late to change things. Their key tactic to keep the people from rebelling is to use deficit spending in lieu of raising taxes to pay for these disastrous foreign and domestic policies. Don't let the public feel the pain and they won't resist. Even when the tragedy of nuclear war comes, no one will be able to stop the war once it starts. To decry government treason in time of war would bring upon oneself the title of traitor. No one will tolerate any "disloyalty" to our troops who go marching off to save the NWO in the name of "God, County and, yes, the Constitution"--which will be meaningless by then.

We must keep fighting to convert, prepare and bolster that 5% of people who will constitute a remnant and a resistance in that day, but we must not delay the physical preparations for hard times lest we have nothing to survive with when social unrest, starvation and panic come upon us.

Even if you disagree with my negative long-term assessment, don't bet against my words. It may be tempting to think that since it has taken such a long time to undermine our liberties, this slow pace of loss will continue at the same rate. It may do so for a few more years, but when this attack on America comes--and not by a tiny group of rogue terrorists--it will come in an instant, suddenly, and almost without warning. As Gary North would say, "Don't bet on making the last train out." Prepare well in advance.

## **MULTIPLE OCEAN CABLES CUT--NO ACCIDENT DESPITE DENIALS**

What is strange about this rash of severed undersea telephone and internet cables is that the companies in charge are still claiming these cuts are accidental even though surveillance cameras near the Egyptian cuts confirm that no ships were present during an hour before or after the cut. Cable companies are uniformly claiming some ship must have dragged an anchor across the bottom and snagged the cable. However, an anchor accident is highly improbable. These cables are marked on charts and ships are prohibited from anchoring in or around cable protected areas. If an anchor did snag a cable it would drag it far off its resting place before severing it. There would be massive signs of stretching and rubbing plus crushed insulation to confirm this. Even after starting the repairs (meaning they've had crews down in the water working), the owners claim to be sure there is no sabotage. How can

they be so sure without any forensic evidence. They are covering for something.

Second, there are simply too many severed cables being cut in rapid succession for it to be by accident--totally without precedent. Here's the list reported so far:

- 1) one off of Marseille, France (leads to Egypt, so may be the same cable cut in Egypt)
- 2) two off of Alexandria, Egypt
- 3) one off of Dubai, in the Persian Gulf
- 4) one off of Bandar Abbas, Iran in the Persian Gulf
- 5) one between Qatar and the UAE, in the Persian Gulf
- 6) one in the Suez, Egypt
- 7) one near Penang, Malaysia

All of the cable cuts target Middle Eastern Muslim nations. In my opinion, these cuts were done by submarine based saboteurs. While many conspiracy theories suggest the US as the bad guy--antagonizing and targeting the Iranians and Arabs, there is no way to tell for sure. Even China, desperate for more oil supplies, could have had a reason to attack the cables and then start a protection racket: "We've just proved your lines are vulnerable. Give us preference in oil supply and we'll see that this doesn't happen again." Typical shakedown.

But an even more probable conspiracy theory is that the US cut the cables, having previously put pressure on the cable operators to allow the US (during the repair process) to splice in a signal splitter so that all traffic could be monitored in real time. The severed cables supplies the rationale to explain the interruption in service. The US is known to have done this to the cables leading to Russia during the cold war, so why not now?

It is also interesting to note that recently all public information on the renovated submarine USS Jimmy Carter has disappeared from the public records and website of the US Navy. The Jimmy Carter (SSN-23) is a special operations submarine designated as a Multi-Mission Platform--meaning special black operations undersea like inserting Navy Seals reconnaissance teams into foreign countries, electronic eavesdropping and, yes, tapping into undersea transmission cables.

### **CONFIRMATION OF STEVEN BRADBURY-MUKASEY DEFIES CONGRESS**

Normally, this is a non-controversial appointment to the DOJ position of Office of Legal Counsel. But the acting head Steven Bradbury is no ordinary legal bureaucrat. He was the author of the DOJ memorandum authorizing torture of suspects, including waterboarding, under the euphemism of "enhanced interrogation." For some reason the Bush administration wants this particular unprincipled lawyer in this position--and they are willing to hold all other nominations before the Senate hostage unless the Democrats relent and confirm him. So far, the Dems are refusing and both sides are accusing the other of holding the other nominees hostage in this test of wills. Why is this tiny office so important? The OLC is the one that has the power to issue "advance pardons," as former OLC head Jack Goldsmith put it. Pardons are an integral part of the

immunity system provided co-conspirators in government illegal operations.

The story gets worse. The more the Senate probes AG Michael Mukasey on all issue pertaining to law and torture, this former judge continues to show how he can weasel out of anything. According to Mukasey, The law is what he says it is. Sounds like the arrogance of the Supreme Court--and yet Mukasey doesn't have that standing.

Paul Kiel describes the verbal jousting that went on in the hearing: "Rep. Bill Delahunt (D-MA) wanted some clarity during his questioning. Was the attorney general really saying that anyone who acted pursuant to a Justice Department legal opinion was 'insulated from criminal liability?' Mukasey wanted to say it more carefully. I think what I said was that we could not investigate or prosecute somebody for acting in reliance on a Justice Department opinion.' But even if that opinion was 'inaccurate,' Delahunt wondered, and that behavior really did violate the U.S. criminal code, you're saying that someone who relied on it would effectively have 'immunity from any culpability?' [You are witnessing an extension of the insider immunity principle that I have warned about for years--a telltale mark of how they run a conspiracy deep inside government.]

"Justified reliance,' Mukasey answered, 'could not be the subject of a prosecution.' Simple as that. 'Immunity connotes culpability,' he added, so it wasn't immunity, exactly, but the effect was the same. Delahunt (much like Sen. Joe Biden (D-DE) in the last hearing) proclaimed himself baffled. This was a 'new legal doctrine' for him. He'd thought 'the law is the law.' What if there was a mistake? he wanted to know. What happened then?

"That made no difference, Mukasey said. If a later legal opinion came to a different conclusion about whether something was lawful, the person who relied on the earlier, erroneous interpretation was still protected. Delahunt, still baffled, wanted to know if there was a 'legal precedent' for this view of the Office of Legal Counsel's power. Mukasey replied that it was a 'practical consideration.' [*Incredible waffling, sophistry*] When Delahunt asked again, Mukasey admitted, 'I can't sit here and cite a case.' Update: As I said earlier, it's worth recalling former OLC chief Jack Goldsmith's comments that the OLC has the power to dispense 'advance pardons.'" And THAT is why he has to have advance immunity. This is immunity from the grantors of immunity. Slick!

"Just to complete the theme of the day, Michael Mukasey said today that if Congress passed contempt citations against current and former White House officials based on their refusal to respond to subpoenas, the Justice Department would not enforce them, as federal law instructs." Incredible!

### **FBI GETS SECRET AUTHORIZATION FOR USING SPYWARE WITHOUT A WARRANT**

Kevin Poulsen wired.com reveals that "The FBI sought approval to use its CIPAV spyware program from the secretive Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court in terrorism or foreign spying cases." It was granted, though

that fact is kept secret as well. Foreign only? Sure--the same terror excuse used for all domestic spying. "Officials processing a Freedom of Information Act request from Wired.com have turned up some 5,000 pages of FBI documents about the CIPAV, according to an FBI FOIA official. They date back to at least 2005. Some 60 - 75 percent of them are internal e-mails. Others are technical documents and legal filings.

As first reported by Wired.com, the software, called a 'computer and internet protocol address verifier,' is designed to infiltrate a suspect's computer and collect various information, including the IP address, Ethernet MAC addresses, a list of open TCP and UDP ports, running programs, operating system type and serial number, default browser, the registered user of the operating system and the last visited URL, among other things. That information is sent covertly to an FBI computer in Quantico, Virginia. The CIPAV then monitors and reports on all the target's internet use, logging every IP address to which the machine connects."

Why does the FBI need this when the NSA is illegally eavesdropping on all emails? Because this is the natural follow up to computerized surveillance: hack into the person's computer with this spyware and track everything on it-without a warrant. And who is to know if the target is foreign or domestic? Do we really trust the FBI to abide by the law?

#### **ENERGY DEPARTMENT FUNDING IRANIAN NUCLEAR INSTITUTE**

With all the Bush administration's sanctions against Iran's nuclear program, and complaining about Russia's role in Iran's nuclear reactor, I find it rather hypocritical that the department of Energy is funding a Russian institute with direct ties to the Iranian nuclear program. As the NY times reports, "The Energy Department is subsidizing two Russian nuclear institutes that are building key parts of Iran's Bushehr reactor even though the United States has spent years trying to shut it down, according to a House committee."

Congressman Dingell, in a telephone interview, pointed out that the State Department has accused Iran of using the Bushehr reactor as a cover for obtaining nuclear technologies useful in a weapons program. 'We've got a bunch of Federal laws that impose sanctions on U.S. companies that develop Iran's oil,' he said, adding, 'Here we've got U.S. money providing assistance to help develop a reactor that we're busy denouncing.'" What bothers me is that with Russia's new oil wealth, American taxpayers have no business subsidizing anything in Russia any more.

#### **NATO: BRINGING SOVIET SPIES INTO THE HOUSE**

David Cronin IPS reports that "governments belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should be more wary about sharing sensitive information now that a Hungarian trained by the Soviet Union's secret service, the KGB, has become chairman of the alliance's committee on intelligence." Sadly, almost all high government officials from the former Soviet satellite nations have a background in Soviet era espionage. This is all part of the grand

deception of taking communism underground and claiming that everyone in office is now a "former communist."

#### **ANOTHER SECRET CAMP REVEALED AT GUANTANAMO**

Apparently the prison camp at Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba has other secret jail facilities not previously revealed by the Bush administration. Andrew Selsky of the AP reports that "Somewhere amid the cactus-studded hills on this sprawling Navy base, separate from the cells where hundreds of men suspected of links to al-Qaida and the Taliban have been locked up for years, is a place even more closely guarded ---- a jailhouse so protected that its very location is top secret.

"For the first time, the top commander of detention operations at Guantanamo has confirmed the existence of the mysterious Camp 7. In an interview with The Associated Press, Rear Adm. Mark Buzby also provided a few details about the maximum-security lockup. Guantanamo commanders said Camp 7 is for key alleged al-Qaida members, who must be kept apart from other prisoners to prevent them from retaliating against long-term detainees who have talked to interrogators. They also want the location kept secret for fear of terrorist attack." Once again, terrorism excuses all things.

#### **CONGRESS MOVES TO RESTORE EXCESSIVE POWERS TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS**

One of the key gripes from property rights defenders over the years has been the vast, unchecked powers of the Army Corps of Engineers which enforces in draconian ways radical environmental restrictions on any portion of a farmer's land that may be considered a waterway.

The American Land Rights Association reports that the Supreme court recently curtailed the Corps' power over wetlands by restricting the definition of 'navigable waters' in the Clean Water Act to truly navigable waters only. Democrats and liberal Republicans in Congress are striking back... by attempting to pass the Clean Water Restoration Act of 2007 (HR2421 and S1870) that would amend the 1972 Clean Water Act and replace the words 'navigable waters' with 'waters of the United States.' Further, it defines "waters of the United States" with such breathtaking scope that federal agencies would be required to regulate use of every square inch of the U.S., both public and private." So instead of accepting the court's constitutionally strict interpretation, they want it broadened. If the court were on our side, they would rule this new law unconstitutional and tell Congress if it wants to expand the Federal Government's power over water ways, they would have to amend the constitution--not simply pass a law.