|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Jihad Report  Dec 17, 2016 - Dec 23, 2016 | |
| Attacks | 42 |
| Killed | 245 |
| Injured | 310 |
| Suicide Blasts | 6 |
| Countries | 13 |

During this time period, there were **2468** Islamic attacks in **61** countries, in which **21192** people were killed and **26599** injured. This brings to total dead to well over 208 thousand people killed by Jihadists globally since 2001. More than this have been injured by Jihadists globally. May the next year bring an end to the murder and mayhem the Seed of Lucifer brings to Earth.

**2017: The War for America**

## 2016 was a great year for most of us – but just because we’ve gained the beachhead doesn’t mean we’re going to win the war.

With Brexit and Donald Trump, we’ve done the equivalent of capturing everywhere from Pointe Du Hoc to Pegasus Bridge. But just like with D-Day, the worst of the fighting is yet to come. Our enemy is fanatical, determined, well organised. Plus, they still hold most of the key positions: the big banks, the corporations, the top law firms, the civil service, local government, the universities, the schools, the mainstream media, Hollywood… Give those bastards half the chance and they’ll drive us back into the sea – which, in contemporary terms, means nixing Brexit (or giving us “soft Brexit”, which is basically the same thing) and frustrating all the things President Trump will try to do to Make America Great Again.

I use the war analogy first because World War II analogies never fail, but second because this really is a war that we’re fighting. The bad news is that wars are hard, costly and ugly. The good news is that we’re on the right side and we’re going to win. Here’s how:

**We will never underestimate the wickedness of the enemy**

The liberal-left loves to portray us as the bad guys. But that’s just projection. From Mao’s China to Stalin’s Soviet Union, from Cuba to North Korea, history is littered with the wreckage of failed left wing schemes to make the world a better, fairer place.

As the great, now sadly-retired [Thomas Sowell](http://townhall.com/tipsheet/christinerousselle/2016/12/27/12-fantastic-thomas-sowell-quotes-in-honor-of-his-retirement-n2263995) says, “Socialism in general has a record of failure so blatant that only an intellectual could ignore or evade it.” Its malign influence is still with us today. Innocent boys being accused of rape on college campuses; genuine rapes committed by gangs of Muslim taxi drivers in northern England and by gangs of Muslim immigrants in German cities like Cologne; hundreds of thousands driven into fuel poverty, landscapes ravaged, avian fauna sliced and diced as a result of crazy renewable energy policies; a Nobel-prize-winning scientist driven out of his job because a feminist loser misreported something he said about women at a conference; generations of kids denied a rigorous, disciplined, useful education; the needless violence and tension engendered by #blacklivesmatter: we should never concede the moral high ground to the kind of people who make all this sort of stuff possible, no matter how many times they tell us how evil and selfish and uncaring we are.

**We will always remember that we are better than them**

I’ll give you an example: the dumbass lecturer at Drexel who tweeted that what he wanted for Christmas was [“white genocide”](http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/12/26/the-far-left-ideas-that-motivate-white-genocide-professor/). Should we be demanding that the university authorities sack him at once? Of course we shouldn’t.

The man has performed an invaluable public service: he has provided the perfect example of how ingrained the values of the left are in academe; he has shown prospective applicants to the Politics and Global Studies course at Drexel University in Philadelphia that unless they want to be indoctrinated with hard-left lunacy they might want to reconsider; he has further shown alumni of Drexel University who believe in old fashioned stuff like free markets that maybe they shouldn’t include their alma mater in their million dollar bequests, after all.

Sure, we should jeer and crow when we catch idiots like this man expressing reprehensible opinions. But the idea that someone should actually lose their job for something they said on Twitter ought to be anathema to those of us on the right side of the argument. One of the most thoroughly hateful things about the left is the way it tries to constrain free expression. If we play the same game, we are no better than they are. And face it: we just are.

**We will take the fight to the enemy, not cower in No Man’s Land**

One of the best things about 2016 for me was the way it gave the lie to the weaselish and wet aphorism – so often repeated by so many of our impeccably reasonable, sensible and balanced TV and newspaper pundits  – that elections are “won in the centre ground.”

This was the Belial philosophy that gave us, in the U.S., that hideous continuum from the Bushes and the Clintons to Obama; and in Britain, the grotesque and malign Third Way squishery that took us from Tony Blair through to his (self-admitted heir) David Cameron and beyond. (It’s also the mindset which invented the disgraceful, sell-out concept of “soft Brexit”.)

No wonder so many of us had become so fed up with politics: no matter which party you voted for, whether the notionally left-wing one or the notionally right-wing one you still seemed to end up with the same old vested interests, the same old liberal Establishment elite.

Of course we should always despise the liberal-left because their philosophy is morally bankrupt, dangerous and wrong. But I sometimes think that the people we should despise most of all are the squishes who pretend to be on our side of the argument but forever betray our cause. Sometimes they do this by throwing the more outspoken among us to the wolves in order to [signal how tolerant and virtuous they are](https://twitter.com/JamesDelingpole/status/811282023075708928); sometimes they do this by endorsing some fatuous liberal position in order to show their willingness to compromise.

I call the latter approach the “dogshit yogurt fallacy.”

If conservatives like fruit or honey in their yogurt and liberals prefer to eat it with dogshit, it is NOT a sensible accommodation – much as our centrist conservative columnists might wish it so – to say: “All right. How about we eat our yogurt with a little bit of both?” We need to understand, very clearly, that there are such things as right and wrong; and that, furthermore, it is always worth fighting to the bitter end for the right thing rather than accepting second best because a bunch of lawyers and politicians and hairdressers from Brazil and squishy newspaper columnists and other members of the liberal elite have told us that second best is the best we can hope for.

On Brexit, for example, I’m with [Her Majesty the Queen](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4069540/Well-said-Ma-BBC-s-Political-Editor-reveals-Queen-supports-Brexit-QUENTIN-LETTS-says-course-does-understands-people-far-better-politician.html): “‘I don’t see why we can’t just get out? What’s the problem?’

**We will never apologise, never explain, never surrender**

See those scalped corpses, littering the plains? These are the guys – and it is, invariably, men – who thought that if only they showed contrition for their confected crimes the enemy would leave them alone. [Sir Tim Hunt](http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2015/12/18/sir-tim-hunt-to-leave-britain-how-feminists-chased-away-one-of-britains-geniuses/) apologised, the [guy from Saatchi](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3718986/Woman-high-flier-hits-Saatchi-boss-sexism-row-Company-s-chief-creative-officer-says-comments-upset-huge-employees.html) apologised, the guy on the Rosetta space programme who wore the [“sexist” shirt](http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/11/15/brilliant-anti-feminist-spoof-claims-space-scientist-s-shirt-is-sexist/) apologised. A fat lot of good it did them. The vengeful liberal-left doesn’t just want humiliation – it wants total annihilation.

Giving even an inch of ground to an enemy so implacable and vile is not only futile – but it also badly lets the side down by granting them a power that they do not deserve. The most recent sorry example of this was Steve Martin who actually deleted a tweet praising his late friend [Carrie Fisher](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/dec/28/steve-martin-deletes-tweet-calling-carrie-fisher-b/) as a “beautiful creature” because a bunch of feminazis on Twitter complained that this was sexist objectification.

Look, I know it’s a scary thing when the SJW witch-hunt mob turns on you. But read [Vox Day’s SJW Attack Survival Guide](http://www.voxday.net/mart/SJW_Attack_Survival_Guide.pdf), follow the example of Nigel Farage and fight these people to the very last bullet (keeping the final round for yourself). Do not surrender! (And if you need reminding why not, read this piece I wrote the other day, of which [I am very proud](http://www.breitbart.com/immigration/2016/12/25/delingpole-moronic-self-righteous-disgusting-losers-tried-to-turn-the-berlin-attack-on-nigel-farage/))

**We will laugh in the face of death**

Something I’ve noticed about the liberal-left: they don’t have a sense of humour.

This is odd, given that 99.99 per cent of professional comedians are liberals. But it’s also unfailingly true. Go on social media and see for yourself: all the wittiest banter, all the funniest memes, all the snarkiest jibes – they all come from the right side of the argument, not the left. And this is as it should be for not only is humour a sign of intellectual superiority but it’s also entirely the right attitude for a team that wants to win.

Humour requires a degree of self-knowledge; an ability to recognise your own weaknesses (vital if you are to triumph over them) and not to take yourself too seriously. Also, it’s a sign that you are a happy warrior – in the manner of heroes like Andrew Breitbart.

I always try to keep this in mind when I’m engaged in a vicious tussle with the liberal-left: that witty barbs hurt them much more than anger. When your enemy takes himself so seriously, no weapon is more effective than a cutting quip. Sometimes it’s hard not be to angry because the left has given us so much to be angry about. But we must resist the temptation if we can because it just plays into the left’s caricature of us as angry, blustering conservatives. We should remember at all times that in the culture wars, we are the Greek city states and the enemy are the Persians. If you want to know the significance of this, I recommend you read Victor Davis Hanson’s Carnage and Culture. Basically, free men will always fight better than serfs because they have more to lose…

**We will mercilessly expose their weaknesses**

People on the liberal-left are just like us, really, only slightly less evolved. Their brains are stuck in that stage of evolution just before ours – the hunter-gatherer stage when we were all roaming the plains and were programmed to respond in the most basic way to our most primal instincts.

This is why so much of the left-liberal ‘argument’ has to do with raw emotion rather than logic; it’s why they’ll almost never engage with us on detail, preferring simply to use what Vox Day calls “point and shriek” tactics, or to try to belittle and demean us with emotive (but meaningless) pejoratives like “racist”, “homophobe”, “misogynist”, “Islamophobe”, “climate change denier.”

They have been using these techniques very successfully for years and in my experience there is only one effective way of dealing with this: you have to show their workings. You have to notice what they are doing and then you have to explain to other people what they are doing.

This is hard: it requires patience, courage and persistence – the equivalent of maintaining discipline under fire. Again, I refer you to [this piece](http://www.breitbart.com/immigration/2016/12/25/delingpole-moronic-self-righteous-disgusting-losers-tried-to-turn-the-berlin-attack-on-nigel-farage/) I wrote recently because it embodies the kind of attitude and techniques required. Essentially it was a response to a mass assault by SJWs using Twitter to brand those of us on the right as heartless, uncaring, ruthless, evil people who would use a man’s recently widowed status against him. The attacks came in 140 character bursts. The response took almost 3000 words. But that’s the way it is: logic and rational argument take much longer to develop than emotive cheap shots. If we don’t use logic and rational argument though, we concede the field to the pointers and shriekers.

**Leave no man behind**

We know everyone in the conservative movement thinks that California is a joke. But 40 per cent of the State voted for Donald Trump and we need their help! Unlike the left – which sees ethnic, sexual and religious minorities mainly as client victim groups to patronise and exploit for identity politics purposes – we on the right “celebrate diversity” by not giving a darn about diversity. In other words, we’re color blind.

The reason Sowell’s great and Milo’s great and Krauthammer’s great is not because they’re black and gay and disabled and therefore “helpful” to our cause, but simply because they think clearly and sensibly and have come to the right conclusions about the world. We support our own through thick and thin. We are all equal and we all have equal rights, just like the 14th amendment says. (Which means, by the way, that we don’t believe in positive discrimination – which is just another form of discrimination, as practised by the disgusting left not the sensible and just right).

**Always attack**

This, pretty much, was the tactic of the Royal Navy throughout the Napoleonic Wars – even when outnumbered and outgunned by the French and the Spanish.

Today we are similarly outgunned and outnumbered by the loathsome edifice of the liberal establishment – and if we are going to reduce it to rubble, as of course we must, then we shall have to fight as aggressively as Nelson and Cochrane did.

For far, far too long, conservatives have been fighting a defensive war – spending more time apologising for being conservatives than actually taking on the enemy. But at last, in the U.S. at least, we have a leader who is not afraid of a fight. What does “always attack” mean in practice, though? Well here’s a perfect example: a recent New York Times story headed “[Wielding Claims of ‘Fake News’ Conservatives take aim at mainstream media](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/25/us/politics/fake-news-claims-conservatives-mainstream-media-.html?_r=0)“.

The author of the story appears slightly taken back that conservatives are behaving in this way. Surely we should be feeling guilty for all those fake news stories spread by evil right-wing people on the internet in order to deceive the weak-minded by acting against their interests by voting for Brexit and Donald Trump? But no, far from apologising it seems that we on the right have been on the attack. If anyone is responsible for pumping out fake news these last few decades it’s the liberal elite and their mouthpieces in the MSM, not us.

OK. We’re done. Unleash hell.

**In a dramatic departure from the longstanding U.S. policy of vetoing anti-Israel resolutions, the Obama administration on Friday abstained from voting on a United Nations Security Council resolution calling for a halt to Israeli construction in the West Bank and eastern sections of Jerusalem, thereby allowing the measure to pass.**

Fourteen member states voted in favor of the resolution; none voted against and the U.S. abstained.

The Times of Israel [reports](http://www.timesofisrael.com/choosing-not-to-veto-obama-lets-anti-settlement-resolution-pass-at-un-security-council/):

Speaking at the Security Council after the vote, US Ambassador Samantha Power said the vote underlined the Council’s long-standing position that “the settlements have no legality.” She claimed the US position was “fully in line with the bipartisan history” of how US presidents have approached the issue for decades.

Earlier today, an Israeli official told reporters, including this reporter at Breitbart Jerusalem, the Obama administration secretly worked with the Palestinian Authority to craft a “shameful” United Nations resolution behind Israel’s back, an Israeli official told reporters on Friday.

The official [told](http://www.breitbart.com/jerusalem/2016/12/23/israel-official-obama-administration-secretly-worked-palestinians-craft-shameful-un-resolution/) *Breitbart Jerusalem*by email:

“President Obama and Secretary Kerry are behind this shameful move against Israel at the UN. The US administration secretly cooked up with the Palestinians an extreme anti Israeli resolution behind Israel’s back which would be a tailwind for terror and boycotts and effectively make the Western Wall occupied Palestinian territory. President Obama could declare his willingness to veto this resolution in an instant but instead is pushing it. This is an abandonment of Israel which breaks decades of US policy of protecting Israel at the UN and undermines the prospects of working with the next administration of advancing peace.”

The text of the resolution repeatedly and wrongly refers to the West Bank and eastern sections of Jerusalem as “Palestinian territory occupied since 1967.”  In actuality, the Palestinians never had a state in either the West Bank or eastern Jerusalem and they are not legally recognized as the undisputed authority in those areas.

Jordan occupied and annexed the West Bank and eastern Jerusalem from 1948 until Israel captured the lands in a defensive war in 1967 after Arab countries used the territories to launch attacks against the Jewish state.  In 1988 Jordan officially renounced its claims to the West Bank and eastern Jerusalem.

The [text](http://www.timesofisrael.com/full-text-of-draft-un-security-council-resolution-demanding-israel-cease-all-settlement-activities/) of the resolution declares that the Israeli settlement enterprise has “no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-state solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace.”

It calls for Israel to “immediately and completely cease all settlement activities in the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem.”

As the Committee for Accuracy for Middle East Reporting in America (CAMERA) pointed out in an email blast, international law does not make Israeli settlements illegal.

CAMERA notes:

Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Conventions, which is relied upon by those who claim the settlements are illegal, does not apply in the case of the West Bank. This is because the West Bank was never under self-rule by a nation that was a party to the Convention, and therefore there is no “partial or total occupation of the territory of a High Contracting Party,” as Article 2 of the Convention specifies. Moreover, even if it did apply, by its plain terms, it applies only to forcible transfers and not to voluntary movement. Therefore, it can’t prohibit Jews from choosing to move to areas of great historical and religious significance to them.

If the resolution is brought to a vote in its current form and Obama fails to veto, the resolution would contradict a Bush administration commitment to allowing some existing Jewish settlements to remain under a future Israeli-Palestinian deal.

That U.S. commitment, which the Obama administration has repeatedly violated by condemning settlement activity, was reportedly a key element in Israel’s decision to unilaterally evacuate the Gaza Strip in 2005.

The UN draft resolution text states that “cessation of all Israeli settlement activities is essential for salvaging the two-State solution,” and it “calls for affirmative steps to be taken immediately to reverse the negative trends on the ground that are imperiling the two-State solution.”

In 2004, just prior to the Gaza evacuation, President Bush issued a declarative letter stating that it is unrealistic to expect that Israel will not retain some Jewish settlements in a final-status deal with the Palestinians.

The letter [stated](https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2004/04/20040414-3.html):

In light of new realities on the ground, including already existing major Israeli populations centers, it is unrealistic to expect that the outcome of final status negotiations will be a full and complete return to the armistice lines of 1949, and all previous efforts to negotiate a two-state solution have reached the same conclusion. It is realistic to expect that any final status agreement will only be achieved on the basis of mutually agreed changes that reflect these realities.

Elliott Abrams, the Deputy National Security Adviser for Global Democracy Strategy during Bush’s second term, was instrumental in brokering understandings between the U.S. and Israel on settlements. In a June 2009 piece published by the Wall Street Journal, Abrams accused the Obama administration of “abandoning” those U.S.-Israel understandings by taking positions critical of all settlement activity.

Abrams [wrote](http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB124588743827950599):

There were indeed agreements between Israel and the United States regarding the growth of Israeli settlements on the West Bank … principles that would permit some continuing growth. … They emerged from discussions with American officials and were discussed by Messrs. Sharon and Bush at their Aqaba meeting in June 2003. … The prime minister of Israel relied on them in undertaking a wrenching political reorientation – the dissolution of his government, the removal of every single Israeli citizen, settlement and military position in Gaza, and the removal of four small settlements in the West Bank. … For reasons that remain unclear, the Obama administration has decided to abandon the understandings about settlements reached by the previous administration with the Israeli government. We may be abandoning the deal now, but we cannot rewrite history and make believe it did not exist

**All our Ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power, is missing is a fiddle. For the duration of the seemingly endless Syrian civil war, she has figuratively fiddled while that country burns. Now, with one foot out the door from a tenure that has all but obliterated her once formidable reputation as an anti-genocide activist, she’s decided to kick Israel in the teeth as though she would like to see Jews pushed into the sea.**

This anti-Israel resolution was cooked up by Barack Obama, John Kerry, Susan Rice, and Power. The proof is going to be handed over to Trump in 19 days. We have long known that the quartet had this in the works. It was common knowledge in Washington, but the globalist media refused to cover the story. This is the most shocking thing I have ever seen, because all of the media giants are managed and/or owned by Jews. Their selective coverage of the UN’s hatred for Israel is like the angels of heaven refusing to sing at the second coming.

Rather, the truly shocking part is that the most senior members of the American foreign policy team were pushing this resolution through while Aleppo was being blown into rubble.

Just imagine — there is a genocide going on for years in the Middle East in general and Syria in particular. Are they killing Muslims? No. Are they killing Jews? No. It involves ISIS targeting Yazidis and Christians for extermination, and, in Syria, Shia Muslims joining Alawites to exterminate Sunnis. This is the classic definition of genocide where an ethnic group is target for annihilation. But when the boats and planes and busses fill up with refugees, 98.8% of them are Muslim. The Obama Administration and his puppet UN refuse to help the Christians.

The genocide reached fever pitch this month, just as the Obama administration, which hasn’t lifted a finger to protect 500,000 Arab Christians from being slaughtered, is winding down. Aleppo is in the news every single day, as the world watches the horrors of bombings of Christian civilians amid incalculable loss of life.

And what was Samantha Power, the great anti-genocide campaigner, doing while Aleppo and its residents were being reduced to rubble? Why, she was slinking around DC in her nightgown doing what she does best. Scheming against Israel, of course! I mean who poses in a silk nightgown and heels for a national magazine cover bragging that the UN is not ready for her to come to town?

Power should have resigned a dozen times, after her drunken activities and her hung-over tirades against permanent members of the UN Security Council. She should have been yanked out of the UN by the President over Syria long ago, but she is doing exactly what he wants her to do. She decided instead to embrace the hypocrisy of having written a Pulitzer-prize winning book condemning previous American administrations who were bystanders to genocide, while becoming a cheerleader for the same murderous regime herself.

That was bad enough. What we know now is far worse. She raised her wine glass again and again to the ISIS rockets pounding the Christian centers in Aleppo into dust as she focused instead on the condemning the Jewish state. The world according to Power sees the greater crime in roads, sewer lines, public utilities and condominiums where mud used to be. Shelling Christian neighborhoods and raping children to death is entertainment for her.

She couldn’t pass even one United Nations Security Council Resolution condemning ISIS and Iran for the slaughter in Syria. But you passed this motion condemning peace-loving Jews who live in the ancient Biblical lands of Judea and Samaria? Who makes a public policy that Jerusalem must have “Jew-free” neighborhoods? Is that not the most racist thing you have ever heard?

Power publicly trumpeted her unique position for speaking truth to the UN’s members, but once in power herself, she remained silent while Christians are being murdered every day in the Middle East and North Africa. She humped her way into an ambassadorship by compromising her enemies, because it was the only way through the glass ceiling. She leaves her Victoria Secret at the world-class wine parties and lobster fests, while Shiites and Sunnis kill each other on a daily basis throughout the Middle East, and thousands die in Sudan, Nigeria, Libya and Yemen. Beguiled by Samantha’s flaming red hair and long, sultry frame, UN members remain silent about hundreds of thousands of Syrian Christians being slaughtered, raped, and beheaded by ISIS thugs financed and supported by the Obama Administration.

Let’s not forget the carnage in Syria is largely a result of Obama’s disastrous foreign policy. Even the most sycophantic press corps agrees that when he precipitously pulled American troops out of Iraq, he created a vacuum that has been filled by Iran, ISIS, al-Qaeda and other radical Islamic groups. Of course every piece of equipment, rocket, missile, grenade, and chunk of satellite intelligence ISIS uses comes from the Obama team as well. Power stood by while Russia, Iran, and its Hezbollah terrorist puppets rushed in to bolster the tottering Assad regime.

Given that Syria is one of the only remaining countries that has not turned all of its wealth over the global central banks, the UN will work tirelessly to see Assad removed, even if it means chasing him into the street and shooting him in the face like they did Gadhafi.  Hillary sacrificed an Ambassador for that deal, thinking it would ensure her the presidency. What is Syria worth?

Acting early on would have saved tens of thousands of lives, but that wasn’t the plan. The plan was to create a massively devastating immigration problem that threatens to bring down Jordan’s pro-American regime and seed Europe, and perhaps the United States, with radical Islamists trained by ISIS and al-Qaeda to infiltrate Western societies for the purpose of committing terror and mayhem. So far, so good. Right Earth Explorers?

Obama also opened the door to Russian intervention. But was it his ineptitude, or was this the plan all along? After the US-led NATO keeping Russia contained in the region for more than 40 years, the UN took over the job. Putin reacted to NATO’s troops being moved in close to Russian borders with movements of his own. The UN tanked the Russian ruble and glutted the oil markets, but Russia does not carry the debt burden of other nations. They are used to hunkering down and working hard under terrible conditions like sanctions. The Ruble bounced back. Oil prices are coming back up. And Russian technical capabilities far outweigh what they lack in military bulk. While Russia was building steady advances, Obama was busy using his executive authority to dismantle America defenses and replace the most experienced generals with academic think tanks and social pioneers.

Obama’s most devastating decision was blaming Assad for the chemical attack on Syrian civilians, when the whole world knew beyond doubt it was Al Qaeda terrorists using weapons Hillary had smuggled to them from Libya.

But heck — at least Obama and Power finally socked it to Bibi and Israel. That’ll teach ‘em.

Then again, by this point no one should be surprised by Samantha’s craft in the face of slaughter. On the hundredth anniversary of the Armenian genocide, she could not bring herself to speak the truth, even after promising to do so during the presidential campaign. Taking the moral low ground, Power continued to repeat, robotically, the politically convenient and historically inaccurate line that Turkey did not wage a genocidal war against the Armenians. There no villages full of Christian farmers and tradespeople bulldozed into ditches and buried.

She was lockstep with Obama to force Assad out of office, her tolerance of Iranian threats of genocide against the Jews encouraged Tehran, and her willingness to go along with Turkey’s rewriting of history has reassured the Turks that America will do nothing to stop the potential genocide directed at the Kurds or the Christians. Even now, the biggest threat to the current ceasefire is Turkish troops marching to southern Syria to keep Western Kurds from uniting with Eastern Kurds. If they are kept separate, the Christians can be eliminated from the Earth in a continuation of what was started with the Armenians.

Samantha could have followed the demands she made of members of earlier Administrations that were bystanders to genocide and resigned from this morally bankrupt administration long ago, and perhaps escaped with some semblance of her reputation intact. Alas, it is far too late now. There has been too much sleeping around. There have been too many late-nite affairs. As a former administration official, she may reap the financial benefits as a lecturer, pontificator and perhaps academic; if she lives to tell about it.

The truth is that no reasonable person will take Samantha Power seriously again when she speaks about human rights. Her conduct has disqualified her from any such discussion, unless it is to explain how someone can stare unflinchingly at Christian genocide while grinding her Louis Vuitton heels into the neck of the Jews in Israel.

**X-Squared Radio Prediction was Correct- AGAIN**

5 month ago, listeners asked me what the best currency investment for 2016 would be. I told them hands down it was the Russian Ruble. I said, you can buy all the Iraqi Dinar and Vietnamese Dong you want, but they will still be worthless. The Russian Ruble will come back, and guess what? The Russian ruble is expected to be one of the strongest currencies in the world this year with the Brazilian real only trading better against the dollar. Rising oil prices and growing interest from foreign investors despite sanctions are the main reasons behind the rally.

This year the Russian currency has strengthened 17 percent against the dollar, only marginally beaten by Brazilian real which gained over 17 percent.

The ruble had a tough first month of the year when oil dipped to $27 per barrel. At the time, the currency hit an all-time low of 82 against the dollar. With crude prices stabilizing, it rebounded to 60.40 in December. On Monday, it was trading at 60.80 against the dollar and 63.60 against the euro, both close to eighteen-month highs.

"We see foreigners are actively entering the ruble market and buying ruble-denominated bonds this year, given the positive trend of strengthening of the ruble and taking into account good yields of such bonds," said Russian Finance Minister Anton Siluanov on Friday.

Since the beginning of the year, the proportion of foreign buyers of Russian federal loan bonds (the so-called OFZ) has grown by over five percent to almost 27 percent.

The Russian stock markets have shown a good performance, too. The ruble-trade MICEX index is up 24 percent this year, hitting many record highs. The dollar-denominated RTS index has been even more successful gaining 49 percent since January.

According to many analysts, Donald Trump’s election as US president is also a significant opportunity for investment in Russia, as Moscow-Washington ties are predicted to improve under Trump’s presidency.

While the incumbent President Barack Obama called Russia “a smaller and weaker country,” Trump’s rhetoric has been much softer. The nomination of ExxonMobil CEO Rex Tillerson as secretary of state is seen as a big positive for improving the relationship. Tillerson is reportedly on good terms with Kremlin insiders from the time his company operated in Russia before sanctions.

**The Faking of a President**

The chief investigator for Sheriff Joe Arpaio’s probe of the validity of the image Barack Obama released as his birth certificate says evidence suggests the involvement of the Hawaiian government in the alleged fabrication.

[WND reported last week that Arpaio](http://wnd.com/2016/12/evidence-obama-birth-certificate-fake-heading-to-congress/) and his chief investigator on the Obama birth certificate issue, Mike Zullo, held a news conference to reveal evidence they say shows the document was fabricated on a computer.

They conclude it is not a copy of any original Hawaiian document, and while their investigation did not address whether Obama is a “natural-born citizen” as the Constitution requires for presidents, or the political implications of such a forgery, they said it certainly raises many questions going forward.

Zullo showed how the digital images on the document released by Obama in a White House news conference allegedly were copied from another document.

Zullo said the alleged fraud apparently involved the Hawaiian government.

His comments came in an interview on the [Hagmann Report,](http://www.HagmannReport.com) where he was joined by pastor, author, radio host and former law-enforcement officer Carl Gallups of the [PPSIMMONS](http://ppsimmons.blogspot.com/) blog, who was made a special deputy by the sheriff for the purposes of information exchange and accountability.

Zullo explained the investigation found that some of the images on the Obama document image apparently were copied from an original birth certificate that belongs to a woman named Johanna Ah’nee.

But Ah’nee said she obtained a copy of her birth certificate and kept it locked in her own files until after the Obama image was released. At about that time, she revealed it to WND senior writer Jerry Corsi, who was reporting on the dispute.

Zullo told how the investigation launched by Arpaio at the request of constituents took him to Hawaii.

If Ah’nee’s copy of birth certificate had not been circulated, posted online or otherwise made available, he concludes that only the Hawaiian government, which had the document image, could have used it to copy elements onto Obama’s.

“These things start to grow hair and you start to work with it,” Zullo explained.

The evidence “pointed to an inside job,” he said.

Gallups said in the interview that now is the time for the questions to be expanded.

“They manufactured a document,” he said. “That’s astounding, because now you have to ask why. Why would people produce a forgery, a fraud, for the president of the United States and defraud the American people. The answers are not good,” he said.

**The Globalist Elites Implementing Global Crash to Beat Trump**

For years, alternative economic analysts have been warning that the “miraculous” rise in U.S. stock markets has been the symptom of wider central bank intervention and that this will result in dire future consequences. We have heard endless lies and rationalizations as to why this could not be so, and why the U.S. “recovery” is real.  At the beginning of 2016, the former head of the Dallas branch of the Federal Reserve crushed all the skeptics and vindicated our position [in an interview with CNBC](http://video.cnbc.com/gallery/?video=3000474362) where he stated:

“What the Fed did — and I was part of that group — is we front-loaded a tremendous market rally, starting in 2009.It’s sort of what I call the “reverse Whimpy factor” — give me two hamburgers today for one tomorrow. I’m not surprised that almost every index you can look at … was down significantly.” [Referring to the results in the stock market after the Fed raised rates in December.]

Fisher continued his warning (though his predictions in my view are wildly conservative or deliberately muted):

“…I was warning my colleagues, “Don’t go wobbly if we have a 10-20 percent correction at some point. … Everybody you talk to … has been warning that these markets are heavily priced.”

Here is the issue **—** stocks are a mostly meaningless factor when considering the economic health of a nation. Equities are a casino based on nothing but the luck of the draw when it comes to news headlines, central banker statements and algorithmic computers. Today, as Fischer openly admitted, stocks are a purely manipulated indicator representing nothing but the amount of stimulus central banks are willing to pour into them through various channels.

Even with the incredible monetary support pooled together by international financiers, returns on equities investments continue to remain mostly flat.  It would seem that the propping up of indexes like the Dow has been only for the sake of keeping up appearances. For many people, revenue is barely being generated.

Unfortunately, the majority of Americans do not care to educate themselves on the finer points of finance. Their only relation to the health of the economy is their daily glance at the Dow. If it is green, or at all time highs, they assume that all is well, even if their gut is telling them something is not quite right.

The elites that stand at the helm of the Federal Reserve understand this dynamic very well. They are not stupid. They know that the whole of the global economy could be in a shambles but as long as stocks remain positive the masses will continue to ignore reality until the flames of destabilization are at their very doorsteps.

With this fact in mind one might think that the Fed would consider it in their best interest to keep stimulus measures operating indefinitely; but that is not what they are doing.

In fact, the Fed along with other central banks like the ECB has been slowly peeling back pillars of support from markets that have been in place since 2008-2009 and leaving the system open to a crisis event that should have been dealt with years ago. I examined this process of deliberate destabilization in my article [‘The Global Economic Reset Has Begun.’](http://alt-market.com/articles/2758-the-global-economic-reset-has-begun)

In that piece I outlined the three major pillars holding up the U.S. market system and certain parts of our economy and how they were being systematically removed. The [first pillar](http://alt-market.com/articles/1721-is-the-fed-ready-to-cut-americas-fiat-life-support) was the use of bailouts and quantitative easing measures. These were diminished through the implementation of the Fed “taper,” which I predicted would happen three months prior that year.

The [second pillar](http://alt-market.com/articles/2674-economic-crisis-goes-mainstream-what-happens-next) was the use of near zero interest rates, which allowed numerous banks and corporations to access low-cost and no-cost overnight loans from the Fed. These companies then used these loans in large part to support a never-ending program of stock buybacks, which reduced the stock pool and artificially boosted the values of the remaining stocks.  I predicted in August of 2015 that the Fed would hike interest rates and that this would be the beginning of the end for the stock buyback bonanza. The Fed hiked rates in December of that year.

This process of removing backdoor manipulation through low interest rates should be our main concern right now. Early in 2016 I believed that the Fed would reach a position in which it would finally unleash a series of rate hikes. I did not think they would be so blatant as to wait until right after the U.S. presidential election to do so. I was wrong.

This is why I eventually predicted the launch of a series of rate hikes starting right after the election of Donald Trump in my article [‘World Suffers From Trump Shell Shock **—** Here’s What Will Happen Next.’](http://alt-market.com/articles/3061-world-suffers-from-trump-shell-shock-heres-what-will-happen-next) The Fed has now once again hiked interest rates with assertions that they will be “accelerating” such hikes throughout 2017.

As I have been arguing for most of the past year, the election of Donald Trump was inevitable and would precede the triggering of the final stage of our ongoing economic crisis. I came to realize that the Fed’s timing of their latest rate hike is highly strategic. Not only does it set the stage for a series of hikes that will crush U.S. stock markets this coming year and finally shock the public out of their fiscal stupor, but it also maneuvers the crisis right into the lap of Donald Trump and the conservative movements that support him.

Beyond this, it perpetuates an increasing Left/Right division in America. Think about it **—** during a fiscal crisis under Trump, triggered by accumulating Fed rate hikes, liberals will immediately set upon Trump as the culprit, while conservatives will immediately defend Trump as a victim of Federal Reserve meddling.

The Federal Reserve and the mainstream media are already composing the narrative by stating that Trump’s potential economic policies and a widening budget deficit [would REQUIRE higher rates](http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2016/11/17/yellen-fed-track-dec-rate-hike/93991628/) at a faster pace in order to be accommodated.

I have heard arguments from some that this tactic would simply not work. That people would “never buy” a narrative in which Trump and conservatives are blamed for a market collapse that was at least eight years in the making. I have to say, this view is incredibly naive.

I understand why people would want to embrace the notion that the public is as savvy as the liberty movement when looking at economic events, but this simply isn’t reality. A large portion of the U.S. population identifies with the “Left” end of the political spectrum. We have already seen how they react in the face of a Trump election win. They are predisposed to believe that Trump is responsible for a market crash regardless of the facts. Not to mention, much of the rest of the world is economically ignorant and will likely jump on the anti-conservative bandwagon during a crisis as well.

But the real master stroke of this strategy on the part of the elites is that it creates the perfect platform for the destruction of the U.S. dollar’s world reserve status **—** the third and final pillar I mentioned months ago that is supporting our economic system.

Imagine that the Fed’s rate hike frenzy sparks an open feud between the central bank and Trump? Some people might say “Good! Shut the bastards down!” However, this is exactly what the elites want. With the Fed “at odds” with the president of the U.S., faith in the U.S. dollar will plummet. Its world reserve status will be destroyed. And instead of being blamed on central banks, the majority of people around the world will claim it was the fault of Trump.

With a historically sufficient excuse for the end of dollar dominance in hand, the elites can move forward with their great global reset, which includes the replacement of the dollar with the IMF’s special drawing rights as the go-to reserve currency mechanism. The SDR basket is an essential bridge in the formation of a single global monetary authority and a true single global currency.

I believe that the Fed will not only continue hiking interest rates throughout 2017, but that some of these rate hikes may be LARGER than many people expect (50 basis points or more). I believe this will be designed to foster extreme tensions between the executive branch and the central bank.

A few months ago I would have said that Trump may or “may not” be aware of this dynamic and the potential that he is a scapegoat. Now that I have seen Trump’s cabinet picks which include neo-con and Goldman Sachs alumni, I have little doubt that he is fully cognizant of the plan.  I will be writing more on the issue of Trump as a “Trojan horse” in my next article.  In the meantime I would point out that all of the elements of psychological support for stock markets will also disappear in the face of a Trump verses establishment narrative.

All those leftist media outlets cherry picking economic stats and telling half truths to support the recovery lie now have no reason to continue cheerleading for the economy. I expect that propaganda rags like Reuters and Bloomberg will quickly change their tune with Trump in the Oval Office and begin a consistent chorus of negative financial data. Not only will the Fed remove all support from the system, but the mainstream media will be pounding day traders with the kind of “doom and gloom” headlines that they have been criticizing us for over the years.

Make no mistake, the election of Trump may have some in the liberty movement ready to pack up their preps and forget about any national crisis in their lifetimes, but the truth is, vigilance is needed now more than ever. I said it before the election and I’ll say it today **—** do not get comfortable; the times are about to get even more interesting.

The schematic for the new world order, according to the admissions of the internationalists, cannot possibly include the continued existence of U.S. geopolitical and economic dominance. The plan, in fact, requires the destabilization and reformation of America into a shell of its former glory. The most important element of this plan demands the removal of the U.S. dollar as the de facto world reserve currency, a change that would devastate our current financial structure.

I outlined with undeniable evidence the reality that major governments, including the BRICS governments of the East, are fully on board with the globalist agenda. There is no way around it; the BRICS, including Russia and China, have openly called for a global monetary system centralized and dictated by the IMF using the SDR basket. This same plan was [outlined decades ago](https://socioecohistory.wordpress.com/2014/07/26/flashback-1988-get-ready-for-a-world-currency-by-2018%E2%80%B3-the-economist-magazine/) in the Rothschild-owned magazine The Economist. We are witnessing that plan being implemented in front of our very eyes today.

For the past couple of years, the current head of the IMF, Christine Lagarde, has used the phrase “global economic reset” often in her speeches and interviews. There is some (deliberate) ambiguity to this notion, but after sitting through hours upon hours of her most boring and repetitive discussions in globalist think tanks such as the Council On Foreign Relations, the consistent message is pretty straightforward. If anyone can stand to listen to this woman's carefully crafted prattle and well-vetted half-truths for more than five minutes, I suggest they watch this particular speech given in January at the CFR:

Her message on the global economic reset is essentially this: “Collective” cooperation will not just be encouraged in the new order, it will be required — meaning, the collective cooperation of all nations toward the same geopolitical and economic framework. If this is not accomplished, great fiscal pain will be felt and “spillover” will result. Translation: Due to the forced interdependency of globalism, crisis in one country could cause a domino effect of crisis in other countries; therefore, all countries and their economic behavior must be managed by a central authority to prevent blundering governments or "rogue central banks" from upsetting the balance.

It’s interesting how the IMF’s answer to the failings of globalization is MORE globalization. In other words, Lagarde would argue that while we are in the midst of an international system, we are not centralized enough for such a system to succeed.

The IMF points out correctly that the economic situation around the world is not stable and could revert once again to the chaos of the initial 2008 crash. The Bank for International Settlements, the primary hub of central bank control, has also given numerous warnings this year on the potential for disaster, including in its [latest quarterly report](https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt1512.pdf).

The warnings of the BIS in particular should not be taken lightly (some analysts are indeed taking them lightly). The BIS knows exactly when financial disasters will erupt because it wrote the central bank policies that created those same events. For example, in 2007, the BIS [released a warning](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/2811081/BIS-warns-of-Great-Depression-dangers-from-credit-spree.html) that perfectly predicted the elements of the derivatives and credit crisis in 2008.

What these globalist institutions will not tell you in a direct manner are the real causes and motivations behind the inevitable next stage in the ongoing destruction of the current economic system

The global reset is not a “response” to the process of collapse we are trapped in today. No, the global reset as implemented by central banks and the BIS/IMF is the CAUSE of the collapse. The collapse is a tool, a flamethrower burning a great hole in the forest to make way for the foundations of the globalist Ziggurat to be built. As outlined in my last article, economic disaster serves the interests of elitists.

When you look at these actions by the Federal Reserve and the U.S. government in particular, questions arise. Is it “stupidity” that is causing them to sabotage the golden goose? Is it hubris and greed? Their actions are clearly facilitating a program of incremental implosion, yet they continue to ignore the obvious. Why?

The people who ask these questions are operating on a false assumption; they have assumed that the international bankers and the puppet politicians they control have any interest in protecting the longevity of the U.S. The fact is they do not. They have no loyalty whatsoever to the U.S. system, nor do they see the U.S. as “too big to fail.” This is utter nonsense to globalists. Rather, they see each nation and central bank as a piece in a game, much like chess. Some pieces have to be sacrificed in order to gain a better position on the board. This is all that the U.S., the Federal Reserve and even the dollar are to them: expendable pieces in a larger game.

The U.S. is now experiencing the next stage of the great reset. Two pillars were put in place on top of an already existing pillar by the central banks in order to maintain a semblance of stability after the 2008 crash.  This faux stability appears to have been necessary in order to allow time for the conditioning of the masses towards greater acceptance of globalist initiatives, to ensure the debt slavery of future generations through the taxation of government generated long term debts, and to allow for internationalists to safely position their own assets.  The three pillars are now being systematically removed by the same central bankers. Why? I believe that they are simply ready to carry on with the next stage of the controlled demolition of the American structure as we know it.

**Bailouts And QE:  The First Pillar Removed**

The bailout bonanza was in part a direct intervention in the deflationary avalanche of the derivatives bubble, but also an indirect intervention in that it changed the psychological dynamics of the markets. As former Fed chairmans Alan Greenspan and Ben Bernanke have both [hinted at](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/11/03/AR2010110307372.html?hpid=topnews) in interviews and op-eds, one of the primary concerns of the central bank was the psychology behind higher stock prices.

Stock prices could be propped up by the Fed itself through proxy buyers using the printing press. Or the Fed could inject billions, if not trillions, of dollars into banks and allow them to run wild, artificially boosting investment while doing nothing to solve the existing dilemma of negative fundamentals.  Beyond this, the markets began to move on the mere words or edicts of Fed officials as algo-computers and the general investment world placed bets on rhetoric rather than reality; a dynamic which is now ending.

The bailouts also reanimated the cadavers of large corporations and banks, not just in the U.S. but in Europe, giving the illusion of life to the financial system while leaving Main Street to rot. In the meantime, quantitative easing measures provided a way to continue financing U.S. government debt at the expense of generations of taxpayers as numerous primary lenders began to abandon typical long-term bond purchases.

Furthermore, oil markets appear to have been directly inflated by QE intervention. It is important to take note that oil prices remained extraordinarily high despite the continuous fall in global demand UNTIL the moment the Federal Reserve instituted the taper of QE3. Then, prices began to plunge.

In a [September 2013 article](http://personalliberty.com/is-the-fed-ready-to-cut-americas-fiat-life-support/), I predicted that the Fed, despite all common sense and the claims of banks like Goldman Sachs, would indeed follow through with the taper: a removal of the first pillar levitating the U.S. system.

I was, of course, called crazy at the time for this prediction by some people within the alternative economic community.

“Why in the world” they asked, “would the Fed taper QE when they can simply print to infinity and kick the can down the road perpetually?” Again, these people do not understand that America is under scheduled demolition by the international banks; it is not being protected by them.

The taper occurred in December of that year.

**Near Zero Interest Rates:  The Second Pillar Nearly Removed**

After the taper of QE, volatility not seen since 2008/2009 returned to the markets. And the public once again was reminded in sporadic moments that the recovery might not be real after all. Europe and Japan quickly stepped in with their own renewed stimulus measures, and Fed officials began using strategic media interviews to “hint” falsely that QE might return. Markets rallied, then fell dramatically, then rallied again, then fell again in a shocking manner. And this volatility has been the trend up until recently, when the question of the end of zero interest rate policy arose.

Again, very few people have ever asked or demanded the Fed end QE or ZIRP. There was never any legitimate public pressure on the fed to remove these pillars. The investment world has been essentially addicted like heroin junkies to assured gains for three years.  The war cry of the investment world has been BTFD! (Buy the f'ing dip) for quite some time; investors have come to expect and demand inevitable central bank intervention and fiat driven stock market rallies.  Yet, the Fed is ending the party anyway.

ZIRP is the only pillar left holding stocks in place. Without zero interest rates, and with even the most minor of .25 basis points added, cost-free overnight lending to banks and corporations will end. They will not be able to afford continued lending on the massive scale seen since 2009/2010. This means no more stock buybacks for dying companies like IBM or General Motors, among others. This means a considerable decline in the markets, declines which we have had a taste of in recent plunges in equities at the mere mention of interest rate increases.

In August in an article entitled ['Economic Crisis Goes Mainstream: What Happen's Next?'](http://alt-market.com/articles/2674-economic-crisis-goes-mainstream-what-happens-next), I wrote:

**"The Federal Reserve push for a rate hike will likely be determined before 2015 is over. Talk of a September increase in interest rates may be a ploy, and a last-minute decision to delay could be on the table. This tactic of edge-of-the-seat meetings and surprise delays was used during the QE taper scenario, which threw a lot of analysts off their guard and caused many to believe that a taper would never happen. Well, it did happen, just as a rate hike will happen, only slightly later than mainstream analysts expect.**

**If a delay occurs, it will be short-lived, triggering a dead cat bounce in stocks, with rates increasing by December as dismal retail sales become undeniable leading into the Christmas season."**

You can also [read my analysis](http://alt-market.com/articles/2695-the-real-reasons-why-the-fed-will-hike-interest-rates) on the motivations behind a Fed rate hike as well as the theater surrounding their policies.

The cat seems to have finished its bounce and stocks are returning to volatility.  Retail sales so far for Black Friday weekend (including Thanksgiving) have posted a staggering 10% drop with online sales below expectations. Chain Store sales have recently crashed 6.3% week over week.  Plunging freight rates and global shipping indicate a severe lack of global demand and a terrible sales season ahead.  Janet Yellen, ignoring all negative economic signals as predicted, has [all but declared](http://www.marketwatch.com/story/in-store-sales-decreased-104-over-black-friday-weekend-2015-12-01) a rate hike a given by Dec. 16.

I was, yet again, called crazy for this assertion by some at the time; and to be clear, I could still be wrong. The Fed could pull a fast one and not raise rates, though the rhetoric coming from the fed today almost guarantees they will take action. Not raising rates doesn’t match with their past habits; they seem to be following the timing of the taper model perfectly. The point is, despite common assumptions within the alternative media, the Fed is not “trapped” and can do whatever it wants, including killing the markets if it benefits the greater goal of a global economic authority. With the ZIRP pillar gone, expect even more violent swings in stocks and general uncertainty and panic among day-traders and the public.

**U.S. Dollar's World Reserve Status:  The Third Pillar In Progress Of Removal**

I’ve been writing about the loss of the dollar’s reserve status since 2008. And as I have always said, the removal of this final pillar is a process, not an overnight affair. The BRICS nations have been positioning themselves for years — China since 2005, the rest of the BRICS since at least 2010.

The delusion that some economic analysts have been under is that the BRICS were strategically vying for power by building their own unified banking institution in “opposition” to the IMF and the West. As I presented in my last article, this has proven to be completely false. They were in fact positioning to take their place as puppets within the new global paradigm taking shape. China has now joined the IMF’s SDR basket (as predicted); and Russia, along with the other BRICS, has openly called for the IMF to take control of the global monetary system.

China’s inclusion, I believe, will hasten the loss of the dollar’s market share of [reserve status](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-11-22/cut-oil-supply-or-drop-riyal-peg-saudis-face-critical-choice) over the next year, along with other factors. Saudi Arabia has also brought the idea of a depeg from the U.S. dollar into the mainstream discussion. This action, which mainstream economists are calling a possible Black Swan, would end the dollar’s petro-status and result in catastrophe for the U.S. economy. The removal of the final pillar is well underway.

As I have stated in the past, the U.S. system as it stands does not necessarily deserve to survive, but then again, this does not mean that it should be sacrificed in order to breathe life into the monstrosity of global economic governance. Such a trade-off only serves the interests of a select group of elites, with the global reset ending in the mechanized multicultural suicide of sovereignty, leeching prosperity from the rest of us in the name of “collective progress.” Globalists want us to believe there is no other option but their leadership, and they will create any measure of chaos in order to convince us of their necessity.

**Recent Geomagnetic Storm**

There have been many strange reports that coincide with the recent geomagnetic storm emanating from the Sun. Sounds coming from the power lines in Norway seemed to intensify as the Northern Lights got brighter and subside when the lights ebbed softer. There may be a connection between the peaks of high energy particles slamming into our upper atmosphere and the energy being picked up by the power lines, which are acting like a an antenna.

This supports my 2014 report to the NERC that solar storms threaten the power grid. Of course, they know that. But I was presenting a solution for locations connected to the power grid to survive a catastrophic failure of large, step-down transformers that make the grid’s voltage suitable for your neighborhood. These 13-14 thousand volt transformers raise the current of the high-tension power by stepping it down to local voltages. But, during a solar storm, they act as step-up transformers as the many hundred thousands of miles of wires on poles act like antennae to conduct the Sun’s power backward to the high tension lines. When those lines explode, local facilities need to keep running. The low-voltage alternatives are I proposed, but research into how to apply these technologies was rejected by the NERC and the Federal government.

Oh well. Me and may of those out there who have figured it out on their own will keep reading by electric light during the night, while hundreds of millions have to go to bed with the chickens.

**Agency Government is Now Unstoppable**

## Obama’s Agency Government has added [record levels of new regulation](http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/obama-unleashes-3853-regs-18-for-every-law-record-97110-pages-of-red-tape/article/2610592#%21) in the year 2016, with 18 regulations added for every new law, according to a new analysis by the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

Whilst Congress passed 211 laws over the course of the year, they had an accompanying 3,852 new federal regulations, costing billions of dollars in both implementation and losses to businesses. This was 443 more regulations than 2015.

There was also a record number of pages of red tape, with 97,110 pages printed on the 2016 Federal Register. However the level of regulation per new law passed is still down considerably compared to  2013, when the Obama administration introduced 3659 new regulations for just 72 new laws, a record 51 pieces of regulation for every new law.

**First to file** (FTF) and **first to invent** (FTI) are legal concepts that define who has the right to the grant of a [patent](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patent) for an [invention](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Invention). The first-to-file system is used in all countries,[[1]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_to_file_and_first_to_invent#cite_note-1) including the United States, which switched to a **first-inventor-to-file** (FITF) system on March 16, 2013 after the enactment of the [America Invents Act](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/America_Invents_Act). Canada, the Philippines, and the United States had been among the only countries to use *first-to-invent* systems, but each switched to first-to-file in 1989, 1998, and 2013 respectively.

Invention in the U.S. is generally defined to comprise two steps: (1) conception of the invention and (2) [reduction to practice](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reduction_to_practice) of the invention. When an inventor conceives of an invention and *diligently* reduces the invention to practice (by filing a patent application, by practicing the invention, etc.), the inventor's date of invention will be the date of conception. Thus, provided an inventor is diligent in actually reducing an application to practice, he or she will be the first inventor and the inventor entitled to a patent, even if another files a patent application, constructively reducing the invention to practice, before the inventor.[[6]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_to_file_and_first_to_invent#cite_note-6)

However, the first applicant to file has the [*prima facie*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prima_facie) right to the grant of a patent. Under the first-to-invent system, when two people claim the same invention, the USPTO would conduct an [interference proceeding](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interference_proceeding) between them to review evidence of conception, reduction to practice and diligence. Interference can be an expensive and time-consuming process.

The problem is that “first to file” really means, “First to write the check.” Under the original Patent law, and inventor could file his own ideas and reduce them to practice, thus protecting his ideas and ensuring he gets the credit, and the license fee, for his ideas. Under Obama, the individual inventor has been excluded from the process, unless he is already independently wealthy. The cost has go0ne from a few hundred dollars to patent to file a provisional patent, and the a few thousand more to file the utility, to tens of thousands of dollars for each patent. Add $20 thousand more to file internationally, and then an additional $2,500 for each country outside of Europe to register the patent. The typical US patent now costs about $40 thousand to file, putting is far out of reach for the average inventor. By the way, a real inventor as a lab notebook full of hundreds of ideas. A fake inventor has only one, and he stole that idea.

The record for overall new regulation is still held by George. W. Bush in 2003, who introduced 4148 new rules to improve security following the 9/11 terror attacks, 21 one pieces of regulation for every law. Even the casual observer has seen the results of that sweeping seizure of liberty and freedom. Hardly anyone even remembers when your family could follow you to the airplane door at your departure and hug you at the gate upon your return.

However, the report states that “the multiple [of number of regulations per law passed] did tend to be higher during Obama administration. Bush’s eight years averaged 20, while Obama’s almost-eight have averaged 29.”

“There’s no pattern to any of this, since the numerators and denominators can vary widely; there had been 114 laws in 2015, and a multiple of 39. The multiple can be higher with fewer laws, or with more regulations, holding the other constant. The point is that agencies do the bulk of lawmaking, no matter the party in power,” the report continued.

Throughout the election campaign, President-elect Donald Trump promised to cut taxation as well as much federal regulation that has risen under Obama. A report from the American Action Forum found that will [save the financial services industry](http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/12/05/report-trump-roll-back-1-7-billion-worth-dodd-frank-regulations/) at least $1.7 billion per year.

The globalists have an agenda. That agenda is to rule the world by law. Congress does not write law any more. Agencies do. And they are not managed by anyone, except the global corporations. Welcome to the new world order.

**Obama Flexes his Cyber Muscle by Choking Alt Media**

## Readers were unable to access the pioneering powerhouse news website Drudge Report for an hour and a half on Thursday, due to what site founder Matt Drudge says was a denial-of-service attack.

On Twitter Thursday night in the midst of the attack and shutdown, Drudge questioned whether the U.S. government might be behind the attack, which he said was the largest in the website’s history. Later, Drudge said the attack came from “thousands” of sources.

Ace investigation reporter Sharyl Attkisson responded to one of Drudge’s tweets, bringing up the fact that Drudge has been targeted by the left as a “fake news” site as part of a wider effort to censor and discredit right-of-center news organizations in the wake of the election of Donald Trump.

The disruption came the same night that the Obama administration [issued sanctions against Russia](http://www.breitbart.com/national-security/2016/12/29/obama-escalates-tensions-russia-executive-order-unproven-hacking-claims/) over unproven allegations of hacking, a claim toward which Drudge has shown skepticism.

The Drudge Report was one of the few news platforms that gave candidate Donald Trump fair coverage during the presidential primary, thereby incurring the wrath of the establishment Republicans as well as the Democrat establishment.

At press time, there was no firm confirmation of who or what caused the attack.

## There have been [more than 50 government shutdowns of the Internet in 2016](https://thewire.in/90591/governments-shut-down-internet-50-times-2016/), costing the respective countries hundreds of millions of dollars and choking citizen freedoms during crucial moments.

According to [a report from the Brookings Institute](https://www.brookings.edu/research/internet-shutdowns-cost-countries-2-4-billion-last-year/), strangling the internet cost $2.4 billion over the course of 2016. Senior Global Advocacy Manager Deji Olukotun of the [Access Now digital rights organization](https://www.accessnow.org/) believes that an even greater cost can be counted in human lives.

Olukotun says that the shutdowns “go hand in hand with atrocities,” citing the deaths of Ethiopian protesters “during the kind of blackout where it’s difficult to report on what’s happening.” Other shutdowns include communication blackouts during the Ugandan elections, and governments that chose to go so far as shutting down all Internet access just to keep students from cheating on exams.

The biggest losses are clustered near the top, with three major contenders. Conservative estimates suggest that India lost nearly a billion dollars due to its shutdowns, while Saudi Arabia managed nearly half a billion on its own. Morocco gave up $320 million.

Even governments that didn’t wall off the entirety of the Internet still blocked access to social media in some cases, and their methods have steadily become more sophisticated. As time goes on, it grows more and more difficult for citizens to find any way around restrictions on digital information.

Olukotun would like to see “telecommunications companies [push] back on government orders, or at least document them to show what’s been happening, to at least have a paper trail.” The UN’s International Telecommunications Union could also discourage such measures by shining a light on the events as they happen.

The good news is, “most governments want to expand internet access,” so that they can “participate in the global economy and be competitive.” There have been as many or more investments in expanding access to the unlimited information made available by the Internet as there have been instances of censorship.

**The Self-Driving Car: DARPA’s Weapon of the Future**

## Cybersecurity expert Jonathan Petit claims that it’s possible to confuse a self-driving car with just $43 and a laser pointer, [according to a report from Business Insider](http://uk.businessinsider.com/driverless-cars-hacking-ricks-2016-12?r=US&IR=T).

“Today’s self-driving cars rely on spinning sensors called lidar that can cost more than $10,000 each. But it took Jonathan Petit just $43 and a laser pointer to confuse and defeat them,” [proclaimed Business Insider’s Danielle Muoio](http://uk.businessinsider.com/driverless-cars-hacking-ricks-2016-12?r=US&IR=T). “When Petit attacked the lidar, he became one of the first researchers to show how easy it is to hack self-driving cars’ sensors. He was able to trick a sensor into thinking objects were there when they weren’t, and vice versa.”

“Anybody can go online and get access to this, buy it really quickly, and just assemble it, and there you go, you have a device that can spoof lidar,” [said Petit](http://uk.businessinsider.com/driverless-cars-hacking-ricks-2016-12?r=US&IR=T). “So here, you can think that the potential consequence of an attack like this could be ‘I tried to crash you into a vehicle ahead of you because I’m telling you there is no object here. So I’m making [the sensors] blind, and now your system thinks it’s free.”

Business Insider also claimed that the exploit could be used to swerve the car by tricking its security systems, consequently throwing it off the road or moving it to a quiet place convenient for criminals.

“So now you’ve changed the path of the vehicle by doing this, that’s also an impact, which means that then the risk could be ‘I’m sending you to small street to stop you and rob you or steal the car,'” Petit explained. “I indeed have the unfortunate feeling that they look at security as an add-on, which is a problem. You should use this opportunity to have security by design and not doing it after thought.”

**Movement Growing to Evict the UN**

The United States pays 22% of the total UN budget. What we get for our [$3 billion a year](http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/patrick-goodenough/us-pays-3b-un-more-185-other-countries-combined) is a corrupt organization whose dysfunctional and hostile agencies are united in opposing us around the world.

The United Nations does only two things consistently and effectively: waste money and bash Israel. Sometimes it manages to do both at the same time.

After an extended, and no doubt costly, visit to the region, the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women [blamed Muslim men beating their wives](https://www.algemeiner.com/2016/03/09/un-blames-israel-for-palestinian-men-who-beat-their-wives/) on Israeli settlements.

No wonder the UN Security Council just condemned them. Who wouldn’t rightfully be upset that Jews living in Jerusalem somehow causes poor Mohammed to batter his wife?

The Jewish State is the UN’s scapegoat for anything and everything. The Palestinian Authority blamed Israel at the UN for Global Warming. WHO denounced Israel for violating “health rights.” And even when Muslim terrorists stab Israelis, it’s still Israel’s fault.

The latest anti-Israel vote at the UN has led to calls to defund the corrupt organization which, even when it isn’t actively trying to hurt us or our allies, is making the world worse every which way it can.

Just this summer the UN admitted that it had spread cholera that killed tens of thousands in Haiti. Sexual abuse allegations against its staffers were up 25% last year. In the spring, the UN admitted that peacekeepers from three countries had raped over 100 girls in only one African country. That’s not the kind of international cooperation that any of the organization’s founders had in mind.

Here’s what we get for our $3 billion.

UNRWA schools are turning out students [who want to fight for ISIS](https://pjmedia.com/parenting/2016/06/17/think-your-kids-schools-are-bad-un-run-schools-are-teaching-kids-to-fight-for-isis/).  The UN’s email system has been used to distribute child pornography. UN staff members have smuggled drugs, attacked each other with knives and pool cues, not to mention a tractor. This month the UN marked Anti-Corruption Day despite [refusing to fight its](http://www.foxnews.com/world/2016/07/12/fraud-what-fraud-watchdogs-find-un-in-state-near-denial-about-internal-corruption.html) own corruption. The former President of the UN General Assembly was arrested on bribery charges last year. He had also headed UNICEF’s executive board. UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon is battling accusations of bribery.

Some of this might be defensible if the UN did anything useful. It doesn’t. It’s just a slush fund for redistributing our money to a vast UN bureaucracy and anyone willing to bribe it for benefits.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu responded to the UN vote by beginning the process of defunding the UN. And there’s every reason in the world for us to also stop tossing money at the United Nations.

It’s something that we and every sane country should have done decades ago. If you give money to the UN, it will end up anywhere and everywhere except where it’s supposed to go. But defunding the UN isn’t enough. There is no reason for us to remain there at all.

The United Nations has never met any of its lofty goals. During the Cold War it became a playground for the Communist powers. The USSR, the second signatory to the UN charter, helped force out the first signatory, Taiwan. Even while the treaty was being signed, it was taking over Poland, the 51st signatory.

These days, the United Nations is a forum for Islamist powers and the rotting remains of the Communist front to continue its war against the free world while seducing weak-minded nations into going along.

We are not making the world a better place by being members of this anti-American organization which vacillates between being evil and useless.

You can always count on UN peacekeeping troops to run away whenever they might be called on to use force. The head of the peacekeeping mission in South Sudan was fired by the UN for refusing to protect aid workers, including Americans, who were being raped and assaulted.

One woman, who was raped by 15 attackers, had even contacted [specific UN battalions](http://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/south-sudan-troops-raped-beat-foreigners-u-n-force-ignored-n630876). And nothing.

The UN was brought into being in the aftermath of the horrors of World War II. Instead of ending “the scourge of war,” the UN has a solid track record of uselessness and complicity in the face of genocide.

Israel was the first to alert the UN to Pol Pot’s genocide in Cambodia. But Moscow and its Syrian ally conspired to protect the Communist dictatorship. The UN did not condemn the killing. And only a generation later did it convene the Khmer Rouge Tribunal, which has been running for almost twenty years. It took ten years to arrest Brother Number Three, the Foreign Minister of the Communist terror state, whose lies the United Nations chose to believe when the butchery was taking place.

He died six years later while still on trial.

The UN has been apologizing for its non-response to the Rwandan genocide for decades. But apologizing for not doing anything is what the United Nations does best. That and condemn Israel.

Earlier this month, the UN Security Council couldn’t even manage to pass a ceasefire resolution on Syria. Venezuela, which championed the anti-Israel resolution, took time out from starving its own people to protect Assad. Why in the world would anyone take this vote, or any UN vote, seriously?

The UN’s Human Rights Council members include China, Cuba, Russia, Saudi Arabia and, of course, Venezuela. UN Women, the body dedicated to empowering women, includes China, which forces women to have abortions; Pakistan, where women can be murdered by their male relatives for marrying on their own; and Iran, where it’s practically illegal for a woman to leave the house.

The United Nations does not promote its own ideals. Or ours. Instead, it sanctimoniously violates them. Providing every brutal dictatorship with equal representation hasn’t ushered in an age of human rights. Allowing Islamic terrorists and the radical left to denounce their enemies hasn’t made the world better. And throwing $3 billion a year at the towering UN swamp on Turtle Bay only wastes our time and money.

If we want to promote human rights worldwide, the first step is real accountability. If you want a loan, don't cry to us about your poverty. Hold free and open elections. Toss away your blasphemy laws and free your political prisoners. That is a lot more likely to bring about human rights than buildings of scuttling UN bureaucrats moving around pieces of paper and dining out in posh restaurants.

The UN doesn’t share our ideals. It’s time to build our closest alliances with the countries that do.

UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has called the 2030 agenda a “Declaration of Interdependence.” We must declare our independence from the UN’s interdependency of corruption and tyranny.

We should defund and withdraw. Where quarreling diplomats once preened in the tower above Turtle Bay, seagulls will soar and young couples will walk with their children. The billions we waste on the UN will go toward taking care of our people. And once we are free of the UN, we will actually be able to promote real human rights instead of pandering to the dictators and Islamists of the United Nations.

Like the League of Nations, the United Nations is a failed experiment. The only difference is that, despite decades of wars, genocides and terror, we still haven’t pulled the plug.

Citing wasted tax dollars and attacks on the constitutionally guaranteed liberties of the American people, Rep. Mike Rogers (R-Ala.; shown) introduced a bill to restore U.S. sovereignty and withdraw from the United Nations. The effort to de-fund and exit the UN comes amid growing scrutiny of the global organization, often ridiculed as the “dictators club,” and [myriad mega-scandals swirling around it](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/africa/item/20776-whistleblower-targeted-for-exposing-un-troops-raping-children). However, despite ever-growing support in Congress for restoring U.S. sovereignty by withdrawing from the UN over the years, the legislation still faces an uphill battle.

In a [statement](http://mikerogers.house.gov/press-release/report-washington-restoring-and-protecting-american-sovereignty) last week announcing the [American Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2015 (H.R. 1205)](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/114/hr1205/text), Rep. Rogers noted that many of his constituents in East Alabama would likely agree with his position that U.S. government participation in the UN should end immediately. “The U.N. continues to prove it’s an inefficient bureaucracy and a complete waste of American tax dollars,” the congressman said, echoing widespread concerns about the international outfit expressed across America and worldwide.

“Why should the American taxpayer bankroll an international organization that works against America’s interests around the world?” asked Rep. Rogers. “The time is now to restore and protect American sovereignty and get out of the United Nations.” He cited attacks on U.S. liberties as a key motivation for the legislation.

Several other liberty-minded congressmen have also sponsored the legislation including constitutionalist Rep. Thomas Massie (R-Ky.), Rep. John Duncan (R-Tenn.), Rep. Lynn Westmoreland (R-Ga.), and Rep. Tim Huelskamp (R-Kan.). A previous bill to withdraw from the UN introduced in the last Congress by then-Rep. Paul Broun (R-Ga.) garnered nine co-sponsors. With the [regime ruling Communist China increasingly taking a leading role at the UN](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/asia/item/21025-china-staking-claim-in-the-new-world-order), among numerous other concerns, opposition to the global body is expected to continue growing.

If approved, the legislation would repeal the UN Participation Act of 1945 and shutter the U.S. government’s mission to the outfit. It would also “terminate all membership by the United States in the United Nations, and in any organ, specialized agency, commission, or other formally affiliated body of the United Nations.” That specifically includes UNESCO, which President Ronald Reagan withdrew from, along with the World Health Organization, the UN Environment Program (UNEP), and more. It would end all U.S. involvement in all UN conventions and agreements, too.

The proposed law, introduced in numerous legislative session of Congress in recent decades, would also end all funding to the UN and all of its agencies — with the estimated savings to taxpayers reaching into the billions per year, and potentially even more. The legislation also aims to end all U.S. military involvement in UN military “peacekeeping” schemes and ban U.S. troops from serving under UN command. Finally, the bill would seek to evict the UN and its [dictator-infested headquarters](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/19338-un-security-council-adds-more-tyrants) from U.S. soil. It would also ban any use of American government facilities by the global outfit, while stripping UN bureaucrats and dignitaries of diplomatic immunity.

Rep. Rogers pointed to a wide range of reasons why the U.S. should dump the UN. “Although the United States makes up almost a quarter of the U.N.’s annual budget, the U.N. has attempted a number of actions that attack our rights as U.S. citizens,” he explained. “To name a few, these initiatives include actions like the Law of the Sea Treaty, which would subject our country to internationally-based environmental mandates, costing American businesses more money, or the U.N.’s work to re-establish an international regulation regime on global warming which would heavily target our fossil fuels.”

Indeed, especially in recent years, the UN has become increasingly brazen in attacking the rights of Americans, and even the U.S. Constitution that enshrines those unalienable rights. From attacks on free speech and gun rights to assaults on America’s federalist system of government and states’ rights, the UN and its member regimes have become increasingly aggressive. Now, the UN is working on a series of major schemes that would undermine even the principles upon which the United States was founded, much of it [under the guise of promoting pseudo-human rights](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/19851-united-nations-exploits-pseudo-human-rights-to-attack-u-s) and [pseudo-environmentalism](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/13126-the-united-nations-on-the-brink-of-becoming-a-world-government).

Rep. Rogers took special aim at a [UN gun treaty that has become a lightning rod for bipartisan opposition across America](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/19486-merry-christmas-united-nations-declares-arms-trade-treaty-to-go-into-effect-dec-24). “The U.N. has also offered a potential Arms Trade Treaty which would threaten our Second Amendment rights and impose regulations on our gun manufacturers, who are already facing regulations and pressure from the Obama Administration,” Rogers explained. That treaty, ATT for short, would purport to require gun registration and eventually strict controls, with the ultimate aim of disarming civilians.

The UN’s perceived anti-Israel bias, which some critics have even dubbed systemic anti-Semitism, also attracted criticism from Rep. Rogers. “Lastly, the U.N. does not support Israel and voted to grant the Palestinian Authority ‘non-member state’ permanent observer status,” he argued. “Anyone who is not a friend to our ally Israel, is not a friend to the United States.” Even some globalist neo-con senators such as Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) have threatened the UN over its apparent hostility to Israel, and the outrage continues to grow.

For the reasons cited above, “among others,” Rep. Rogers said, he introduced the American Sovereignty Restoration Act. By introducing the bill in this session, the congressman from Alabama continues the long and valiant effort by lawmakers to get the U.S. government out of the UN. Former Rep. Ron Paul (R-Texas), a GOP presidential candidate last election and a hero of many liberty-minded and constitutionalist Americans, first introduced the bill in 1997, when it garnered 54 supporters. The next time it was voted on, support had drastically increased.

While anti-UN sentiment is fierce and growing across much of America, in Alabama, where the legislation’s lead sponsor comes from, that animosity is especially pronounced. In 2012, for example, both houses of the state legislature voted unanimously [to ban the deeply controversial UN “sustainable development” program known as Agenda 21](http://www.thenewamerican.com/tech/environment/item/11592-alabama-adopts-first-official-state-ban-on-un-agenda-21) in what was hailed as a major victory for property rights and sovereignty. Since then, [UN meddling in American affairs](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/16467-un-demands-obama-nullify-stand-your-ground-laws) has accelerated dramatically, sparking even more outrage about the global organization across Alabama and beyond.

In the U.S. Senate, pro-sovereignty sentiment is also growing. Earlier this year, Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.), a leading contender for the 2016 nomination, blasted the UN and [suggested it should be dismantled](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/19921-sen-rand-paul-would-be-happy-to-dissolve-the-un). “I dislike paying for something that two-bit Third World countries with no freedom attack us and complain about the United States,” explained the senator, who is also Ron Paul’s son. “There’s a lot of reasons why I don’t like the UN, and I think I’d be happy to dissolve it.”

The American public generally shares those sentiments, with a 2014 Gallup poll showing that a staggering 57 percent of Americans believed the UN was doing a “bad job,” versus 37 percent who thought it was doing a “good job.” More than two thirds of Americans were upset with the UN, and independents were also overwhelmingly opposed. But even among Democrats, half thought the UN was doing a bad job. The Obama administration, meanwhile, apparently out of step with the American people, has [called for drastically expanding and empowering the UN](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/17990-obama-budget-supersizes-u-s-funding-for-un-global-military) and its [scandal-plagued military forces](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/africa/item/20776-whistleblower-targeted-for-exposing-un-troops-raping-children).

The legislation to withdraw U.S. participation in the UN is currently sitting in the House Foreign Affairs Committee chaired by Rep. Edward “Ed” Royce (R-Calif.), who will play a key role in deciding whether it moves on to the full House for a vote by the American people’s elected representatives. Americans who support U.S. sovereignty and the U.S. Constitution should urge their representatives to take action.

As efforts to fully restore U.S. sovereignty proceed, though, the Republican Congress should completely de-fund the UN in the meantime. Without action, the [increasingly powerful and lawless UN](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/13126-the-united-nations-on-the-brink-of-becoming-a-world-government) will continue seeking to further empower itself at American expense — trampling on liberty and sovereignty in the process.

U.S. lawmakers and pro-Israel activists are calling for an end to American taxpayer funding of the United Nations after a [controversial UN Security Council vote declared some Israeli settlements to be illegal](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/asia/item/24937-un-resolution-on-israeli-settlements-prompts-mixed-reactions). Congress is already planning to cut the UN's funding in response to the UN scheme. The growing outrage also came from President-elect Donald Trump, who vowed that the UN situation would change once he is in the Oval Office. But other critics of the UN said defunding the “dictators club” would not be enough, and that it was past time for the U.S. government and other civilized member states to [ditch the scandal-plagued global body altogether.](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/congress/item/21058-congressman-mike-rogers-introduces-bill-to-get-u-s-out-of-un)

The most recent wave of outrage surrounding the UN came in response to UN Security Council Resolution 2334, [a deeply controversial measure](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/asia/item/24937-un-resolution-on-israeli-settlements-prompts-mixed-reactions) adopted on December 23 with 14 votes in favor and the Obama administration abstaining. Among other controversies, the measure purports to declare the Jewish presence in parts of Jerusalem and an area known to Jews as Judea and Samaria (“West Bank” to Arabs) to be a “flagrant violation” of what the UN likes to call “international law.” Basically, the UN and more than a few of its autocratic member regimes do not think Jews should be allowed to live in East Jerusalem and other areas.

Unsurprisingly, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu blasted the UN and its “shameful” resolution, vowing to ignore it and curtail relations with the governments and regimes responsible for the scheme. “Israel rejects the anti-Israel resolution at the United Nations,” Netanyahu’s office said in a statement ridiculing the UN. “Israel looks forward to working with President-elect Trump and with all our friends in Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, to negate the harmful effects of this absurd resolution.”

Trump, a longtime critic of the UN and globalism in general, was among those to speak out, albeit more mildly than on the campaign trail. “The United Nations has such great potential but right now it is just a club for people to get together, talk and have a good time. So sad!,” said Trump on social media after having previously noted that the UN was not a friend of Israel, freedom, or the United States. Unfortunately, as explained by its own founders, the UN was always designed to be progressively strengthened. And it already does much more damage than it would if it were merely a place for people to talk and have a good time at taxpayer expense. Trump sent out another statement blasting Obama and the UN, urging Israel to “stay strong” because “January 20th is fast approaching!”

But the world may not have to wait until Trump is sworn in for concrete action. Leading Democrats and Republicans alike have fervently denounced the UN and slammed the Obama administration for failing to exercise the U.S. government's veto to stop the scheme. Even ultra-far-left U.S. lawmakers slammed the UN scheme, with Congressman Eliot Engel (D-N.Y.) blasting it as “a one-sided, biased resolution.” Incoming Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.), another pro-UN globalist who also happens to be pro-Israel, blasted the UN as a “fervently anti-Israel body” that has been that way since it declared Zionism to be racism. Other Democrats also rushed to put out statements condemning the UN resolution.

Republicans — even of the globalist and neocon variety — were also furious at the UN vote. Perhaps most vocal was conservative Senator Ted Cruz (R-Texas), who is leading the charge to cut all U.S. funding to the UN. “The disgraceful anti-Israel resolution passed by the UNSC was apparently only the opening salvo in the Obama administration’s final assault on Israel,” he was quoted as saying, reminding Obama that Congress reconvenes soon and that under the U.S. Constitution, Congress controls the money. On social media, he said: “No US $ for UN until reversed.” Other GOP lawmakers agreed.

Even neocon globalist and reliable establishment figure Senator Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), who chairs the Senate appropriations subcommittee for the State Department and foreign operations, vowed to push for Congress to stop funding the UN. “The UN has made it impossible for us to continue with business as usual,” Graham said. “Almost every Republican will feel like this is a betrayal of Israel and the only response that we have is the power of purse.”

“This is a road we haven’t gone down before,” Graham was quoted as saying in media reports, adding that the UN was increasingly being viewed as anti-Semitic. “If you can’t show the American people that international organizations can be more responsible, there is going to be a break. And I am going to lead that break.” A number of other GOP senators have already pledged their support, and media reports suggested that Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) would also be on board.

Senate aides quoted in a number of media reports said a variety of options were under consideration. Among them: defunding the UN, defunding certain UN programs and policies, withdrawing from UN agencies such as the [communist-controlled UNESCO](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/23451-corrupt-communist-leads-race-for-un-boss), and even passing legislation to protect any Jews targeted by the UN who may also be American citizens. Also being considered is cutting off funds for the U.S. taxpayer-funded Palestinian Authority, and even the possibility of expelling its diplomats in the United States.

While the situation is likely to get more dramatic after Trump is sworn in, congressional officials speaking to reporters off the record said action could begin as soon as next week when lawmakers reconvene. “We will make a very strong attempt to do something immediately,” one senior GOP senate aide told the pro-Obama, pro-Clinton, pro-UN Washington Post. “It is a real moment to re-examine the relationship with the United Nations and what it really does.”

Even Israel's most vehement American critics have realized that the UN's behavior is bizarre — the UN and its various agencies have condemned Israel more often than all other governments on earth, combined. The U.S. government, of course, pays more for the UN than 185 other member governments and dictators — combined. And yet the UN, when it is not demonizing Israel, spends much of its time haranguing Americans and others to surrender their God-given rights under various guises.

From [free speech and religious freedom to gun rights and due process, the UN has become increasingly bold and vicious](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/19851-united-nations-exploits-pseudo-human-rights-to-attack-u-s) when it comes to attacking the unalienable rights enshrined in the U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights. It is also increasingly [threatening U.S. independence and self-government as it seeks to empower itself](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/23450-u-s-independence-attacked-as-never-before-by-un-interdependence) as what UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon called the “Parliament of Humanity.”

For those reasons and others, The John Birch Society, a constitutionalist group with chapters in all 50 states, has long worked to not just defund the UN, but to get the U.S. government out of the UN and the UN off U.S. soil. “For over 56 years, The John Birch Society has been warning and educating the American people of the danger called the United Nations,” JBS CEO Art Thompson said, a reference to the 56-year-old “[Get US Out of the United Nations](http://www.jbs.org/issues-pages/get-us-out)” campaign. “The recent brouhaha is only the tip of the iceberg relative to the harm that the UN has done since its very founding by those who wish to destroy the independence of the United States — indeed all nations — on the road to a one world government led by megalomaniacs.”

Other prominent commentators also referenced the JBS campaign amid the recent furor over the Israeli settlements resolution. Conservative commentator and former presidential candidate Pat Buchanan picked up on comments by senators Schumer and Graham blasting and threatening the UN to illustrate the escalating fury over the global outfit. “If the folks over at the John Birch Society still have some of those bumper stickers — Get the U.S. out of the U.N., and the U.N. out of the U.S.! — they might FedEx a batch over to Schumer and Graham,” Buchanan [quipped in his latest column](http://www.thenewamerican.com/reviews/opinion/item/24944-barack-backhands-bibi). “May have some converts here.”

More than a few other prominent conservative commentators said plans to defund the UN did not go far enough. David Greenfield at FrontPage Magazine went through a litany of UN crimes, abuses, and horrors before saying that “we and every sane country” should have defunded the UN decades ago. “If you give money to the U.N., it will end up anywhere and everywhere except where it’s supposed to go,” he continued. “But defunding the U.N. isn’t enough. There is no reason for us to remain there at all.”

He said the U.S. government should “defund and withdraw” from the scandal-plagued outfit. “The billions we waste on the U.N. will go toward taking care of our people,” he added. “And once we are free of the U.N., we will actually be able to promote real human rights instead of pandering to the dictators and Islamists of the United Nations.”

Former Senator and GOP presidential contender Rick Santorum, meanwhile, said the growing crisis in relations between the UN and the U.S. government was the perfect opportunity for those seeking to abolish the UN altogether. “This has opened up the opportunity for those of us who are very anti-U.N., who think that it has passed its prime, it’s not serving any really good purpose, it’s not helping legitimate governments around the world and it’s outlived its usefulness,” he was quoted as saying. “To the extent we can deconstruct it, the better.”

Santorum also suggested Trump's focus could now move from NATO, a UN subsidiary, to the UN itself. “The focus will come off NATO and will move squarely onto the U.N.,” Santorum explained to a pro-UN propagandist at the anti-Trump Washington Post, which claimed the U.S. was better off with a functioning UN in a propaganda piece [about the upcoming "war" between Trump and the UN](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/josh-rogin/wp/2016/12/28/inside-the-coming-war-between-the-united-states-and-the-united-nations/?utm_term=.a0c56a2ae8a3). “It’s going to be a very raucous time. Barack Obama, with this move, did more damage to the United Nations than he did to Israel.”

Conservative media outlet WND is circulating [a petition slamming the UN and calling for a U.S. withdrawal](http://www.wnd.com/wnd_petition/petition-urging-donald-trump-and-the-congress-of-the-united-states-to-withdraw-from-the-united-nations/). “It is outrageous an organization hosted on American soil, protected by American arms, funded by American tax dollars and built upon a global order sustained by the United States seemingly spends all its time attacking America and its ally Israel,” reads the petition, signed by thousands of people so far since it was published on December 27. “The United States should stand with its allies and in defense of its own principles rather than continuing to pay the bills of an organization which has all but openly declared itself an enemy both of our Republic and the besieged Jewish State.”

Writing in PJ Media, Roger Simon, co-founder of the conservative outlet, also said it was time to take on the UN. Ridiculing the UN as a “moribund center of international corruption and megaphone for tin-pot dictators,” Simon suggested that Trump could find savings to rebuild the military and U.S. infrastructure by ending funding of the “clowns” at the UN. “Although, in this case, it would be useful to negotiate the entire institution out of existence, or at least impoverish it to the degree it will have to decamp from Manhattan and leave that pricey Turtle Bay real estate for better purposes,” he said, adding that there is apparently lots of empty space in Yemen.

“I wouldn't doubt you would have all your deplorables solidly behind you in this negotiation/defunding and a lot more of the country as well, once they get full knowledge of exactly how much we're actually paying for this insanity,” Simon continued. “As with most things, they haven't been told by our media, who have no interest in informing the public on anything that might disrupt their narrative.” But the truth is getting out anyway, and the American people overwhelmingly think the UN is doing a bad job.

Even some neocons and establishment loyalists called for taking serious action against the rogue international body. Columnist and establishment talking head Charles Krauthammer, for example, a member of the globalist Council on Foreign Relations that has been instrumental in surrendering U.S. sovereignty for generations, suggested on Fox News’ “Special Report” that Trump should turn UN headquarters in New York City into condos.

“We’re paying an organization that spends half its time — more than half its time and energy and resources and bureaucracy trying to attack the only Jewish state on the planet, a tiny little spec, while genocide, mayhem, murder, terrorism is going on all over the world,” declared Krauthammer, a neocon. “It’s an obsession that to an outside a observer appears to be insane. And the rest of the time is spent undermining the United States and democracy [sic] and our allies around the world. It is an organization that exacerbates tensions, it does not assuage them.... It turned out to be a disaster.”

While stopping short of calling for an American exit (Amexit) from the UN, Krauthammer did suggest getting the UN out of the United States. “Any move to minimize our support for it, any move to get it out of the U.S. — imagine if [UN] headquarters were in Zimbabwe. The amount of weight and coverage it would get would be zero. I think that’s good real estate in downtown New York City, and Trump ought to find a way to put his name on it and turn it into condos.” Considering the UN’s three tributes to mass-murdering Cuban dictator Fidel Castro so far in the weeks after his death, Havana might make a good spot for UN headquarters as well.

With the UN, [there is much more at stake than Israeli settlements. And there are plenty of reasons](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/23450-u-s-independence-attacked-as-never-before-by-un-interdependence) to [support a U.S. government withdrawal, or an “Amexit,” from the UN](http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/north-america/item/23697-brexit-to-amexit-keep-the-momentum-going) beyond the recent resolution. Legislation to secure an Amexit, the [American Sovereignty Restoration Act](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/congress/item/21058-congressman-mike-rogers-introduces-bill-to-get-u-s-out-of-un), has been introduced in practically every Congress for decades. With lawmakers on both sides of the aisle and large swaths of the American public in outrage mode over the latest anti-Israel vote, the time has never been better to Get US Out of the United Nations. Concerned Americans should contact their elected representatives to make their feelings known.

**The Great Global Propaganda Machine**

In a type and a shadow observation, State broadcaster Central China Television has rebranded its international networks and digital presence under the name China Global Television Network as part of a push to consolidate its worldwide reach.

CCTV on Friday unveiled several new mobile apps under the CGTN brand, and visitors to CCTV's non-Chinese language websites are directed to a new http://www.cgtn.com site. The broadcaster says it made the move to "integrate resources and to adapt to the trend of media convergence," with foreign language channels, video content and digital media falling under the new group.

The broadcaster published a congratulatory letter from President Xi Jinping on Saturday urging the newly launched CGTN to "tell China's story well, spread China's voice well, let the world know a three-dimensional, colorful China, and showcase China's role as a builder of world peace."

The government has long grumbled about the Western news media's hold on international discourse and has spent vast sums in recent years to enhance its own influence and shape global opinion, with CCTV as one of its spearheads. The broadcaster has channels in English, Arabic, French, Spanish and Russian, and production centers in Washington and Nairobi.

The international-facing makeover will be extensive. CCTV's international newscasts will now carry CGTN logos, while CGTN has unveiled two new smartphone apps: one that contains mostly news articles and one for live broadcasts. CCTV's social media accounts on Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram and Tumblr — all of which are aimed at international audiences, because the platforms are all blocked inside China — have all been rebranded as CGTN.

In the past year, Xi has tightened the ruling Communist Party's control over state media outlets while re-articulating their core mission to serve as the government's mouthpiece. Xi memorably sat in the evening news anchor's chair himself during a high-profile tour of CCTV's Beijing headquarters in February when he urged journalists to ramp up their coverage of positive news and pledge complete loyalty to the party.

Major state media including CCTV and the official Xinhua News Agency have expanded aggressively in recent years with dual missions of becoming globally credible media heavyweights while sustaining their roles as vital propaganda organs of the Communist Party.

According to a 2009 South China Morning Post report, China's government planned to earmark 45 billion yuan ($6.5 billion) to help spread its message abroad. The spending was never officially confirmed, but in recent years CCTV and Xinhua have invested heavily in newsgathering and broadcasting and raising their international visibility.

In 2011, Xinhua leased a giant display in New York's Times Square that has, among other things, broadcast videos arguing China's position on the South China Sea territorial dispute.

The outlets have also deployed vast numbers of journalists to produce extensive daily reports from around the world, including from countries in the Middle East, Latin America and Africa where Western media presences are shrinking amid vanishing budgets.

Their swift inroads have at times raised concerns among some domestic media in Australia and politicians in the U.S. In early December, President Barack Obama signed into law a "counter-propaganda" bill that its sponsor, Sen. Rob Portman of Ohio, said was aimed at propaganda from "Russia, China and other nations."

The Government has Been Deploying Propaganda On U.S. Soil for Many Years as part of an intelligence agenda

The United States Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities found in 1975 that the CIA submitted stories to the American press (see video).

**Operation Mockingbird**

“After 1953, the network was overseen by Allen W. Dulles, director of the CIA. By this time, **Operation Mockingbird** had a major influence over 25 newspapers and wire agencies. The usual methodology was placing reports developed from intelligence provided by the CIA to witting or unwitting reporters. Those reports would then be repeated or cited by the preceding reporters which in turn would then be cited throughout the media wire services.

The Office of Policy Coordination (OPC) was funded by siphoning off funds intended for the Marshall Plan [i.e. the rebuilding of Europe by the U.S. after WWII]. Some of this money was used to bribe journalists and publishers.” (Wikipedia [adds details](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Mockingbird))

In 2008, the New York Times [wrote](http://papercuts.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/01/23/the-cia-and-the-culture-war/index.html?hp):

During the early years of the cold war, [prominent writers and artists, from Arthur Schlesinger Jr. to Jackson Pollock] were supported, sometimes lavishly, always secretly, by the C.I.A. as part of its propaganda war against the Soviet Union. It was perhaps the most successful use of “soft power” in American history.

A CIA operative [told](http://www.amazon.com/Katharine-Great-Graham-Washington-Empire/dp/0941781135/ref=pd_rhf_p_t_1) Washington Post editor Philip Graham … in a conversation about the willingness of journalists to peddle CIA propaganda and cover stories:

You could get a journalist cheaper than a good call girl, for a couple hundred dollars a month.

Famed Watergate reporter Carl Bernstein [wrote](http://carlbernstein.com/magazine_cia_and_media.php) in 1977:

More than 400 American journalists … in the past twenty‑five years have secretly carried out assignments for the Central Intelligence Agency, according to documents on file at CIA headquarters.

\*\*\*

In many instances, CIA documents show, journalists were engaged to perform tasks for the CIA with the consent of the managements of America’s leading news organizations.

\*\*\*

Among the executives who lent their cooperation to the Agency were [the heads of CBS, Time, the New York Times, the Louisville Courier‑Journal, and Copley News Service. Other organizations which cooperated with the CIA include [ABC, NBC, AP, UPI, Reuters], Hearst Newspapers, Scripps‑Howard, Newsweek magazine, the Mutual Broadcasting System, the Miami Herald and the old Saturday Evening Post and New York Herald‑Tribune.

\*\*\*

There is ample evidence that America’s leading publishers and news executives allowed themselves and their organizations to become handmaidens to the intelligence services. “Let’s not pick on some poor reporters, for God’s sake,” William Colby exclaimed at one point to the Church committee’s investigators. “Let’s go to the managements.

\*\*\*

The CIA even ran a formal training program in the 1950s to teach its agents to be journalists. Intelligence officers were “taught to make noises like reporters,” explained a high CIA official, and were then placed in major news organizations with help from management.

\*\*\*

Once a year during the 1950s and early 1960s, CBS correspondents joined the CIA hierarchy for private dinners and briefings.

\*\*\*

Allen Dulles often interceded with his good friend, the late Henry Luce, founder of Timeand Life magazines, who readily allowed certain members of his staff to work for the Agency and agreed to provide jobs and credentials for other CIA operatives who lacked journalistic experience.

\*\*\*

In the 1950s and early 1960s, Time magazine’s foreign correspondents attended CIA “briefing” dinners similar to those the CIA held for CBS.

\*\*\*

When Newsweek waspurchased by the Washington Post Company, publisher Philip L. Graham was informed by Agency officials that the CIA occasionally used the magazine for cover purposes, according to CIA sources. “It was widely known that Phil Graham was somebody you could get help from,” said a former deputy director of the Agency. “Frank Wisner dealt with him.” Wisner, deputy director of the CIA from 1950 until shortly before his suicide in 1965, was the Agency’s premier orchestrator of “black” operations, including many in which journalists were involved. Wisner liked to boast of his “mighty Wurlitzer,” a wondrous propaganda instrument he built, and played, with help from the press.)

\*\*\*

In November 1973, after [the CIA claimed to have ended the program], Colby told reporters and editors from the New York Times and the Washington Star that the Agency had “some three dozen” American newsmen “on the CIA payroll,” including five who worked for “general‑circulation news organizations.” Yet even while the Senate Intelligence Committee was holding its hearings in 1976, according to high‑level CIA sources, the CIA continued to maintain ties with seventy‑five to ninety journalists of every description—executives, reporters, stringers, photographers, columnists, bureau clerks and members of broadcast technical crews. More than half of these had been moved off CIA contracts and payrolls but they were still bound by other secret agreements with the Agency. According to an unpublished report by the House Select Committee on Intelligence, chaired by Representative Otis Pike, at least fifteen news organizations were still providing cover for CIA operatives as of 1976.

In 2013, the American Congress [repealed the formal ban](http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/07/14/u-s-repeals-propaganda-ban-spreads-government-made-news-to-americans/) against the deployment of propaganda against U.S. citizens living on American soil.  So there’s even less to constrain propaganda than before.

Another key to American propaganda is the constant repetition of propaganda.    As Business Insider[reported](http://www.businessinsider.com/us-domestic-propaganda-officially-aired-2013-7) in 2013:

Lt. Col. Daniel Davis, a highly-respected officer who released a [critical report regarding the distortion of truth](http://www.businessinsider.com/lieutenant-colonel-davis-blows-the-lid-off-the-official-story-on-afghanistan-2012-4?utm_source=hearst&utm_medium=referral&utm_content=allverticals) by senior military officials in Iraq and Afghanistan ….

From Lt. Col. Davis:

In context, Colonel Leap is implying we ought to change the law to enable Public Affairs officers to influence American public opinion when they deem it necessary to “protect a key friendly center of gravity, to wit US national will.”

The Smith-Mundt Modernization Act of 2012 appears to serve this purpose by allowing for the American public to be a target audience of U.S. government-funded information campaigns.

Davis also quotes Brigadier General Ralph O. Baker — the Pentagon officer responsible for the Department of Defense’s Joint Force Development — who defines [Information Operations](http://www.au.af.mil/pace/handbooks/usawc_io_primer_nov2010.pdf) (IO) as [activities undertaken](http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2011/mar/17/us-spy-operation-social-networks) to “shape the essential narrative of a conflict or situation and thus affect the attitudes and behaviors of the targeted audience.”

Brig. Gen. Baker goes on to equate descriptions of combat operations with the standard marketing strategy of repeating something until it is accepted:

For years, commercial advertisers have based their advertisement strategies on the premise that there is a **positive correlation between the number of times a consumer is exposed to product advertisement and that consumer’s inclination to sample the new product. The very same principle applies to how we influence our target audiences when we conduct COIN**.

And those **“thousands of hours per week of government-funded radio and TV programs” appear to serve Baker’s strategy**, which states: **“Repetition is a key tenet of IO execution, and the failure to constantly drive home a consistent message dilutes the impact on the target audiences.”**

or decades, a so-called anti-propaganda law prevented the U.S. government’s mammoth broadcasting arm from delivering programming to American audiences. But on July 2, that came silently to an end with the implementation of a new reform passed in January. The result: an unleashing of thousands of hours per week of government-funded radio and TV programs for domestic U.S. consumption in a reform [initially criticized as a green light for U.S. domestic propaganda efforts](http://www.buzzfeed.com/mhastings/congressmen-seek-to-lift-propaganda-ban). So what just happened?

Until this month, a vast ocean of U.S. programming produced by the Broadcasting Board of Governors such as Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks could only be viewed or listened to at broadcast quality in foreign countries. The programming varies in tone and quality, but its breadth is vast: It’s viewed in more than 100 countries in 61 languages. The topics covered include human rights abuses in Iran, self-immolation in Tibet, human trafficking across Asia, and on-the-ground reporting in Egypt and Iraq.

The restriction of these broadcasts was due to the Smith-Mundt Act, a long-standing piece of legislation that has been amended numerous times over the years, perhaps most consequentially by Arkansas Senator J. William Fulbright. In the 1970s, Fulbright was no friend of VOA and Radio Free Europe, and moved to restrict them from domestic distribution, [saying](http://mountainrunner.us/2012/02/history_of_smith-mundt/#.UeBLBD4wY0I) they "should be given the opportunity to take their rightful place in the graveyard of Cold War relics." Fulbright’s amendment to Smith-Mundt was bolstered in 1985 by Nebraska Senator Edward Zorinsky, who argued that such "propaganda" should be kept out of America as to [distinguish](http://mountainrunner.us/2012/02/history_of_smith-mundt/#.UeBLBD4wY0I) the U.S. "from the Soviet Union where domestic propaganda is a principal government activity."

Zorinsky and Fulbright sold their amendments on sensible rhetoric: American taxpayers shouldn’t be funding propaganda for American audiences. So did Congress just tear down the American public’s last defense against domestic propaganda?

BBG spokeswoman Lynne Weil insists BBG is not a propaganda outlet, and its flagship services such as VOA "present fair and accurate news."

"They don’t shy away from stories that don’t shed the best light on the United States," she told *The Cable*. She pointed to the [charters](http://www.bbg.gov/our-mission/) of VOA and RFE: "Our journalists provide what many people cannot get locally: uncensored news, responsible discussion, and open debate."

A former U.S. government source with knowledge of the BBG says the organization is no *Pravda*, but it does advance U.S. interests in more subtle ways. In Somalia, for instance, VOA serves as counterprogramming to outlets peddling anti-American or jihadist sentiment. "Somalis have three options for news," the source said, "word of mouth, al-Shabab, or VOA Somalia."

This partially explains the push to allow BBG broadcasts on local radio stations in the United States. The agency wants to reach diaspora communities, such as St. Paul, Minnesota’s significant Somali [expat](https://sites.google.com/a/macalester.edu/refugees/somalis) community. "Those people can get al-Shabab, they can get Russia Today, but they couldn’t get access to their taxpayer-funded news sources like VOA Somalia," the source said. "It was silly."

Lynne added that the reform has a transparency benefit as well. "Now Americans will be able to know more about what they are paying for with their tax dollars — greater transparency is a win-win for all involved," she said. And so with that we have the [Smith-Mundt Modernization Act of 2012](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-112hr5736ih/pdf/BILLS-112hr5736ih.pdf), which passed as part of the 2013 National Defense Authorization Act, and went into effect this month.

But if anyone needed a reminder of the dangers of domestic propaganda efforts, the past 12 months provided ample reasons. Last year, two *USA Today* journalists were [ensnared](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/story/2012-04-19/vanden-brook-locker-propaganda/54419654/1) in a propaganda campaign after reporting about millions of dollars in back taxes owed by the Pentagon’s top propaganda contractor in Afghanistan. Eventually, one of the co-owners of the firm [confessed](http://gawker.com/5913166/propaganda-contractor-admits-to-running-smear-campaign-against-usa-today-reporters) to creating phony websites and Twitter accounts to smear the journalists anonymously. Additionally, just this month, the *Washington Post* [exposed](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/somali-american-caught-up-in-a-shadowy-pentagon-counterpropaganda-campaign/2013/07/07/b3aca190-d2c5-11e2-bc43-c404c3269c73_story.html) a counter-propaganda program by the Pentagon that recommended posting comments on a U.S. website run by a Somali expat with readers opposing al-Shabab. "Today, the military is more focused on manipulating news and commentary on the Internet, especially social media, by posting material and images without necessarily claiming ownership," reported the *Post*.

But for BBG officials, the references to Pentagon propaganda efforts are nauseating, particularly because the Smith-Mundt Act never had anything to do with regulating the Pentagon, a fact that was misunderstood in media reports in the run-up to the passage of new Smith-Mundt reforms in January.

One example included a [report](http://foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/05/23/much_ado_about_state_department_propaganda) by the late *BuzzFeed* reporter Michael Hastings, who suggested that the Smith-Mundt Modernization Act would open the door to Pentagon propaganda of U.S. audiences. In fact, as amended in 1987, the act only covers portions of the State Department engaged in public diplomacy abroad (i.e. the public diplomacy section of the "R" bureau, and the Broadcasting Board of Governors.)

But the news circulated regardless, much to the displeasure of Rep. Mac Thornberry (R-TX), a sponsor of the Smith-Mundt Modernization Act of 2012. "To me, it’s a fascinating case study in how one blogger was pretty sloppy, not understanding the issue and then it got picked up by *Politico*‘s Playbook, and you had one level of sloppiness on top of another," [Thornberry told](http://foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/05/23/much_ado_about_state_department_propaganda) *The Cable* last May. "And once something sensational gets out there, it just spreads like wildfire."

**The Smith-Mundt Modernization Act**

The **U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948** (Public Law 80-402), popularly called the **Smith–Mundt Act**, specifies the terms in which the United States government can engage global audiences, also known as [propaganda](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Propaganda). The act was first introduced as the Bloom Bill in December 1945 in the 79th [Congress](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Congress) and subsequently passed by the 80th [Congress](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Congress) and signed into law by President [Harry S. Truman](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_S._Truman) on January 27, 1948.

The [National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Defense_Authorization_Act_for_Fiscal_Year_2013) (section 1078 (a)) amended the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 and the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1987, allowing for materials produced by the State Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) to be released within United States borders for the Archivist of the United States.

The original legislation authorizes the [U.S. State Department](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Department_of_State) to communicate to audiences outside of the borders of the United States through [broadcasting](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Broadcasting), face-to-face contacts, exchanges (including educational, cultural, and technical), online activities, the publishing of books, magazines, and other media of communication and engagement. Funding for these activities comes from other legislation passed by the U.S. Congress called [appropriations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Appropriation_%28law%29).

The legislation was introduced in the [House Committee on Foreign Affairs](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_House_Committee_on_Foreign_Affairs) in October 1945 at the request of the State Department. It passed the committee onto the floor of the House of Representatives and became known as the Bloom Bill after the committee's chairman, Rep. [Sol Bloom](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sol_Bloom) (D-NY). The purpose was to make permanent various information and exchange activities that began as early as a decade before, including the [*Voice of America*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voice_of_America) radio broadcasts that began in 1942. The bill was to make permanent global engagement. On the cultural side, the so-called "slow" communications, it reintroduced cultural programming Bloom had attempted to pass the year before. On the "fast" side of communications, it would provide legislative approval for a new peacetime instrument of [foreign policy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_policy).

The shift from wartime to peacetime "[propaganda](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Propaganda)" operations was not taken lightly by Congress, especially with fresh memories of President [Woodrow Wilson](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Woodrow_Wilson)’s [Committee on Public Information](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Committee_on_Public_Information) (CPI), President [Franklin D. Roosevelt](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Franklin_D._Roosevelt)’s [Office of War Information](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Office_of_War_Information) (OWI), and the [Nazi propaganda](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Propaganda_in_Nazi_Germany) machine, but there were other, deeper concerns on which Congress focused.

Now, the [Smith-Mundt Modernization Act of 2012](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-112hr5736ih/pdf/BILLS-112hr5736ih.pdf) (part of the [National Defense Authorization Act](https://www.techdirt.com/blog/?tag=ndaa)) has repealed the domestic prohibition, allowing the government's broadcasting to be directed at/created for Americans for the first time in over 40 years.   
  
BBG spokesperson Lynne Weil says these efforts aren't simply pro-government hype machines.

*"They don't shy away from stories that don't shed the best light on the United States," she told The Cable. She pointed to the charters of VOA and RFE: "Our journalists provide what many people cannot get locally: uncensored news, responsible, discussion, and open debate."*   
  
*A former U.S. government source with knowledge of the BBG says the organization is no Pravda, but it does advance U.S. interests in more subtle ways. In Somalia, for instance, VOA serves as counterprogramming to outlets peddling anti-American or jihadist sentiment. "Somalis have three options for news," the source said, "word of mouth, Al-Shabaab or VOA Somalia."*

As Weil points out, this will bring a new level of transparency to the BBG as communicating *to* Americans is no longer prohibited. If nothing else, transcripts of BBG programming will be easier for Americans to get ahold of. [A court ruled in 1998](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smith%E2%80%93Mundt_Act#Recent_Interpretations) that the limitations of the Smith-Mundt Act exempted the Voice of America from releasing transcripts in response to FOIA requests.   
  
Another possible plus is the fact that the BBG will provide a free, "local" news source for immigrant populations.

*The agency wants to reach diaspora communities, such as St. Paul Minnesota's significant Somali expat community. "Those people can get Al-Shabaab, they can get Russia Today, but they couldn't get access to their taxpayer-funded news sources like VOA Somalia," the source said.*

These positives aside, the thought of a state-run news agency being allowed to direct its efforts at Americans is still uncomfortable. Despite claims of independence, it's hard to believe the source is 100% trustworthy when its stated purpose is to run flack for the State Department in foreign nations. (Of course, the mainstream media outlets haven't shown much reluctance to regurgitate talking points, which almost makes the BBG's efforts seem redundant.)   
  
While the BBG may provide a less-biased source of news for many foreigners (or at least provide a *different* bias), the purpose of its broadcasts to its new American audience is less clear. The fact that the State Department is behind the effort doesn't do much to allay fears that the BBG will become a tool of domestic propaganda. The State Department's reaction to the leak of diplomatic correspondence by Wikileaks was to block its [employees' access](https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20101206/17104312150/defense-department-blocking-any-website-with-wikileaks-title.shtml) to the site (or any site containing the word "Wikileaks") and demand the digital documents [be "returned."](https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20101208/09012712186/state-department-once-again-asks-wikileaks-to-return-leaked-cables.shtml) How will a state-run press react to developments like these? Will it be forced to play by the department's rules, no matter how illogical, or will it be able to deal with them in a more forthright manner?   
  
In a time where the administration seems to be forced to [play defense](https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130523/18225323199/president-obama-is-troubled-about-chilling-effects-his-own-administration-is-causing-to-journalism.shtml) with increasing frequency, it's hard to believe it won't be willing to exploit this addition to its PR arsenal.