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| Jihad Report Sep 16, 2017 -Sep 22, 2017  |
| Attacks | 37  |
| Killed | 206  |
| Injured | 243  |
| Suicide Blasts | 4  |
| Countries | 8 |

**The Glacier Growth in Montana**

Glacier National Park (GNP) straddles the continental divide along Montana’s border with Canada.  Ever since Al Gore’s 2006 film, “*An Inconvenient Truth*,” the Park has been seen as ground zero in the international battle over manmade global warming.  Almost every major figure promoting apocalyptic-manmade-global-warming-by-CO2 hysteria has made a publicized visit to the Park.

Today’s visitors to GNP are met with a steady stream of climate-change messaging.  Official Park literature claims that all glaciers in GNP are predicted to melt away by the year 2030.  (Some signs even tell visitors that the glaciers may be gone by 2020.)



A recurring trick by climate hysterics is to show an old photograph of one of GNP’s glaciers next to a more recent photo of the same glacier showing a massive decrease in size.  Often the pictures do not precisely specify what calendar dates the photos were taken on.  This is significant because the melting season is quite short and rapid, and an image from August can be starkly different from an image from just weeks earlier.

The average date of first freeze in East Glacier, Montana is September 13th.  It is only then that one can assess whether the glaciers are getting bigger or smaller than in previous years.

In September 2015, Lysander Spooner University launched an annual research project aimed at visiting GNP’s glaciers every year at their lowest points.  This year a small group of us opted to hike to the popular Grinnell Glacier and take a few snapshots on September 16.  We hiked the 5.5 miles from the Many Glacier Hotel and arrived at glacier’s edge late in the afternoon.



The Grinnell is perhaps the most iconic of two dozen named glaciers in the Park.  Untold thousands of people have hiked to it.  Millions more have been exposed to government imagery of the Glacier melting away.  The nearby Many Glacier Hotel features pictures on its walls showing the Grinnell’s decline from the 1880s to 2008.  Numerous blog posts and magazine feature stories have also addressed this theme.





Upon our return to the Hotel after visiting the Glacier, we noticed that our brand-new photos appear to show that the Grinnell Glacier has grown slightly from the 2008 images that are displayed on the Hotel walls.  There has been no reporting of this in any newspaper or broadcast that we know of.  (In fact, all news coverage reports the precise opposite.)  The smaller Gem Glacier—which is visible from the valley miles below—also appears to be slightly larger than it is shown in 2008 pictures on display.

We did not have enough people this year to trek to other glaciers.  However we will return to GNP in September 2018 for more critical glacier research.

**Drone Wars Update**

The Air Force is aggressively accelerating its hypersonic weapons development effort, following findings from a recent service report identifying Russian and Chinese ongoing hypersonic weapons testing.

A recent Air Force Studies Board report identified that the U.S. is not alone in its quest for this increased speed, an Air Force statement said.

The statement went on to say that China and Russia are already flight testing hypersonic weapons, and several other countries have shown interest in pursuing many of the underlying technologies for hypersonic flight.

“We must push the boundaries of technology in every area," Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. David L. Goldfein said in a statement. "Our adversaries aren’t standing still. They are looking for every advantage they can get.”    ([Air Force Story HERE](http://www.af.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/1177338/accelerating-hypersonics-development/))

While expressing growing concern about Russian and Chinese hypersonic weapons progress, US developers have been progressing with hypersonic flight and hypersonic weapons possibilities for several years.

Describing the trajectory of hypersonic technology in terms of “stair steps,” Air Force Chief Scientist Geoffrey Zacharias said incremental progress will require decades of continued technological development.

While unmanned hypersonic surveillance flight is on track for the 2030s, launching recoverable hypersonic drones is not expected be possible until the 2040s, Zacharias said in an interview with Scout Warrior.

Air Force weapons developers expect to operate hypersonic intelligence, reconnaissance and surveillance drones by the 2040s, once scientific progress with autonomy and propulsion technology matures to a new level.

The advent of using a recoverable drone platform able to travel at high altitudes, faster than Mach 5, will follow the emergence of hypersonic weapons likely to be operational in the mid-2020s.

By the 2040s, however, the Air Force could very well have a hypersonic “strike” ISR platform able to both conduct surveillance and delivery weapons, he added.

**Hypersonic Weapons Technology**

Since hypersonic vehicles can travel in a parabola-type flight path, they rise very high up into the atmosphere to reach hypersonic speeds before returning to lower altitudes.

Developing recoverable drones is much more challenging given the level of autonomy and re-entry needed for hypersonic vehicles to descend and perform ISR missions.

“A booster sends it into the atmosphere and then it dives down to its target,” Zacharias said. “A re-entry vehicle would need to be maneuverable with sufficient wing area so it can avoid counter-missiles. We need to design that chamber and make it stable to allow for maneuver.”

The advantages of hypersonic ISR drone flight are multi-faceted.

“You could fuel one of these to go for 1,000 miles in ten minutes. It speeds up the kill chain,” he said.

While today's cruise missiles travel at speeds up to 600 miles per hour, hypersonic weapons will be able to reach speeds of Mach 5 to Mach 10, Air Force officials said.

A weapon traveling at hypersonic speeds, naturally, would better enable offensive missile strikes to destroy targets such as enemy ships, buildings, air defenses and even drones and fixed-wing or rotary aircraft depending upon the guidance technology available.

Last year, the Air Force launched several hypersonic speed “test flights” as part of a joint program with Australia.

Some of the remaining scientific challenges to sustaining hypersonic drone flight include developing an ability for vehicles to operate at very high temperatures, Zacharias said.

The Air Force will likely have high-speed, long-range and deadly hypersonic weapons by the 2020s, providing kinetic energy destructive power able to travel thousands of miles toward enemy targets at five-times the speed of sound.

“Air speed makes them much more survivable and hard to shoot down. If you can put enough fuel in them that gets them a good long range. You are going roughly a mile a second so if you put in 1,000 seconds of fuel you can go 1,000 miles - so that gives you lots of standoff capability,” Zacharias said.

While much progress has been made by Air Force and Pentagon scientists thus far, much work needs to be done before hypersonic air vehicles and weapons are technologically ready to be operational in combat circumstances.

“Right now we are focusing on technology maturation so all the bits and pieces, guidance, navigation control, material science, munitions, heat transfer and all that stuff,” Zacharias added.

A super high-speed drone or ISR platform would better enable air vehicles to rapidly enter and exit enemy territory and send back relevant imagery without being detected by enemy radar or shot down.

A weapon traveling at hypersonic speeds, naturally, would better enable offensive missile strikes to destroy targets such and enemy ships, buildings, air defenses and even drones and fixed-wing or rotary aircraft depending upon the guidance technology available.



A key component of this is the fact that weapons traveling at hypersonic speeds would present serious complications for targets hoping to defend against them – they would have only seconds with which to respond or defend against an approaching or incoming attack.

Hypersonic weapons will quite likely be engineered as “kinetic energy” strike weapons, meaning they will not use explosives but rather rely upon sheer speed and the force of impact to destroy targets.

“They have great kinetic energy to get through hardened targets. You could trade off smaller munitions loads for higher kinetic energy. It is really basically the speed and the range. Mach 5 is five times the speed of sound,” he explained.

The speed of sound can vary, depending upon the altitude; at the ground level it is roughly 1,100 feet per second. Accordingly, if a weapon is engineered with 2,000 seconds worth of fuel – it can travel up to 2,000 miles to a target.

“If you can get control at a low level and hold onto Mach 5, you can do pretty long ranges,” Zacharias said.

Although potential defensive uses for hypersonic weapons, interceptors or vehicles are by no means beyond the realm of consideration, the principle effort at the moment is to engineer offensive weapons able to quickly destroy enemy targets at great distances.

Lockheed Martin

Some hypersonic vehicles could be developed with what Zacharias called “boost glide” technology, meaning they fire up into the sky above the earth’s atmosphere and then utilize the speed of decent to strike targets as a re-entry vehicle.

For instance, Zacharias cited the 1950s-era experimental boost-glide vehicle called the X-15 which aimed to fire 67-miles up into the sky before returning to earth.

**China’s Hypersonic Weapons Tests**

Zacharias did respond to recent news about China’s claimed test of a hypersonic weapon, a development which caused concern among Pentagon leaders and threat analysts.

While some Pentagon officials have said the Chinese have made progress with effort to develop hypersonic weapons, Zacharias emphasized that much of the details regarding this effort were classified and therefore not publically available.

Nevertheless, should China possess long-range, high-speed hypersonic weapons – it could dramatically impact circumstances known in Pentagon circles and anti-access/area denial.

This phenomenon, referred to at A2/AD, involves instances wherein potential adversaries use long-range sensors and precision weaponry to deny the U.S. any ability to operate in the vicinity of some strategically significant areas such as closer to an enemy coastline. Hypersonic weapons could hold slower-moving Navy aircraft carriers at much greater risk, for example.

An April 27th report last year in the Washington Free Beach cited Pentagon officials stating that China successfully tested a new high-speed maneuvering warhead.

“The test of the developmental DF-ZF hypersonic glide vehicle was monitored after launch Friday atop a ballistic missile fired from the Wuzhai missile launch center in central China, said officials familiar with reports of the test,” the report from the Washington Free Beacon said. “The maneuvering glider, traveling at several thousand miles per hour, was tracked by satellites as it flew west along the edge of the atmosphere to an impact area in the western part of the country.”

**X-51 Waverider**

Scientists with the Air Force Research Laboratory and the Pentagon's research arm are working to build a new hypersonic air vehicle that can travel at speeds up to Mach 5 while carrying guidance systems and other materials.

Air Force senior officials have said the service wants to build upon the successful hypersonic flight test of the X-51 Waverider 60,000 feet above the Pacific Ocean in May of 2013.

The Air Force and DARPA, the Pentagon's research entity, plan to have a new and improved hypersonic air vehicle by 2023.

The X-51 was really a proof of concept test designed to demonstrate that a scram jet engine could launch off an aircraft and go hypersonic.



The scramjet was able to go more than Mach 5 until it ran out of fuel. It was a very successful test of an airborne hypersonic weapons system, Air Force officials said.

The successful test was particularly welcome news for Air Force developers because the X-51 Waverider had previously had some failed tests.

The 2013 test flight, which wound up being the longest air-breathing hypersonic flight ever, wrapped up a $300 million technology demonstration program beginning in 2004, Air Force officials said.

A B-52H Stratofortress carried the X-51A on its wing before it was released at 50,000 feet and accelerated up to Mach 4.8 in 26 seconds. As the scramjet climbed to 60,000 feet it accelerated to Mach 5.1.

The X-51 was also able to send back data before crashing into the ocean -- the kind of information now being used by scientists to engineer a more complete hypersonic vehicle.

"After exhausting its 240-second fuel supply, the vehicle continued to send back telemetry data until it splashed down into the ocean and was destroyed as designed," according to an Air Force statement at the time. "At impact, 370 seconds of data were collected from the experiment."

This Air Force the next-generation effort is not merely aimed at creating another scramjet but rather engineering a much more comprehensive hypersonic air vehicle, service scientists have explained.

Hypersonic flight requires technology designed to enable materials that can operate at the very high temperatures created by hypersonic speeds. They need guidance systems able to function as those speeds as well, Air Force officials have said.

The new air vehicle effort will progress alongside an Air Force hypersonic weapons program. While today's cruise missiles travel at speeds up to 600 miles per hour, hypersonic weapons will be able to reach speeds of Mach 5 to Mach 10, Air Force officials said.

The new air vehicle could be used to transport sensors, equipment or weaponry in the future, depending upon how the technology develops.

Also, Pentagon officials have said that hypersonic aircraft are expected to be much less expensive than traditional turbine engines because they require fewer parts.

For example, senior Air Force officials have said that hypersonic flight could speed up a five- hour flight from New York to Los Angeles to about 30 minutes. That being said, the speed of acceleration required for hypersonic flight may preclude or at least challenge the scientific possibility of humans being able to travel at that speed – a question that has yet to be fully determined.

**Mattis Hints at Using Kinetic Weapons Against Little Kim**

U.S. Defense Secretary Jim Mattis [hinted](https://amp.businessinsider.com/mattis-secret-military-options-for-north-korea-2017-9) at using a kinetic weapon on Tuesday while discussing tensions with North Korea when he made a Freudian slip.

Mattis was asked whether there was “any military option the US can take with North Korea that would not put Seoul at grave risk,” Mattis responded, “Yes, there are, but I will not go into details.”

Later during the press conference, another reporter questioned Mattis and caught him off-guard:

“Just to clarify, you said that there were possible military options that would not create a grave risk to Seoul,” a reporter asked. “Are we talking kinetic options as well?”

“Yes, I don’t want to go into that,” Mattis responded.

Previously, Mattis stated that a war with North Korea would “involve the massive shelling of an ally’s capital, (South Korea) which is one of the most densely packed cities on earth.”

U.S. President Donald Trump in a speech to the United Nations on Tuesday [threatened](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/trump-threatens-totally-destroy-north-korea-first-u-n-speech-n802596) to “totally destroy North Korea” if Pyongyang didn’t quit its nuclear testing and threats.

This also comes after the U.S. and South Korea wrapped up its [annual military drill](https://www.activistpost.com/2017/08/u-s-south-korea-stage-huge-military-exercise-today-despite-tensions.html) harassing of North Korea, reminding the dictatorship of its military presence at its southern border.

In 2015, the U.S. Air Force [confirmed](https://www.digitaltrends.com/cool-tech/us-air-force-confirms-boeings-electromagnetic-pulse-weapon/) that military contractor Boeing has an electromagnetic pulse weapon, which is capable of targeting and destroying electrical systems without the collateral damage of killing people. It’s essentially an EMP that takes out the power grid of a given area.

The project is known as the “[CHAMP,](http://www.fool.com/investing/general/2015/05/24/boeing-unveils-electromagnetic-pulse-weapon.aspx)” or Counter-electronics High-powered Microwave Advanced Missile Project, and it already has been operational since 2015, [according](http://www.fool.com/investing/general/2015/05/24/boeing-unveils-electromagnetic-pulse-weapon.aspx) to Air Force Research Laboratory commander Major General Tom Masiello.

In January, Trump’s Air Force chief of staff revealed to *USA TODAY* that the U.S. President could use “space weapons against ISIS.”

“If we want to be more agile than the reality is we are going to have to push decision authority down to some lower levels in certain areas the big question that we’ve got to wrestle with … is the authorities to operate in cyber and space,” General David Goldfein, the Air Force chief of staff, told [*USA TODAY.*](http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2017/01/02/military-air-force-cyber-space-weapons-islamic-state/95970438/)

However, the U.S. also has other kinetic weapons in its arsenal that would allow Trump to “totally destroy North Korea” — one of weapons system is the “Rods from God.”

What is the Rods from God? The “Rods from God” is a part of the directed energy weapon family; it’s a kinetic energy weapon.

The rods are directed munitions, the higher you are (the greater your distance from the planet), the greater the kinetic energy you have, to an asymptote.

In 2004, published in *Popular Science*, Eric Adams [writes](http://www.popsci.com/scitech/article/2004-06/rods-god):

A pair of satellites orbiting several hundred miles above the Earth would serve as a weapons system. One functions as the targeting and communications platform while the other carries numerous tungsten rods–up to 20 feet in length and a foot in diameter–that it can drop on targets with less than 15 minutes’ notice. When instructed from the ground, the targeting satellite commands its partner to drop one of its darts. The guided rods enter the atmosphere, protected by a thermal coating, traveling at 36,000 feet per second–comparable to the speed of a meteor. The result: complete devastation of the target, even if it’s buried deep underground. The two-platform configuration permits the weapon to be “reloaded” by just launching a new set of rods, rather than replacing the entire system.



The concept of developing kinetic energy weapons has been around since the 1950s when the RAND Corporation proposed placing rods on tips of ICBMs, although the Pentagon won’t say how far along the research is, or even confirm that any efforts exist, citing those details as classified. The “[U.S. Air Force Transformation Flight Plan](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/af/af_trans_flightplan_nov03.pdf),” published by the Air Force in November 2003, references “hypervelocity rod bundles” in its outline of future space-based weapons; and, in 2002, another report from RAND, [“Space Weapons, Earth Wars,”](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/2011/RAND_MR1209.pdf) talks about the effectiveness of such a weapon.

A space weapons agreement was proposed by Rep Dennis Kucinich called the [“Space Preservation Treaty”](https://www.congress.gov/bill/109th-congress/house-bill/2420)  in 2005 which states that countries won’t seek to weaponize space. However, that bill never made it past the introduction stage. Another House of Representatives bill known as the [H.R.2977 “Space Preservation Act”](https://fas.org/sgp/congress/2001/hr2977.html) was proposed in 2001 to ban the use of “exotic weapons” listing the following:

(B) Such terms include exotic weapons systems such as —  (i) electronic, psychotronic, or information weapons; (ii) chemtrails; (iii) high altitude ultra low frequency weapons systems; (iv) plasma, electromagnetic, sonic, or ultrasonic weapons; (v) laser weapons systems; (vi) strategic, theater, tactical, or extraterrestrial weapons; and (vii) chemical, biological, environmental, climate, or tectonic weapons.

Obama violated this agreement under the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act before leaving office, and no one noticed that the legislation he signed is essentially the [Star Wars Defense Initiative II](http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2016-12-24/while-blaming-trump-arms-race-obama-signs-momentous-star-wars-ii-defense-bill) that his predecessor, Ronald Reagan, signed calling for a space-based missile system.

**The Obama Wiretap Scandal May Slaughter the Golden Calf**

Over the years, a curious habit has taken hold at the United Nations. A body designed to strengthen the best of humanity has too often become a font of doublespeak and appeasement that protects the worst of humanity.

That tragic comity was shattered when President Trump played the skunk at the garden party and [dared to tell the truth](http://nypost.com/2017/09/19/tough-proud-and-honest-trump-at-the-un/). Many truths, in fact.

Among them, that Islamic terrorism is a scourge that must be stopped. That Iran is [controlled by a “murderous regime”](http://nypost.com/2017/09/19/trump-hints-at-possible-withdraw-from-iran-nuclear-deal/) bent on getting nukes.

That North Korea’s “Rocket Man is on a suicide mission” and the United States “will have no choice but to totally destroy” that country [if war begins](http://nypost.com/2017/09/19/trump-tells-un-that-us-is-prepared-to-totally-destroy-north-korea/). And that socialism and communism have failed everywhere, including Cuba and Venezuela.

The delegates and heads of state got The Full Trump, including what it means to put America First. It was the president’s finest, most complete expression of his worldview and, thankfully, contained no apologies for American power or history.

Yet even as Trump spoke, a threat to his presidency gained new steam. Reports that special counsel Robert Mueller had [wiretapped former Trump campaign boss Paul Manafort](http://nypost.com/2017/09/18/fbi-allegedly-wiretapped-paul-manafort-before-after-election/) and plans to indict him sent Washington into a new tizzy of speculation.

[According to CNN](http://www.cnn.com/2017/09/18/politics/paul-manafort-government-wiretapped-fisa-russians/index.html?adkey=bn), which first carried the wiretapping report, Manafort was surveilled under a FISA warrant, meaning the FBI suspected he was operating as a foreign agent. The network said it is possible G-men listened to the president talking to Manafort because the wiretap continued into this year and Trump and Manafort often talked in 2017.

**[FBI allegedly wiretapped Paul Manafort before, after election](http://nypost.com/2017/09/18/fbi-allegedly-wiretapped-paul-manafort-before-after-election/)**

If so, that would mark an infamous history — an American president being overheard by secret agents of his own government.

It would also be additional support for Trump’s charge that former President Barack Obama “had my ‘wires tapped’ in Trump Tower just before the victory.”

It was in March when Trump [made that explosive claim](http://nypost.com/2017/03/04/trump-accuses-obama-of-having-wires-tapped-in-trump-tower/), and the Democratic media rushed to denounce him [even before Obama did](http://nypost.com/2017/03/04/obama-responds-to-trumps-wiretapping-claim/). Subsequent denials from then-FBI boss James Comey and other Obama aides all were rock-solid in declaring that no such thing had happened. There was no wiggle room in their denials, some of which were made under oath before Congress.

But something certainly happened. And what if it was the worst imaginable something? What if the Republican candidate for president was put under surveillance by a Democratic administration that was trying to elect another Democrat?

There was reason to suspect that was true before the Manafort reports added fuel to the fire.

Recall that, starting last fall, continuing throughout the transition and into the early months of the administration, much of the media was obsessed with the narrative that “Russia hacked the election and Trump colluded.”

It was a feeding frenzy of reports naming various Trump associates who had any contacts with Russians. It was guilt by association, all based on leaks of classified secrets that originated either in law enforcement or intelligence agencies, or the Obama White House.

[As I wrote back in April](http://nypost.com/2017/04/11/trump-were-not-going-into-syria/), at least six people from the campaign, including Trump himself, were identified in various reports as having been picked up in intercepted communications.

Always, the reports insisted that the Americans were not the targets of the surveillance, that they were “incidentally” picked up while talking to targets.

Those six included Gen. Mike Flynn, Trump’s first national security adviser, then-Senator and now-Attorney General Jeff Sessions and Jared Kushner.

Another [was Carter Page](http://nypost.com/2017/04/11/fbi-reportedly-probed-ex-trump-aide-carter-page-during-campaign/), briefly a Trump adviser, and Manafort.

But since then, media reports say that Page was, in fact, being surveilled under a FISA warrant. And now we learn that Manafort was, too.

So those initial reports about the Trumpsters being “incidentally” picked up were wrong. Fake news, you might say, because Manafort and Page were FBI targets whose communications were being intercepted — and the media’s sources had to have known that.

That the public has been lied to repeatedly is beyond doubt. Recall also that Susan Rice, Obama’s last national security adviser, initially claimed in interviews to know nothing about the [“unmasking” of Americans whose names were picked up in intercepted calls](http://nypost.com/2017/04/03/susan-rice-tried-to-unmask-trump-associates-in-intelligence-reports/).

**[Susan Rice explains why she 'unmasked' senior Trump officials](http://nypost.com/2017/09/13/susan-rice-explains-why-she-unmasked-senior-trump-officials/)**

But before Congress, she told a different tale — about needing to know who in Trump’s circle met with a visiting official from the United Arab Emirates, and so [she “unmasked” their names](http://nypost.com/2017/09/13/susan-rice-explains-why-she-unmasked-senior-trump-officials/).

Thus, skepticism is required over her insistence that she knows nothing about how those names were then leaked to the media, which could be a felony.

And we still don’t know why Samantha Power, Obama’s UN ambassador, frequently requested the names of Americans picked up in foreign surveillance. Such information would have no bearing on her job, yet her requests were said to be routinely granted.

Related current reasons to doubt our government’s honesty involve the Hillary Clinton email case. For example, the State Department refused to release ­emails to Judicial Watch showing how she arranged government favors for big donors to the Clinton Foundation [until a court ordered it to last week](http://nypost.com/2017/09/17/heres-more-evidence-team-hillary-tried-to-destroy/).

And the FBI still refuses to allow two top aides to appear before Congress, even though the aides told a Justice Department investigator that Comey had [written a draft letter exonerating Clinton](http://nypost.com/2016/07/05/fbi-boss-outrageous-double-standard-in-letting-hillary-skate/) months before he interviewed her or 15 other witnesses.

These and other incidents appear to be part of the effort to undermine Trump from within the government, and they give rise to a growing belief that America is infected with a “deep state,” a malevolent permanent bureaucracy that feels entitled to power and will stop at almost nothing to keep it.

I have been reluctant to reach that conclusion, believing that “deep state” is a more fitting concept for a Third World country that has corrupted institutions and no rule of law or history of individual freedom.

But I’m beginning to wonder. The more we learn about the last eight years and eight months, the more reason there is to believe that something is rotten in Washington.

I don’t just mean the ordinary corruption of the swamp variety. I mean something fundamental, something that suggests major elements in our government believe they, and not the people, are sovereign.

Which brings us back to the ultimate test: Did Obama or somebody working for him put Trump under surveillance during or after the election for the purpose of a political coup?

It’s a frightening question, all the more so because I suspect the answer will be yes — if we can ever get to the truth.

**What Happened?**

Gallup's latest survey on the top problems facing the nation shows that government, specifically "dissatisfaction with government," is the number one problem that concerns Americans. Gallup added that government has been the number one concern, or among the top concerns, since it started this poll in 2004.

In the survey, [Gallup asked](http://news.gallup.com/poll/219020/government-top-problem-race-immigration.aspx?version=print), "What do you think is the most important problem facing this country today?" Eighteen percent of respondents said "dissatisfaction with government." Of course, this could mean lots of things>. It could mean that government doesn’t pay for enough stuff. It could mean that government is everywhere we look in our lives, and it is supposed to be, by design, almost nowhere in our lives.

It could mean that Congress isn’t spending money right, or governing the agencies right, or even telling the truth enough. It could also mean that they want the MAGA agenda implemented, and they are pissed at the Senate for standing in the way of repealing Obamacare and shutting down the Dept of Education and cutting the EPA down to size. It could mean that they don’t understand how we are taking in record tax revenues and still falling a trillion dollars short every year.

Coming in second was race relations/racism, with 12% saying it was the most important problem. IN other words, we had this problem solved ten years ago. Why are we seeing so much racism today? Why are white people being targeted for extermination by main stream media and the education system from K through college? It could mean this.

Immigration was third, with 11%. Third! That means more important than global warming, more important than the economy, more important than jobs, and more important than impending war with North Korea. It means that America thinks the Wall is the 3rd most important project to get done. Period. Once it is done, then we can sit down and talk about assimilating the immigrants who are here now.

Interestingly, the "situation with North Korea" ranked seventh, with only 6% of respondents saying it was an important problem.

"Dissatisfaction with government remains solidly at the top of the list," [said Gallup](http://news.gallup.com/poll/219020/government-top-problem-race-immigration.aspx?version=print). This is the first time in history it has been this way. We can thank Donald Trump, Edward Snowden, and Julian Assange for showing us what our government has become. They are a population of sleazy, child molesting, bribe taking, whores who will do anything and say anything it takes to stay in office where they can continue their insider trading and selling favors for cash.

The survey was conducted Sept. 6-10, with a random sample of 1,022 adults, aged 18 and older, living in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The margin of error was +/- 4 percentage points.

**The Clinton Crime Syndicate**

One of the things that holds the core together in my newest book Charm of Favor, is the evidence revealing a Syndicate that has a long game for victory; a really long game. They have been planning and implementing steps in that plan like they have a view of the future. I’m serious. It makes me want to believe in time travel when I see some of this stuff. Trust me, I reveal things in this book that almost no one in the public sector, that would be you out there, has ever heard before.

So, if there is this Syndicate, why is it that Obama seems to be the genie of corruption? That, earth explorers, is only a matter of authorization. You see, a black president can do things much more openly, because if you oppose him or saying anything about the blood on his hands, he will just label you a racist. The press will strike up the racist band, they will flash the racist graphics, specially created for this purpose, across the TV screen, and your political effectiveness is slashed by a stunning 47%, according to a study done by Mitt Romney.

What are the most bold, in your face, corrupt actions taken by the Syndicate? Oh, and don’t think for one microsecond that these were created or orchestrated by Obama.

News [reports](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2017/09/20/samantha-power-sought-to-unmask-americans-on-almost-daily-basis-sources-say.html) are surfacing that former U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Samantha Power unmasked the identities of American citizens on an “almost daily basis,” revealing the possibility that Power alone may have violated the constitutional rights of hundreds of American citizens.

Her reported actions should not come as much of a surprise to those who followed the Obama administration’s eight years in power, which was rife with executive abuses of authority.

Here are some of the worst of Obama’s abuses of power:

**“A pen and a phone”**

**“**Where they won’t act, I [will](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/14/us/politics/obama-era-legacy-regulation.html?mtrref=undefined&gwh=AE3342817ECCCA479ED2D4181D24A37B&gwt=pay),” President Obama said in 2011 after the 2010 midterm elections that saw a wave of Republicans enter office. Over his two terms, Obama rammed through countless executive actions that legal scholars say thwarted the proper congressional channels. Continuing his heavy-handed approach to implementing policy through the White House, Obama promised in 2014: “I’ve got a pen and a phone,” famously [pledging](http://washington.cbslocal.com/2014/01/14/obama-on-executive-actions-ive-got-a-pen-and-ive-got-a-phone/) to dismiss Congress “in order to make sure that we’re providing Americans the kind of help they need.”

**Unmasking**

“Unmasking” is the term used for unveiling the names of American citizens whose names are caught up in foreign surveillance or other intelligence collection methods. Not only was Samantha Power involved in shady unmasking procedures, but so was Obama’s national security adviser [Susan Rice](https://www.conservativereview.com/articles/levin-susan-rice-lied-is-the-gop-going-to-do-anything-about-it) and top White House aide Ben Rhodes, according to [reports](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/450113/obama-administration-unmasking-trump-should-declassify).

Why did the Obama Administration do it? They wanted to know every move Donald Trump would do. The shock was that they won without cheating, without breaking the law, and spending less than $25 million. The scary thing about this entire thing is that America is not outraged at the surveillance State being used against Americans on behalf of the Syndicate. That is the real crime.

**Iran nuclear deal**

President Obama unilaterally agreed to an accord with the terrorist regime in Tehran while completely [overstepping](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/423845/how-obama-swindled-americans-iran-charles-krauthammer) the Senate’s treaty-making powers (as granted in the Constitution). Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, also known as the Treaty Clause, mandates that any treaty made by the president requires the support of two-thirds of the Senate.

Obama, with the help of senators like Tennessee Republican Bob Corker, flipped the Treaty Clause on its head. Obama [secured](http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/254030-senate-dems-stonewall-iran-resolution-handing-victory-to-obama) a new standard for the Iran deal that required 60 senators to vote in the affirmative simply to move ahead with a simple resolution of disapproval**.** Because 42 Democrats voted “no” on ending the debate of disapproval, the bill did not even get a final vote in the Senate.

Why did he do it? The process would allow Iran to control the Middle East. All of it. Saudi Arabia would be a major regime change in a year. Mecca and Medina would then be in Shia control for the first time, and Sunni Muslims would be scattered. The press focused on the $150 billion in Iranian funds held in Western banks since the 1970’s, earning interest for, well for the banks. Obama released that money back to Iran. He then secretly shipped $1.7 billion in cash, and I do mean cash, to Iran in private jets in January of 2016. It was caught 8 months later. No one knows if it was $1.7 billion, or if it was $2 billion with a 15% handling charge of $300 million for the Syndicate. Cash. Untraceable cash.

**DACA**

Even though he had previously declared that he could not “just suspend deportations through executive order,” Obama proceeded to sign the Deferred Actions for Childhood Arrivals order, an [unconstitutional](http://www.heritage.org/immigration/commentary/daca-unconstitutional-obama-admitted) amnesty program for illegal residents in the United States. Why did he do this? Well in 2012, Obama made three key recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board. It was unanimously ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, because the Senate was not in recess.

Since the advent of air travel, the United States Senate has no longer needed to have long recesses. That has potentially changed the meaning of the Recess Appointment Clause of the Constitution, which has affected the way the Senate and the President interact.

NLRB v. Canning dealt specifically with Noel Canning, a Pepsi distributor affected by a ruling of the National Labor Relations Board, and it had potential implications on the executive branch's power to appoint officials without Senate approval. The NLRB had found that Noel refused to execute a collective bargaining agreement with a labor union, allegedly in violation of federal law. Noel appealed the board's ruling to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit claiming that three of its five members were invalidly appointed, leaving the board without a quorum of lawfully appointed members. (The Court had previously held in New Process Steel, L. P. v. NLRB that the NLRB could not act without a quorum.) The D.C. Circuit vacated the NLRB's orders. In a similar case, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit held that the NLRB could not enforce its orders because of a lack of quorum caused by the ineffectiveness of recess appointments made by President Obama while the Senate was not in recess.

Why did he do it? Because Mr. Cordray planned to form the largest labor union in the world with more than 11 million illegal immigrants by issuing them green cards. 26 States, led by Ted Cruz, stopped them from doing that long enough for the Supreme Court to Act. It still took a year to get Cordray out of there. Obama nearly pulled it off, providing the Democrat Party with a monthly cash flow of $660 million a month.

**Paris climate accord**

Comparable to how the U.S. entered the Iran deal, Obama did not consult Congress before entering into the Paris climate accord, which committed the U.S. into an agreement that entails paying billions into an international climate fund and imposed onerous job-killing environmental standards. Why did he do it? Because the USA would have paid the way for dozens of “developing countries” to receive trillions in unearned income. This would have empowered the Syndicate to expand across Africa and take control of half the world’s natural resources.

**What is the War on Terror?**

War on Terror has become a catchcry phrase after the biggest of all false flag operations, September 11th. While it’s true that 9/11 became the pretext for the **War on Terror™**, and catapulted the doctrine from an idea to official US policy (and a preeminent Western ideology going into the 21st century), the idea didn’t originate with the George W. Bush Administration. The origins of the phrase **War on Terror** can actually be traced back to around 1979 and to another infamous New World Order agenda-pusher by the name of Benjamin Netanyahu, the current Prime Minister of Israel. The War on Terror™ has become such a hackneyed phrase that it’s worthy of being trademarked and corporatized, if the Military Industrial Complex hasn’t done so already. Think of how much carnage, death and destruction have been wrought in the name of fighting the War on Terror™ and its various offshoots such as **Radical Islamic Terrorism™** – millions of people killed in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Pakistan, Yemen, Syria, Palestine and more – and there’s no sign of it stopping. The War on Terror™ is the ultimate abstract endless war against a nebulous faceless enemy. It’s not going to stop until enough people see through the deception.

### Meet Benjamin Netanyahu, Inventor of the War on Terror

Netanyahu is more than just an Israeli politician. Netanyahu’s father, Benzion Netanyahu, was a leader of Revisionist Zionism, a colonialist, aggressive, xenophobic and expansionist form of Israeli nationalism founded by Ze’ev Jabotinsky in the early part of the 20th century. Netanyahu was already talking about terrorism in 1979 when he wrote his book International Terrorism: Challenge and Response that year. He wrote another book on terrorism in 1995, a major work entitled Fighting Terrorism: How Democracies Can Defeat Domestic and International Terrorism. The book explains all sorts of themes that have now become public knowledge and household terms and ideas: terrorism, radical Islamic suicide attacks and Iran pursuing a nuclear program. He repeatedly uses the phrase “Weapons of Mass Annihilation” throughout the book – now you know where the term “WMD” (Weapons of Mass Destruction) originated from! Netanyahu is not a prophet but rather a driver of these agendas. Using the immense power of Zionism, Jewish lobbies in America and the Jewish international banking cabal, he persuaded the US to align itself with Israel and view Islam as the next great enemy.

### Netanyahu’s Pre-9/11 Speech

According to this [source](http://www.truth-and-justice.info/origwat.html), Netanyahu made a speech in Israel at the Jewish Agency Assembly Plenary meeting held in Israel on June 24th, 2001 (2-3 months before 9/11) where he made these points:

“1. The Palestinians are to blame for the conflict in the Middle East, and specifically Yasser Arafat.

2. It is legitimate for established states to engage in wars, because the societies are imperfect.

3. Palestinians are not waging a legitimate war (like established states using regular armies) and are terrorists.

4. The Palestinian terrorists deliberately attack civilians.

5. The Israelis are responding in self-defense.

6. When the Israelis respond, they respond against combatants.

7. Arafat and the Palestinian Authority are committed to the destruction of the State of Israel.

8. Arafat and the Palestinian Authority are using the illegitimate and criminal means of terrorism.

9. The Palestinian are wrong and the Israelis are right.

10. Terrorism invariably comes from terrorist regimes.

11. Terror is useful, only if the cost of waging terrorism, the cost of that regime is lower than the benefits of waging terrorism.

12. To stop terrorism, one must make the terrorist regime pay very very heavily.

13. The root core of the Middle East conflict is the existential opposition by a great many in the Arab world still, and certainly by the Palestinian leadership to Israel’s very existence.

14. The first way of ensuring Israel’s existence is that the Arabs simply understand that Israel is so powerful, so permanent, so unconquerable in every way that they will simply abandon by the force of the inertia of Israel’s permanence all opposition to Israel.

15. The second way [of ensuring Israel’s existence] is for the forces of democratization get to the Arab regimes.

16. Using propaganda techniques, like broadcasting American television serials (which Netanyahu sees as subversive material) will ultimately bring down regimes like the Ayatola regime and the Khoumeni regime in Iran.

17. In the 21st century, you cannot achieve a military victory unless you achieve a political victory to accompany it; and you cannot achieve a political victory unless you achieve a victory in public opinion; and you cannot achieve a victory in public opinion unless you persuade that public that your cause is just.

18. It doesn’t make any difference if you are on the side of the angels or on the side of the devil. Anyone fighting in the international arena for public opinion must argue the justice of his cause. Hitler argued for the justice of his cause and Stalin argued for the justice of his cause. They all had propaganda machines. Whether you are right or you are wrong you must argue the justice of your cause.”

Note how he was already setting up a distinction between “legitimate” war and “illegitimate” war, thus trying to provide a legal and moral justification for war (which is legalized violence and mass murder) that would be initiated by Israel, the US and allies in the years to come against the Palestinians and other Muslim-majority nations. He made the point that states using regular armies can engage in legitimate war, but not loose bands of fighters which he brands terrorists.

### Dubya Enshrines the War on Terror as Official US Policy and Ideology

Soon thereafter, George W. Bush [declared](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_CSPbzitPL8) the **Netanyahu doctrine of War on Terror** as official US policy on September 20th, 2001:

“We will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime … the civilized world is rallying to America’s side. They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next. Terror, unanswered, can not only bring down buildings, it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments.”

This speech included the famous “you’re either with us or with the terrorists” ultimatum, a manipulative way to force other nations to take sides and to make a complex issue black and white. It also echoed Netanyahu’s concept of “legitimate” nations, “legitimate” war and “legitimate” government. In this way, the US tried to claim the moral high ground and granted itself the tyrannical power of being able to list any individual or group as “terrorists” and justify killing them them on those grounds, as well as branding any nation as a ”terrorist haven” and justify invading them on those grounds – both in stark violation of international law.



### Netanyahu’s Post 9/11 Speech

It wasn’t long before Netanyahu expanded this now official War on Terror doctrine to include Israel. Netanyahu now expanded upon the childish “Us” vs. “Them” demarcation set up by Dubya to make it “US, Israel and the civilized democracies of the world” vs. “Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and other Arab and Muslim dictatorships of the world.” Here are the main points of his speech on April 10th, 2002 in front of the US Senate, from the same [source](http://www.truth-and-justice.info/origwat.html):

“1. The American victory against terror in Afghanistan is only the first step in dismantling the global terrorist network. The other terrorist regimes must now be rapidly dealt with in similar fashion.

2. Israel, a democratic government that is defending itself against terror should not be equated with the Palestinian dictatorship that is perpetrating it.

3. Israel should not be asked to stop fighting terror and return to a negotiating table with a regime that is committed to the destruction of the Jewish State and openly embraces terror.

4. Israel has the right to defend itself.

5. The government of Israel must fight not only to defend its people, restore a dangerously eroded deterrence and secure the Jewish State, but also to ensure that the free world wins the war against terror in this pivotal arena in the heart of the Middle East.

6. Israel must dismantle Arafat’s terrorist regime and expel Arafat from the region.

7. Israel must clean out terrorists, weapons, and explosives from all Palestinian controlled areas.

8. Israel must establish physical barriers separating the main Palestinian population centers from Israeli towns and cities to prevent any residual terrorists from reaching Israel.

9. There can never be a political solution for terror. The grievance of terrorists can never be redressed through diplomacy. That will only encourage more terror. Yasser Arafat’s terrorist regime must be toppled, not courted. The Oslo agreements are dead. Yasser Arafat killed them.

10. A political process can only begin when this terrorist regime is dismantled.

11. The urgent need to topple Saddam is paramount. The commitment of America and Britain to dismantle this terrorist dictatorship before it obtains nuclear weapons deserves the unconditional support of all sane governments.

12. America must show that it will not heed the international call to stop Israel from exercising its right to defend itself. If America compromises its principles and joins in the chorus of those who demand that Israel disengage, the war on terror will be undermined.

13. For if the world begins to believe that America may deviate from its principles, terrorist regimes that might have otherwise been deterred will not be deterred. Those that might have crumbled under the weight of American resolve will not crumble. As a result, winning the war will prove far more difficult, perhaps impossible.

14. To assure that the evil of terrorism does not reemerge a decade or two from now, we must not merely uproot terror, but also plant the seeds of freedom.

15. It is imperative that once the terrorist regimes in the Middle East are swept away, the free world, led by America, must begin to build democracy in their place.

16. We simply can no longer afford to allow this region to remain cloistered by a fanatic militancy. We must let the winds of freedom and independence finally penetrate the one region in the world that clings to unreformed tyranny.”

Some key themes are introduced here, which those who follow Middle Eastern and Zionist affairs will notice. Firstly, Netanyahu pushes for the US to invade Iraq, a wish was fulfilled a short time later. Secondly, Netanyahu pushes back against calls for Israel to stop its harsh and barbaric treatment of the Palestinians, by simply declaring that Israel has a right to defend itself – even if Israel attacks first and uses missiles and bombs against Palestinian Arabs who throws sticks and stones at it. Thirdly, diplomacy doesn’t work with terrorists so Israel must keep fighting and killing its enemies (note the dehumanization that comes along with the word terrorist and the big lie that there’s no point talking or negotiating).

 Lastly, Netanyahu even promotes the idea of US seeding “democracy” (which has always been a big con – see US infiltration through [NGOs](http://freedom-articles.toolsforfreedom.com/ngos-choice-tool-subversion-nwo/)) in other nations after the invasions – i.e. more permanent US occupation and military bases abroad, which only serve to expand the US (NWO) Empire! Time for the world to learn that when America or its allies say “democracy”, it’s a codeword for forced **regime change**.

### The War on Terror is an Israeli War Strategy

If you are thinking that the term and concept itself of “War on Terror” has all the hallmarks of a New World Order scheme, you’re right. This article by [Christopher Bollyn](http://tapnewswire.com/2016/05/how-israel-created-the-fiend-for-the-war-on-terror/) provides further background:

“The War on Terror is essentially an Israeli war strategy. It was first promoted on the world stage by Benjamin Netanyahu and Menachem Begin (of the terrorist Likud party) at the Jerusalem Conference hosted by the Netanyahu Institute in July 1979.

According to the War on Terror doctrine advocated by Netanyahu, “Islamic terrorists” attack Israel because it is a Western state with Western values. The West, Netanyahu says, is the real target so the U.S. must lead the West in waging a global War on Terror to destroy Islamic terrorists and the regimes that support them. This is exactly what the United States has done since 9/11, at incredible expense to its own population, leaving a trail of devastated nations in its wake.”

The War on Terror**™** has been used by Israel to bring in the US (and the West) to help destroy Israel’s enemies by branding them as terrorists. The Zionist State has been fundamental in the creation of fake Islamic terrorism (**Zio-Islamic Terrorism™**) and in the manufacturing of scary enemies (al Qaeda, Daesh/ISIS, etc.) to serve as an excuse to target sovereign Arab and Muslim-majority nations surrounding them. Needless to say, the Zionist-controlled MSM has dutifully played its part by selling the fraudulent War on Terror to a largely unsuspecting public.

### Final Thoughts

The War on Terror**™** is an all-encompassing concept with which the NWO is expanding its Empire across the world. It’s a war that can never end. It’s a war whose success or failure can never be measured. It’s a war that leaders can always invoke to justify more money, power and regulation. 16 years on, have enough people woken up to the propaganda in order to break its spell?

**The Digital Coup**

Digital freedom is the last frontier of free and open expression, the only reliable independent space for real news, information and analysis – enabling anyone to freely express views on any topics.

Government censorship remains an ominous possibility. Last spring, UK Prime Minister Theresa May’s Tory Manifesto called for Britain becoming “the global leader in the regulation of the use of personal data and the Internet.”

She urged government control over what people write, post and share online, the end of UK digital democracy if enacted into law. Britain’s Investigatory Powers Act requires Internet companies to maintain records on customers’ browsing histories, along with ministerial power to breach online privacy, including encrypted content – on the phony pretext of assuring no “safe space for terrorists to be able to communicate online.”

The issue, of course, is who gets to make anti-government, or anti-May speech into terror speech? When a politician feels threatened with exposure for their corruption and tyranny, will they call their enemies terrorists? When we express our passion behind our words, does that suddenly become hate speech? If white people become targeted for genocide, is that considered terror?

Her scheme isn’t about “protect(ing) the security of people and ensur(ing) the fairness of the rules by which people and businesses (must) abide.” It’s a sinister plan control online content, prohibiting what Tories want suppressed, government acting as gatekeeper. When government becomes the arbiter of speech, it is automatically sinister. All the protection we need against hate speech is choice. We simply change the channel.

In early September, international advocacy group [European Digital Rights](https://edri.org/leaked-document-eu-presidency-calls-for-massive-internet-filtering/) reported a leaked European Union document (dated August 30), revealing that Estonia (serving as EU president) “push(ed) (for) Member States to strengthen indiscriminate internet surveillance, and to follow in the footsteps of China regarding online censorship.”

“Standing firmly behind its belief that filtering the uploads is the way to go, the Presidency has worked hard in order to make the proposal for the new copyright Directive even more harmful than the Commission’s original proposal, and pushing it further into the realms of illegality.”

The proposal is a blatant attempt to end EU digital democracy, letting member states censor and control content if adopted.

Following last week’s London commuter train bombing, a possible false flag, not terrorism as claimed, Trump called for “cut(ting) off” the Internet because of extremists.

“Loser terrorists must be dealt with in a much tougher manner,” he roared. “The internet is their main recruitment tool which we must cut off & used better!”  Clearly, he is talking about taking site-specific action against predators and terrorists using the net to facilitate their war. They will leave a trail, and that trail should be followed. The issue is that Jeff Sessions is doing nothing about it, that we can see.

UK hardliners urged the same action against terrorists. They just don’t know how to make it happen. Like world-changing 9/11-style laws, they want expanded powers over everyone. Of course, they will spend 100% of their time on the low-hanging fruit and not go after the brazen, more well-funded enemies like ISIS or the Clinton Crime Syndicate. The Agency government has painstakingly built their tyrannical empire by carefully engineered litigation. Win the easy cases first, and then add the harder cases by using the prior victories in court.

Congressional Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers legislation (SESTA) proposes the wrong solution to a serious problem. Introduced on August 1, a Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee hearing took place this week. This should take law enforcement, not content regulation by government.

The United States Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is a standing committee of the United States Senate.[1] It is empowered with legislative oversight of the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine, interstate commerce, communications, highways, aviation, rail, shipping, transportation security, oceans, fisheries, climate change, disasters, science, nonmilitary aeronautical and space sciences, sports, tourism, consumer issues, economic development, technology, competitiveness, product safety, insurance, and standards and measurement. The committee also has jurisdiction over coastal zone management, inland waterways (except construction), the Panama Canal and other interoceanic canals, and commerce aspects of Continental Shelf lands.

What does this have to do with this subject? Why use Congess’ largest committee to get this done? “The Senate’s passage of these bipartisan bills is an important step in the ongoing battle against human trafficking,” said Sen. Thune, the chairman of the Commerce Committee. “These bills create a common sense consequence for egregious wrongdoing and serve as a starting point for better recognition and reporting of human trafficking by commercial drivers.”

“Truckers and commercial drivers are our eyes and ears on the road and often the first line of defense against human trafficking—a crime we’re seeing in our own backyards in Minnesota,” Sen. Klobuchar said. “The passage of these two bills brings us one step closer to this bipartisan legislation being signed into law to ensure truckers and commercial drivers are empowered and equipped to help prevent this heinous crime across the country.”

Last night, the Senate passed the following bills:

- S. 1532, the No Human Trafficking on Our Roads Act, to disqualify individuals from operating a commercial motor vehicle (CMV) for their lifetime if they used a CMV to commit a felony involving human trafficking.

- S. 1536, the Combating Human Trafficking in Commercial Vehicles Act, designates a human trafficking prevention coordinator at the U.S. Department of Transportation and would increase outreach, education, and reporting efforts at the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Both bills were previously approved by the committee. Sen. Bill Nelson (D-Fla.), the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, is among the cosponsors of both bills.

Sound benign enough. Don’t use trucks to traffic people. But, it lays the foundation for going after the digital world for trafficking, and that may empower them to quash political opposition. Sort of like ANTIFA for the web.

It’s passage may weaken online free expression. It could shift blame for users’ speech to web platforms (the vehicles), forcing them to closely monitor and restrict content – censorship by other means. After all, it is always the party with the most to lose that will restrict that action. One person can ruin a good thing for everyone. An open mic is a great idea until someone uses it for something society, or its ruler, does not like.

Trump wants Net Neutrality eliminated, a digital freedom holy grail. I believe he is correct in this desire. When the government has the authority to rule over the content of the web, we will tumble into tyranny immediately. FCC chairman Ajit Pai advocates letting private market forces govern how fast the web moves and what can be hosted. If the cable and telecommunication companies control, censor and discriminate against online users, the users will simply move their dollars to where they are not censored. The new world order nuts want to prevent web providers from offering affordable internet at slower, less equipment intensive speeds. They claim they want even the poorest person to have a 1 gig connection, same as Amazon or Wells Fargo. The tech companies know this is impossible, so they are being forced out of the high speed market by the government. There is absolutely, positively not one size or one speed that fits everyone. That is the entire net neutrality argument in a simple concept.

Former Rep. Tom Tancredo, in an opinion piece for The Hill, started out his shocking warning by downplaying the so-called Russian actors who may have spent a measly $100,000 with social media giant Facebook in exchange for ads that hurt Hillary Clinton.

Tancredo not only correctly noted that such a small amount of money could not have actually altered the election, he also destroyed the notion that the American establishment is “surprised” by the idea of a foreign government trying to influence an election.

 Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg said this month that his company sold over $100,000 in social media advertising to a Russian government-controlled front group during the 2016 election cycle. While that amount is a relative pittance and critics are saying the ads were poorly produced — where is Bill Maher when you really need him? — the discovery has raised alarms.

 It’s ironic, of course, that America’s media elites are suddenly alarmed, considering that the CIA and intelligence agencies abroad have engaged in similar activity for decades. But putting that aside, what if the bigger danger comes not from amateurish foreign advertisers, but from foreign governments seeking to influence the American regulatory agencies meant to act as the citizens’ watchdogs?

The former congressman then gets to the crux of his warning, asking a very pointed question to the reader that unfortunately sounds all too plausible in this day and age.

 Could a foreign government — such as Russia, Ukraine, or Mexico, for example — bribe or “incentivize” a federal agency such as the Federal Election Commission to regulate (or “rein in”) conservative news websites?

 The truth could be stranger than fiction if you examine the habits of the federal commissioners who run our regulatory agencies.

Tancredo then reveals a fact that news outlets like The Daily Sheeple have long reported – there are absolutely elements within the federal government who have expressed support for censoring The Drudge Report in the past while at the same time taking dozens of trips overseas, sometimes even bashing the American way of life while doing so.

 For years, Democrats on the FEC have been vocal in their desire to regulate speech on websites such as Facebook and Twitter, to say nothing of Drudge and Fox News. Will they use the news of foreign government purchasing social media advertising as an excuse to enter that regulatory minefield more boldly?

 But what’s even more worrisome is that third-party groups, some connected to foreign governments, have spent tens of thousands of dollars helping regulators travel around the world. Who’s to say that quid pro quo, spoken or unspoken, isn’t part of the equation?

 It’s far more likely than the idea that foreign governments might be using a website like Drudge to spread propaganda. Buying one regulator would be more cost-effective than spending millions trying to sway millions through advertising. After all, “I can get it for you wholesale” is still the American way.

Consider this. As the establishment media continues to push their 24/7 anti-Trump echo chamber, real dangers posed by other countries are going unchecked, with many in the media most likely on board with the idea that top conservative news outlets need to be censored.

At this point one can’t help but wonder (and worry) that some form of political censorship of the internet is on the horizon which will most likely be attempted by connecting the amazing success of someone like Matt Drudge to supposed Russian propaganda operations – all in the name of censoring non leftist voices.

**The Peccadillo Prophecy**

If you poke at a bull long enough, it will eventually weaken and lose its ability to fight back, and then he is ready for the Matador. But sometimes, the Peccadillo gets attacked with swift and deadly results. Last week the House passed a bill to expand the government’s ability to deport immigrants on the basis of alleged gang affiliation. Sounds great. Right? It’s about time. Right?

Promoted by Republicans as a way to target members of gangs such as the transnational M13 gang, H.R. 3697, the “Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act,” amends the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding gang affiliation to the list of criminal offenses that qualify as grounds for detention and deportation. We want them out of our society and sent back where they came from; across the wall and away from our towns.

The bill passed 233 – 175 with almost unanimous Republican support and now must gain approval in the Senate, where it is currently pending in the Committee on the Judiciary. While the bill still has yet to come to a vote in Senate, it has already gained the presidential nod of approval. Shortly following the bill’s passage, the White House Press Secretary published a statement applauding Congress’ decision, and the administration already affirmed that “If H.R. 3697 were presented to the president in its current form, his advisors would recommend that he sign the bill into law,” according to a statement of administrative policy published last Tuesday.

The bill has received strong criticism from House Democrats and organizations such as the National Immigrant Justice Center (NIJC) and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), who claim the bill provides the government with sweeping discretion to detain and deport immigrants using a broad and arbitrary label.

The bulk of the debate on the bill revolves around how it defines ‘gangs.’ The bill defines a gang as any group of five or more people that has as one of its primary purposes the commission of one or more specified criminal offenses. The bill goes on to expand on these ‘criminal offenses’ to include felony drug offenses, which would include the possession of marijuana. It also explicitly names the ‘harboring’ of undocumented immigrants as a crime.

This means, theoretically, that any organization that helps, shelters, or hires undocumented immigrants could be considered a gang, and thus any immigrant member of such group could theoretically be detained or deported as a gang member.

The National Immigrant Justice Center’s recent policy report explains:

 “For example, the government could attempt to designate a church group that elects to offer shelter to an undocumented immigrant as a gang. Similarly, a fraternity whose members use expired identification documents to purchase liquor or engage in initiation rites or a Fortune 500 company that employs workers who may or may not have irregular documents could also fall under this definition.”

The government already has a history of liberally applying the ‘gang’ label. Just ask the Juggalos, a fan group of the Insane Clown Posse. They took to the streets Saturday to protest the FBI’s designation of their group as a gang in the bureau’s National Gang Threat Assessment report back in 2011. The fans and the band have been fighting to clear their name ever since. The issue even ended up in court last year when the Clown Posse sued the FBI for withholding documentation about the gang classification of their fans.

In a revealing profile about the group, Vox writer Dylan Matthews explained that the parallel would be to criminalize someone for being a “Belieber”(Justin Bieber fan) or a “Swiftie” (Taylor Swift fan). While perhaps ridiculous in theory, the classification has had serious consequences for group members, causing some fans to lose their jobs and, in some cases, their parental rights because of their affiliation with the so-called ‘gang.’

In the case of H.R. 3697, the consequences of alleged gang affiliation would be much more dire — as in no-bond mandatory detention.

 “Mandatory detention refers to a provision of the INA that states that non-citizens with certain criminal convictions must be detained by ICE. People who are subject to mandatory detention are not entitled to a bond hearing and must remain in detention while removal proceedings are pending against them,” explains a policy handout by the Immigrant Law Research Center.

H.R. 3697 would expand the terms of mandatory detention, which the ACLU considers a clear violation of the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause. It also transfers the discretion of determining bond eligibility from the Attorney General to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

 “[The bill] grants the Department of Homeland Security massive discretion to designate a group of people as a ‘criminal gang,’ based on secret evidence, and without meaningful judicial review,” the ACLU writes in their vote recommendation and analysis of the bill.

While the practice may appear unconstitutional, it wouldn’t be the first time the government has sanctioned detention without trial. During the War on Terror era, the government adopted the practice of ‘indefinite detention’ whereby suspected terrorists can be held without charge or trial. Despite facing challenges in Congress and in the courts, indefinite detention was signed into law as a provision of the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act, where it remains in legal standing today.

In the same way the War on Terror became a catch-all justification for constitutionally questionable policies, it seems that the vaguely defined threat of immigration and ‘criminal aliens’ will be this administration’s keyword for getting around civil liberties.

**Bearing Arms, Losing Job**

Folks who work at convenience stores probably think a fair bit about what to do if they’re faced with an armed individual. After all, their stores are common targets for armed robbery, regardless of the relative safety of a community.

For one cashier at a Circle K in Albuquerque, that meant [a trip to the hospital for the bad guy](http://www.wbrc.com/story/36416075/gas-station-worker-tired-of-being-sitting-duck-shoots-robbery-suspect) who came into her store looking for trouble.

“I grabbed my gun from my pocket, I cocked it, and I shot,” said Jennifer Wertz, who shot the robbery suspect. “I’m sick and tired of being a sitting duck.”

In front of the Circle K near Eubank and Candelaria, Wertz said on Tuesday that she didn’t hesitate to shoot a man who ran into the store on Monday. “He like stepped into the door and pointed the gun at me. I reacted,” she said. Police say she hit 23-year-old Ferron Mendez in the chest. He’s expected to live.

Wertz says she had the gun at work clearly visible on her hip because it’s become a dangerous place to be. “Robberies have been going on like this for the past few weeks. They have done nothing to protect me. And I felt the need to protect myself,” Wertz said.

She says Circle K suspended her for two weeks for shooting the suspect. She’s quitting and now looking for a new job. Wertz doesn’t like company policy in these types of situations.

I don’t think any reader of Bearing Arms is going to blame her for that one.

I’m not a fan of saying, “There ought to be a law,” or anything, but I do think policies like this are horribly wrongheaded. They put law-abiding citizens at risk simply because they can’t carry their legally-owned firearms for their personal protection.

Wertz is far from the first person to have job difficulties because of defending themselves, but I can’t help but want to ask these companies which they prefer: An armed employee shooting someone in self-defense or a dead employee? Because those are your alternatives.

Unfortunately, policies such as Circle K’s are based on the media-perpetuated myth that lawful gun owners are somehow a danger to society. They’re not, unless by “society,” you mean “violent criminals.”

It’s my hope that Wertz gets a far better job with a company that sees no need to turn their employees into potential victims due to a misguided policy powered by anti-gun ideology more than real-world statistics. She did what she needed to do, and that also includes quitting a job that wants to punish her for not allowing herself to be shot.

Anyone who can’t see how idiotic that policy is needs to get their head examined.  No one in their right mind should see an employee not being shot and killed as a bad thing under any circumstances, yet that’s what Wertz and others have encountered. They are either disciplined or lose their jobs for the “crime” of not rolling over and being a victim.

That should never be the case. Not in this country.