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| Attacks | **42** |
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| Injured | **266** |
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**Shout out to 101.9FM in Hot Springs, Montana**

**The Most Secret Court in the World**



E. Barrett Prettyman Federal Courthouse in Washington, D.C., where secret FISA court reportedly operates (Photo: Wikimedia Commons)

WASHINGTON – It’s a mysterious court that hides behind a hulking vaulted door and impenetrable concrete walls – and it’s where the federal government makes some of its most secretive decisions concerning Americans’ basic liberties.

If you dare ask where the secret court is located, employees at the E. Barrett Prettyman Federal Courthouse in Washington, D.C. – where the court reportedly relocated in 2009 – won’t tell you.

That’s because the super-secret court is far beyond the reach of any journalist or curious American citizen.

Fortified with biometric hand scanners, [wooden and metal doors and walls reinforced by concrete,](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/03/01/AR2009030101730.html) it’s the room where it all happens: Eleven powerful court judges approve wiretaps, data collection and government requests to monitor suspected terrorists, spies and even American citizens. And they’re given sweeping power under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA.

In 2013, Eric Mill – a blogger and alum of the Sunlight Foundation, a nonprofit organization that advocates for government transparency – documented his efforts to learn more about the nation’s most secure and secretive courtroom.

Mill [presents images of the mysterious Washington institution through illustrations](https://konklone.com/post/the-door-to-the-fisa-court) because, he explained, “One of the first things that happens when you walk into the Prettyman Courthouse is they take away your phone.”

[](http://https/konklone.com/post/the-door-to-the-fisa-court)

[Eric Mill posted this illustration by Lindsay Young on his blog](https://konklone.com/post/the-door-to-the-fisa-court). He says he believes it to be the door of the FISA court inside the E. Barett Prettyman Courthouse in Washington, D.C. (Photo: [Konklone.com](https://konklone.com/post/the-door-to-the-fisa-court))

Employees at the courthouse reportedly “laughed at” Mill’s endeavor and referred to the FISA courtroom as the “[Room of Requirement](http://harrypotter.wikia.com/wiki/Room_of_Requirement).”

They claimed they “had no idea what floor it was even on.”

Still, Mill wandered the long hallways and located what appeared to be a door to the FISA court.

“To the right of the door, next to the intercom and the small sign saying ‘Access Restricted,’ is a biometric hand scanner,” he wrote. “It’s (probably) a [Schlage HandKey II](http://us.allegion.com/Products/biometrics/handkey2/Pages/default.aspx), a device that quickly snapshots the three-dimensional bone and joint structure of the hand and matches it against previously registered snapshots.”

[What do YOU think? Are you concerned feds will use secret powers to spy on you? Sound off in the WND Poll!](http://www.wnd.com/2018/02/those-peepers/)

A look inside secret FISA process



Presiding FISA court judge Rosemary Collyer

Established in 1978 at the height of the Cold War, the clandestine FISA court, known as the U.S. Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, is located blocks away from the White House and the Capitol in a bunker-like complex.



FISA court Judge James E. Boasberg

The barest of details about the court and its oversight were publicly disclosed until the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, when 19 militants associated with al-Qaida carried out suicide attacks, hijacking four planes and flying them into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and a field in Pennsylvania, triggering major U.S. initiatives to combat terrorism.

Authorities began dramatically intensifying their espionage efforts, doubling the number of warrant applications. This prompted the court to authorize sweeping collections of mass data.



FISA court Judge Rudolph Contreras

The FISA court approves more than 99 percent of the domestic electronic surveillance requests the deep state brings to its vaulted door, [according to the Wall Street Journal](https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887324904004578535670310514616)



FISA court Judge Anne C. Conway

[A 2016 Justice Department report](https://www.justice.gov/nsd/nsd-foia-library/2015fisa/download) showed the National Security Agency and the FBI made 1,457 requests for permission to the FISA court to conduct electronic surveillance in 2015.

While it is the sole responsibility of the FISA court to scrutinize every one of these requests, only one application was rejected by the government in all of 2015.



FISA court Judge Joseph R. Dearie

As for the rest, “FISC did not deny any applications in whole, or in part,” the Justice Department said.

The FISA court also issues subpoenas that intelligence agencies use to compel private companies to turn over personal data on customers. These “national security letters” contain everything from Americans’ billing information to their browsing histories.



FISA court Judge Claire Eagan

In most cases, “national security letters” are accompanied by gag orders, legally forcing companies to give up customer data and prohibiting the companies from telling anyone about the process.



FISA court Judge James Parker Jones

According to the report, the FBI made a total of 48,642 requests for national security letters to the FISA court. It’s unclear, however, how many of those requests were approved.

[The 11 federal district judges](http://www.fisc.uscourts.gov/current-membership) are all chosen by the chief justice of the Supreme Court. One FISA judge sits on the court at a time, and the judges each take turns serving in week-long shifts, [according to the Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/03/01/AR2009030101730.html).



FISA court Judge Robert Kugler

All of the current judges on the FISA court were selected by Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts.

They are appointed without confirmation or oversight by Congress.



FISA court Judge Michael Mosman

The FISA court has long been criticized as judicial body that essentially rubber-stamps warrants for any U.S. intelligence agency seeking to conduct surveillance.

And now that a bombshell GOP memo has alleged abuse of the FISA spying warrant process by the highest echelons of the FBI and the Department of Justice, the revelation is sparking demands to know more about this secret court.



FISA court Judge Thomas B. Russell

High-ranking officials of the FBI and DOJ – James Comey, [Loretta Lynch](http://www.wnd.com/2017/11/deadline-set-for-doj-to-release-lynch-clinton-tarmac-meeting-docs/), [Andrew McCabe](http://www.wnd.com/2018/01/fbi-deputy-director-andrew-mccabe-suddenly-quits/), [Andrew Weissmann](http://mobile.wnd.com/2017/10/wheres-the-oversight-of-mueller/), Sally Yates, [Peter Strzok](http://www.wnd.com/2018/02/anatomy-of-a-coup/), Lisa Page and Bruce Ohr – are accused of weaponizing the most fearsome government agencies to spy on officials in Donald Trump’s 2016 presidential campaign.



FISA court Judge F. Dennis Saylor

The [GOP memo, released earlier this month by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the White House](http://www.wnd.com/2018/02/controversial-nunes-memo-declassified/), alleges that the FBI obtained a FISA warrant under false pretenses.

To secure a spying warrant on Trump foreign policy adviser Carter Page, former FBI Director James Comey signed off on a FISA spying application presented to the FISA court. The GOP memo states that an unverified dossier was cited as key intelligence in the FISA application.

The problem?

The dossier was prepared by a former British spy, using anonymous Russian sources, and it was funded by Hillary Clinton’s campaign and the Democrat National Committee.

In essence, it was a political document bankrolled by the target’s political opposition.

The fact that FBI officials cited the unverified dossier to obtain a spying warrant on an American citizen has raised grave concern over just how much scrutiny the court is placing on the Justice Department’s surveillance requests.

‘If you think they won’t come after you …’



Rep. Scott Perry, R-Pa.

The super-secret court, which is capable of destroying American liberty and violating Americans’ Fourth Amendment protections, must be reformed, warns Rep. Scott Perry, R-Pa.

“If you think they won’t come after you – I mean, they are trying to take down the president of the United States, how much more do you have to see? Do you think they’re worried about your average American citizen?” Perry asked in an exclusive interview with WND.

The court’s cavalier approach to issuing a surveillance warrant that potentially undermines the legitimacy of the presidential election demonstrates such a severe disrespect for civil liberties that the entire FISA system should be examined, Perry said.

“If they will spy on the president of the United States, or a candidate for the presidency of the United States, do you think they are going to [spy on] somebody like you?” he asked. “They can surveil whomever they want to, do whatever they want to.”



The GOP memo contends that the salacious and unverified dossier, funded by Clinton and the DNC, was essential to obtaining permission to spy on Page on Oct. 21, 2016.

Page [acknowledges](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2018/02/13/did-carter-page-contacts-give-obama-fbi-window-into-trump-team-world.html) communicating with Trump campaign contacts after the FBI began spying on him – indicating multiple members of the president’s team likely were caught up in the secret government surveillance, which began days before the 2016 election.

The real problem lies with Congress, which authorized the FISA court, gave it extraordinary authority and failed to stipulate surveillance limitations, Perry said.

“Here’s the deal that I think Americans maybe don’t understand: This isn’t your average court where one side presents their case and then the defense presents their case,” he said. “It’s only one side. It really comes down to a few people and the integrity of those people. If you have some people with marginal integrity – and apparently that’s the case – this is what you get.”

Perry continued, “It’s incumbent upon us to reform this and put some controls in place so that these things don’t happen.”

Trump, Congress reauthorize FISA until 2023

President Trump signed the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017 into law just weeks ago, on Jan. 20. The current authorization will expire in December 2023.

The FISA court process is intended to be the legal check on the government’s surveillance powers, but Perry said the court authorizes virtually all requests submitted by the intelligence agencies.

“It is unbelievable how much of our Fourth Amendment rights have been taken away under this program,” he said. “Look, for foreigners who don’t have constitutional rights, that’s fine. But not American citizens.”

The U.S. House of Representatives [voted 256 to 164](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/115-2018/s12) to approve a six-year extension of the controversial Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act after a contentious debate last month. The Senate [voted 65 to 34](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/115-2018/s12) to approve the reauthorization on Jan. 18 before sending it to the White House.



Rep. Stephen Lynch, D-Mass.

Rep. Stephen Lynch, D-Mass., also emphatically called for reformation of the FISA court process, arguing that the FBI’s spying targets should be granted legal representation.

“There should be actually an added element – an advocate on behalf of the target,” Lynch told WND. “If the FBI comes to the court and says, ‘We have evidence that this person is acting in the interest against the United States and may be a threat to national security and we want to surveil them,’ and they present their evidence, there should be someone on the other side, an advocate on behalf of the court to say, ‘Here are the reasons why the court should not grant a wiretap or a surveillance warrant.’ That is lacking.”

What’s the biggest problem with the FISA court process?

Rep. Lynch said there’s only “one argument” made before the judge. There are no checks and balances – no defense attorney to argue the adversarial case against the government.

“You don’t have – as we do in every other case – an adversarial debate in court about whether it should be granted or not,” he said. “Under the counter system, that’s the judge’s responsibility to poke holes in the prosecution’s case.

“Really, you might want to have an advocate representing the people who could potentially be targets,” Lynch continued. “If we introduce an advocate, a friend of the court, they would try to push back on some of the surveillance of American civilians and American citizens. That would be an improvement.”

Demands for special prosecutor probe FBI actions, FISA process

Former FBI Director James Comey slammed the declassified House GOP memo immediately after it was released, arguing that it’s “dishonest” and “misleading.” Comey said it “inexcusably exposed” classified investigations.

Nonetheless, no law currently forbids misusing the power of the presidency to spy on one’s adversaries. But it is a [crime under both the protections of the Fourth Amendment and section 1809 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act](https://lawandcrime.com/high-profile/yes-obama-could-be-prosecuted-if-involved-with-illegal-surveillance/) for anyone to either “engage in” electronic surveillance under “color of law” under FISA without following the law’s restrictions, or “disclose” or “use” information gathered from it in contravention of the statute’s sharp constrictions.



Then-President Barack Obama and James Comey in the Rose Garden of the White House, June 21, 2013, as Obama announced Comey’s nomination to succeed Robert Mueller as FBI director (Photo: Wikimedia Commons)

Perry suspects the FBI violated the law. He’s demanding an independent prosecutor investigate Comey and the high-ranking officials at the FBI for misleading the FISA court. He also wants a probe of the FISA court itself since it failed to substantiate the FBI’s evidence.

“I think crimes have been committed – we are going to find that out,” Perry said. “You can’t have the Department of Justice, the FBI and FISC investigating themselves. I am not a big fan of special counsels, but we need a second special counsel just to deal with this, for a federal grand jury to get this information, find out where the facts are, find out who is responsible and provide some accountability.”

He said an independent prosecutor might also launch an investigation into possible Democrat collusion with Russia.

“We are waiting for one fact that shows any collusion regarding Trump and the Russians or the Trump campaign – we haven’t seen one fact of collusion. So, with all due respect, I think Mueller’s probe would be wrapping up pretty quickly,” he told WND.

“The memo calls into question the very basic tenets of that investigation. If we are looking for a foreign collusion, like with Ukraine, all those things that the Trump administration and campaign and Republicans are accused of, you can safely say that the evidence is replete. It’s all out there – this collusion actually happened on the Democrat side.”

House intel member: ‘No question’ FBI and DOJ ‘manipulated’ FISA court



Rep. Chris Stewart, R-Utah, a member of the House Intelligence Committee

Rep. Chris Stewart, R-Utah, a member of the House Intelligence Committee, told WND the American people should be more concerned about political weaponization of the FBI, rather than the FISA process.

“The problem is with leadership at the FBI, not necessarily the FISA court,” Stewart said. “There are some things we need to do to add transparency to the court, but the judges have to presume that they are being given all of the evidence and that the evidence is being presented fairly – that just didn’t happen in this case. There’s no question that FBI and the Department of Justice manipulated FISC. There needs to be accountability.”

Stewart also said Attorney General Jeff Sessions should appoint a new special counsel to conduct a full review of the investigative and prosecution powers wielded by the Obama-era Justice Department and FBI.

“This dossier is just political garbage. It’s no more credible than a $2 novel,” Stewart said. “The FBI used that dossier to survey a private U.S. citizen who had no accusations against him except that he has associations with the Trump campaign. It’s an absolute abuse of power, and we just want the American people to know that.

“We need to look at DOJ, look at FBI, make sure they’re adhering to policies and to law. If after that, we think we need additional review oversight of FISA, I wouldn’t object to that.”

Dems: Don’t ‘nitpick’ FISA, FBI



Rep. Matthew Cartwright, D-Pa.

Rep. Matthew Cartwright, D-Pa., a proponent of FISA, contends that the court serves as a sufficient check on the government’s powers and protects the nation.

“You always worry about a trade-off with the invasion of personal privacy,” Cartwright told WND. “Democrats tend to be very worried about that aspect, but seven out of nine Democrats on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence voted to reauthorize the courts. I support the FISA court. [The judges] are helping to keep America safe from terror attacks in this country.”

Cartwright warned Americans not “nitpick” the FBI and the FISA court. He claimed [the Democrat Party response to the GOP’s memo, which was released Saturday](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2018/02/24/house-intelligence-committee-releases-dem-rebuttal-to-gop-fisa-memo.html), would prove the bureau’s surveillance had nothing to with political partisanship.

“The FBI is doing wonderful work toward that end of protecting all of us from terrorists in this country,” he said. “People should rather be protected from terrorists acts than nitpick with particular decisions of the FISA court. [The Democrat rebuttal] will prove the FBI has not been politicized.”



Rep. Danny Davis, D-Ill.

Due to coverage of the ongoing Russia probe, Americans will have a more comprehensive understanding of how the FISA court and the FBI function, Rep. Danny Davis, D-Ill., told WND.

“There are a lot of people, like myself, who always wanted to understand more about what governs the behavior of the FBI in terms of having the FBI become more transparent relative to what they do, how they do it and the authority they have,” Davis explained. “What we are getting now is a pretty good look at the FBI and the FISA court, something we don’t always get. Once this is all said and done, there will be a different level of transparency and a different level on the part of the citizenry of what they understand about the FBI.”

Dems say FISA court didn’t need dossier to grant spying warrant

Democrats insist the FISA court would have granted the spying warrant to the FBI even without the dossier.

“The dossier was part of the evidence provided, but I think it would have been granted without the dossier,” Rep. Lynch told WND. “The first warrant on Carter Page went back to 2013. He had been surveilled back then as a possible Russian agent. FBI had the evidence. That may have had some influence on the court.”

Lynch contends that the FBI was actually forthcoming in its FISA request to surveil Page because the bureau included a “footnote” in its application that noted the dossier was obtained from a political party.

“There’s a footnote in the warrant application that says part of the evidence has been provided by a political party – didn’t say which one, didn’t say it was the Clinton campaign, didn’t say that the dossier was paid for by the Democrats, but it said some of the evidence was paid for,” he said.



Rep. Raúl M. Grijalva, D-Ariz.

George Papadopoulos, an early foreign policy adviser to Trump’s presidential campaign, was the catalyst for the FISA court’s decision to grant the spying warrant to surveil Page, Rep. Raúl M. Grijalva, D-Ariz., told WND.

“The FISA process was not abused. The FISA warrant is not even tied to the dossier. The memo released from Chairman [Devin] Nunes and the Republicans on that committee has been discredited,” Grijalva told WND. “The motivation for asking for FISA authority came from what George Papadopoulos was saying to a high-ranking diplomat in Australia. The FBI is not in a violation, and FISA is not being used for partisan reasons.”

He continued: “When we see what was sent to the president in terms of the [Democrat response to Mr. Nunes’ memorandum](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2018/02/24/house-intelligence-committee-releases-dem-rebuttal-to-gop-fisa-memo.html) – we’ll see point by point – those are going to be rebuked. As it’s been said by Republicans, this in no way exonerates anybody, including the president, from the continuing investigation of Russian influence on our election.”



Rep. Eliot Engel, D-N.Y.

The Democrat response to the GOP memo proves the Trump administration is intent on destroying the legitimacy of the FBI to conceal the truth about President Trump’s collusion with Russia during the election, Rep. Eliot Engel, D-N.Y., told WND.

“The whole picture is that the president of the United States and his administration has been trying to sully the reputation of the FBI and the Justice Department,” he said. “I am for opening up the window and letting fresh air come in.”

Asked whether the FBI should be held accountable for misleading the FISA court, Engel skirted WND’s questions, again urging Americans to “look at the whole picture.”

“You cannot take one incident, or two incidents, or even 10 incidents, in isolation,” he said. “We have to look at the whole picture. It’s very difficult to comment on something like that unless you know the whole picture. … The American people ought to see the whole picture, not just one part of the story.”



Rep. Brenda Lawrence, D-Mich.

Rep. Brenda Lawrence, D-Mich., slammed Republicans for claiming the dossier is a political document that Clinton and the DNC “bought and paid for.”

“I will not say that that dossier was political,” Lawrence told WND. “It is my understanding that it was not this single document that the FBI used to obtain the FISA warrant. We are singling this one document [out] in the multitude of information that has been reviewed and looked at, and I don’t think you can pull this one document out as the single source.

“Our intelligence pulled as many sources as possible. I would not expect the FBI to use a document that was not vetted as being facts.”

Forcing the FBI to reveal its methods or evidence for obtaining the warrant jeopardizes national security, Lawrence argued.

“This letter, dossier, has nothing to do with the probe, and it didn’t start the probe,” she said. “There’s a reason for confidentiality and classified information. We might as well not have an intelligence force in our government if everything is going to be revealed. If every piece of information is declassified, then intelligence won’t work. What we need to look at is what we define as classified information.”

Even Dems see ‘politicized’ FBI – but favoring Trump

Rep. Davis railed against the “politicized” leadership of the FBI, arguing the FBI’s investigation of Clinton’s use of a private, unsecured email server during the 2016 presidential election was baseless and cost Clinton the presidency.

“I do believe that the FBI revelations – the way they handled information, especially near the end of the campaign – that their behavior had a great deal to do with the ability of President Trump to be elected president,” Davis told WND.



Rep. Grace Napolitano, D-Calif.

Rep. Grace Napolitano, D-Calif., one of the 58 Democrats who voted in favor of a motion to impeach President Trump last December, told WND she doesn’t know whether the FBI has been politicized or if the FISA court process should be reformed because she relies on the news media to learn more about the Russia probe.

“Even some members of Congress like me, I am not privy to the higher intelligence clearance, so I am not privy to what is going on in some of those areas,” she explained. “We learn about a lot of these things from what we hear in the press. We should have as much information as some of the others to be able to effectively talk about some of the issues that are coming before the rest of the country. I don’t know enough to make a comment on the dossier because its way beyond the intelligence clearance that I have, and I don’t get enough information on that.”

However, Napolitano added: “I hope Americans continue to trust the FBI. It’s one of the only weapons we have – one of the only safeguards we have. I hope they are thinking in a nonpartisan method to keep out of politics and do their job.”

**Seth Rich Parents Confirm Wikileaks Handoff**

The parents of murdered Democrat National Committee (DNC) Staffer Seth Rich confirmed to family friend Ed Butowski, it \_was\_ their son who provided WikiLeaks with a trove of DNC E-mails to expose cheating by the DNC against Bernie Sanders.

There were NO Russian Hackers. The DNC knew this from the beginning and concealed it so they could launch a charade upon the nation about non-existent "Russian Hackers" for over a year, with the sole purpose of destabilizing the Presidency of Donald Trump.

Right after Seth Rich gave the emails to Wikileaks, Hillary called in FireEye's Cyber Foreinsics team to 1) figure out who was the source of the leaks and 2) create an "independent" report that would say Russia hacked the emails. FireEye's Cyber Forensics team, made up largely of former law enforcement agents, identified Seth Rich as the source of the leaked emails to Wikileaks. A short time later, Seth Rich was killed in a "robbery."

Except unlike any other Robbery ever committed, the Robbers took nothing from Seth Rich. Not his phone, not his cash, not his credit cards... NOTHING. Normally, if police find a person who's been shot and killed in a bad neighborhood, they check to see if belongings are missing. In the case of Seth Rich, the cops declared the case a botched robbery despite the evidence. I wonder why?

Private Investigators have attempted to look into the Seth Rich case. Many of whom are experienced and well-networked within DC law enforcement circles. One by one, they've been stone-walled—met with cease and desist orders or leaks to the press the compromise them.

We still don’t know who pulled the trigger on the gun that killed Seth Rich, and we still don’t know who is running cover by attacking any PI who looks into the case. We need to find out.

WHY his parents have kept that hidden this long and in fact let it be DENIED by Brad Bauman can mean only ONE THING: They were being threatened. Aaron (Seth's brother) was being threatened. Hits of this nature never take anything from the body. It's a warning to others. This was clearly a warning to anyone else thinking about exposing Hillary and her voter fraud

**Why Would Democrats Oppose Private Gun Ownership?**

On the surface, the story of Leland Yee looks like a precipitous fall from grace.

The 67-year-old had risen steadily in the ranks of Bay Area politics since the late 80s, when he was elected to the San Francisco School Board. He then went on to sit on the city’s Board of Supervisors and in the state Assembly. The latter role saw him become the first Asian American speaker pro tem in 2004, making him the second-highest ranking Democrat in the California assembly at the time.

From 2006 onwards, Yee served as a state senator and was plotting a secretary of state campaign when his political visions were curtailed by a federal indictment in March 2014.

The arrest swept Yee and his associate Keith Jackson, 51, up in charges alongside some of the city’s most notorious characters, notable among them Chinatown gangster Raymond “Shrimp Boy” Chow.

[The wild tale of ‘Shrimp Boy’ Chow, notorious Chinatown ex-mobster and now alleged murderer]

It was one thing for the public to learn that Chow, a known convict, may have become embroiled in more objectionable schemes. But it was quite another to hear that Yee, a respected public figure who had supposedly distanced himself from San Francisco’s corrupt past, was being accused through the same undercover FBI investigation.

This Wednesday, Yee received a five-year prison sentence for accepting bribes and trafficking in arms. After initially denying culpability, Yee pleaded guilty to the charges last summer.

“I hope that in your sentencing of me, you will look at my entire life and not just these crimes I have committed,” the senator implored U.S. District Judge Charles Breyer on Wednesday, the Los Angeles Times reported. “In the 67 years of my life, I have devoted much of it to the work of the community, to people here in San Francisco and in the state of California.”

Yee added that he was most ashamed to have hurt his family and supporters: “That will always weight on me, and that will always haunt me for the rest of my life.”

Breyer was unsympathetic to the calls for leniency. While holding public office, Yee had accepted thousands of dollars in campaign contributions in exchange for political favors. And on the side, he and two associates had been involved in a weapons trafficking plot.

These acts were discovered by undercover federal agents investigating organized crime in San Francisco’s Chinatown. Jackson, a former school board president who helped Yee facilitate the bribes, received a nine-year sentence.

“It must be that the public has trust in the integrity of the institution, and Mr. Yee, you abused that trust,” Breyer said, according to the Times. He called Yee’s actions “vile” and the arms dealings particularly “hypocritical” given the politician’s history of gun control advocacy.

In this July 31, 2014 file photo, California state Sen. Leland Yee, D-San Francisco, leaves federal court in San Francisco. (AP Photo/Noah Berger, File)

Court records show that Yee agreed to perform certain official acts in exchange for mayoral campaign and later secretary of state campaign donations. He obliged one undercover agent who wanted him to make a call to the California Department of Public Health on behalf of an invented contract, as well as another who asked him to take a particular stance on medical marijuana legislation.

Yee also discussed buying weapons overseas and bringing them to the U.S. with two associates and an undercover agent. He accepted $6,800 and a list of arms for purchase in the Philippines.

The maneuvers were not only illegal, but also in stark contrast to what he had long purported to stand for.

Yee told CBS two years before he was arrested: “It is extremely important that individuals in the state of California do not own assault weapons. I mean that is just so crystal clear — there is no debate, no discussion.”

As a legislator, Yee supported strict gun control laws and was named to the Brady Campaign’s Gun Violence Prevention Honor Roll.

The calamitous epilogue to Yee’s career, then, seems to be an abrupt about-face. During his campaigns, Yee had styled himself as an outsider removed from the corruption that plagued San Francisco governments past.

“My parents didn’t encourage me to go into politics at all,” he told Hyphen magazine in 2011. “There was a stereotype in the Chinese community that sees politics with suspicion. Politicians aren’t honorable, they’re corrupt and unsavory.”

Some members of the public have expressed disappointment over his conviction, but many more think the five-year sentence is fair (if not too light) for someone who has admitted to abusing his position.

There is also a portion of the San Francisco community that couldn’t be less surprised. While Yee maintained a clean-cut image on the surface, those who followed his career closely — and opposed him politically — have viewed him as a contradictory figure from the start.

He was never someone who could be trusted, they say. The signs of corruption have been there all along, and whispers about his beguiling character were part of why he came fifth in the 2011 mayoral election.

Crowds jam Grant Avenue in Chinatown during a Chinese New Year festival and fair Saturday, Feb. 20, 2016, in San Francisco. (AP Photo/Eric Risberg)

Yee was born in China’s southern Guandong province during Mao Zedong’s Communist takeover. Yee’s father was a storeowner who served in the U.S. Army during world War II, and the family fled to San Francisco Chinatown when Yee was three years old.

For the first four years, the San Francisco Bay Guardian reported, Yee lived with his sister and mother in a one-room apartment while his father sailed for the Merchant Marine. The community was tight-knit and insular.

“The movie theater, the shoe store, the barber shop, food — everything you needed you could get in Chinatown,” Yee told the Guardian. “You never had to leave.”

He eventually did leave, to go to college at UC Berkeley, then get a masters San Francisco State University and a Ph.D in child psychology at the University of Hawaii.

When he returned to Hawaii on a trip in 1992, Yee had his first little-known run-in with the law. According to the Hawaii Reporter, Yee was arrested that year for allegedly stuffing a bottle of Tropical Blend Tan Magnifier Oil into his pocket and walking out of the store.

Yee skipped his court appearance and the case was dismissed. The incident was minor, to be sure. But it represented one of many minor transgressions which pointed to something potentially more insidious. As SF Weekly wrote in a 2011 cover story, “beneath that do-gooder veneer lurks a long history of apparent ethical lapses. During a generation in public life, Yee has become expert at talking himself out of trouble.”

Former employees at Asian Americans for Community Involvement, for which Yee was an administrator, told SF Weekly that he once used a bottle of Wite-Out to revise the medical records of the nonprofit’s beneficiaries to make their conditions seem more severe.

Another time, while serving on the city school board, Yee reportedly registered his children under a fake address so they could attend a better school.

While he was running for mayor, rallies for his opponent and current mayor Ed Lee doubled as opportunities to speak out against him, the Guardian reported. Despite his Chinatown roots, he lacked the Chinese American support that Lee enjoyed.

Rose Pak, a “Chinatown powerbroker,” told the Guardian that Yee had “no moral character.” She rattled off a list of her (unconfirmed) suspicions — “How did the guy manage to buy a million-dollar house on a $30,000 City Hall salary?” — but the gist was clear: Pak didn’t trust him.

In the words of the Guardian’s Tim Redmond, Yee was a “political puzzle”:

He’s grown, changed and developed his positions over time. Or he’s become an expert at political pandering, telling every group exactly what it wants to hear. He’s the best chance progressives have of keeping the corrupt old political machine out of City Hall — or he’s a chameleon who will be a nightmare for progressive San Francisco.

**Illinois Illegals can Vote**

Did you know that as of January of this year, Illinois residents must have a passport to fly inside the USA? Their State ID allows illegals to vote. The REAL ID Act of 2005, Pub.L. 109–13, 119 Stat. 302, enacted May 11, 2005, is an Act of Congress that modifies U.S. federal law pertaining to security, authentication, and issuance procedures standards for state driver's licenses and identity documents, as well as various immigration issues pertaining to terrorism.

The law sets forth requirements for state driver's licenses and ID cards to be accepted by the federal government for "official purposes", as defined by the Secretary of the United States Department of Homeland Security. The Secretary of Homeland Security has defined "official purposes" as boarding commercially operated airline flights, and entering federal buildings and nuclear power plants, although the law gives the Secretary the unlimited authority to require a "federal identification" for any other purposes.[4]

The REAL ID Act implements the following:

Title II of the act establishes new federal standards for state-issued driver's licenses and non-driver identification cards.

Changing visa limits for temporary workers, nurses, and Australian citizens.

Funding some reports and pilot projects related to border security.

Introducing rules covering "delivery bonds" (similar to bail, but for aliens who have been released pending hearings).

Updating and tightening the laws on application for asylum and deportation of aliens for terrorism.

Waiving laws that interfere with construction of physical barriers at the borders.

On December 20, 2013, the Department of Homeland Security announced that implementation of Phase 1 would begin on January 20, 2014, which followed a yearlong period of "deferred enforcement". There are four planned phases, three of which apply to areas that affect relatively few U.S. citizens—e.g., DHS headquarters, nuclear power plants, and restricted and semi-restricted federal facilities.[5] On January 8, 2016, DHS issued an implementation schedule for Phase 4, stating that starting January 22, 2018 **"passengers with a driver's license issued by a state that is still not compliant with the REAL ID Act (and has not been granted an extension) will need to show an alternative form of acceptable identification for domestic air travel to board their flight"**. Starting October 1, 2020 "every air traveler will need a REAL ID-compliant license, or another acceptable form of identification, for domestic air travel."[6] As of February 2018, 31 states and territories have been certified as compliant, 24 have been granted extensions, and one is not compliant.

**The HRC State Department Alive and Well**

The Pentagon will allocate $40 million into an inter-agency unit housed at the State Department to counter online propaganda and disinformation campaigns conducted by foreign nations, in an effort to respond "aggressively" to attacks.

The program was announced by the State Department this week in conjunction with the US Department of Defense, which will allocate the funds to the **Global Engagement Center** (GEC) - created in spring 2016 to replace the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications (CSCC).

*"One of those initiatives is the creation of an Information Access Fund to support public and private partners* ***working to expose and counter propaganda and disinformation from foreign nations.****"*

**This funding is critical to ensuring that we continue an aggressive response to malign influence and disinformation and that we can leverage deeper partnerships with our allies, Silicon Valley, and other partners in this fight,** said Under Secretary Goldstein. It is not merely a defensive posture that we should take, we also need to be on the offensive.

**Last year Secretary of State Rex Tillerson requested that $40 million be transferred from the Department of Defense**, with an overall allocation of up to $60 million from the US Defense budget. **The funding was authorized in a December 2016 defense bill signed by President Obama - which widened the scope of the center's activities.**



Previously, the GEC had focused exclusively on terrorist propaganda, however it was Tillerson's request for the funds that got the ball rolling on the expanded operation.

*Almost $20 million of the $60 million was already in the State Departments coffers and will be released to the center's officials to fight propaganda by terrorist groups such as the Islamic State. Tillerson also approved a request for a transfer of $40 million from the Pentagon to the center so it can fight state-sponsored propaganda. -*[*Politico*](https://www.politico.com/story/2017/08/31/rex-tillerson-funding-russian-propaganda-242224)

The GEC will counter disinformation campaigns primarily from China, North Korea and Russia.

Tillerson's delay in implementing funding authorized for the GEC had frustrated U.S. officials - who called it an example of "severe slowdown" within the State Department's decision making process. Sources, however, cited another factor at play; angering Russia.

*At one point during the discussions, Tillerson aide R.C. Hammond suggested the money is unwelcome because any extra funding for programs to counter Russian media influence would anger Moscow, according to a former senior State Department official. -*Politico

Hopefully the good folks at the GEC will be able to match forces with the **"90 people with a shaky grasp of English and a rudimentary understanding of U.S. politics shitposting on Facebook.**" at that Russian troll farm whose trash CNN went rooting through a few weeks ago. The one which Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein said had zero effect on the outcome of the election.

Maybe the GEC can consult with Facebook's VP of advertising, Rob Goldman, who noted that the majority of the Russian ad spend happened "AFTER the election," and wasn't intended to impact the election. Apparently dividing America by stoking political activism was their thing.

Just remember, it wasn't Hillary's fault that she lost - and the GEC will keep feeble-minded Americans safe and un-propagandized by foreign masterminds.

**Astroturfing: The Organization Utilizing Mass Shootings**

“Can you believe these kids?” It’s been a recurring theme of the coverage of the Parkland school shooting: the remarkable effectiveness of the high school students who created a gun control organization in the wake of the massacre. In seemingly no time, the magical kids had organized events ranging from a national march to a mass school walkout, and they’d brought in a million dollars in donations from Oprah Winfrey and George Clooney.

The Miami Herald credited their success to the school’s stellar debate program. The Wall Street Journal said it was because they were born online, and organizing was instinctive. If you’re awake, after listening to this program for a while, you recognize that we are being lied to…again.

On February 28, BuzzFeed came out with the actual story: Democrat from Broward County, Debbie Wassermann Schultz aiding in the lobbying in Tallahassee. This moved money, expensive communications, web development, and social media skills into action. The teacher’s unions organized the buses that got the kids to the coordinated photo shoots. Billionaire globalist, Michael Bloomberg’s groups and the radical, anti-American Women’s March organized the upcoming March For Our Lives. MoveOn.org, funded by Federal tax dollars by billion-dollar Planned Parenthood, crafted social media promotion, march logistics, and training for student activists provided.

The president of the American Federation of Teachers told BuzzFeed they were openly supporting the national school walkout, which well-practiced propagandists had previously assured the public was the sole work of a single, gifted teenager.

In other words, the response was massively professionalized and funded with millions in high skill activism. That’s not surprising, because this is what insurrection capable of taking down a nation looks like. All angles. All forms of media. A grassroots movement in a can, ready to go.

 It’s not a bunch of magical kids in somebody’s living room saying, ‘Hey wouldn’t it be great if we could do this? Hey, does your mom have any more Doritos?’

Wake up, America. It isn’t a coincidence that the professionalization happened right off the bat. Broward County’s teacher’s union is militant, and Rep. Ted Lieu stated on Twitter that his family knows Parkland student activist David Hogg’s family, so there were plenty of opportunities for grown-ups with resources and skills to connect the kids.

That’s before you get to whether any of them had been involved in the Women’s March. According to BuzzFeed, Wassermann Schultz was up and running with her massive Democrat political machine on day two.

What’s striking about all this isn’t the organization. If you start reading books about organizing, it’s clear how it all works. Every story on every channel, every daytime talk show, and every newspaper, was about the Parkland kids being magically effective. The really scary thing is that most of the stories were written well in advance of the event, as though the story was just waiting on the massacre to occur.

On Twitter, I lost track of the number of bluechecked accounts sprung up overnight rhapsodizing over how effective the kids’ organizational instincts were. I have been trying for a year to get a blue checkmark on Twitter. Denied. Social media response like this is not common, or organic. It’s skilled work. You have to learn how to do it, and it takes really a lot of people who know a lot of people in the business to make these things happen. You don’t just get a few magical kids who are suddenly amazing and naturally good at it.

The real tip-off should have been the $500,000 donations from Oprah Pimpfrey and Clooney. Big celebrities don’t give huge money to strange kids on a whim. These people are insulated with ten layers of privacy. They don’t have cell phones. They have agencies. They don’t have email addresses, they have publicists and agents and armed guards. Somebody who knows Pimpfrey and Clooney called them and got them involved.

For two weeks, journalists were AWOL. Free speech is supposed to tell the public what’s going on, keep runaway corruption like this exposed, and function as the core of any free people. And any of them who had any familiarity with organizing campaigns absolutely knew what was going on. They became part of the insurrection. They refused to protect our rights.

Matt Pearce, of the Los Angeles Times, would have been ideally placed to write an excellent article: Not only is he an organizer for the Times’s union, he moderated a panel on leftist activism for the LA Times Book Festival and has the appropriate connections in organizing. He should have known and would have been consummately positioned to expose the high-power organizers behind this media blitz. Instead, he wrote about an organic school walkout.

But it’s not just a mainstream media problem. Very few programs discussed the stark evidence that professional organizers were backing the Parkland kids. Instead, they objected to the front-and-centering of minor kids as unseemly, which does no good: Lefties aren’t going to listen. They are quite used to publicly fondling children with impunity. Unless, of course, they have become unable to raise money for the Democrats. Remember, John Conyers? Al Franken?

There was Elizabeth Harrington at the Washington Free Beacon, who noted that Clooney’s publicist was booking the kids’ media interviews pro bono. The result of all this is that the average American does not understand what’s going on in activism, because all they see is what the press covers. The stuff that’s visible. It’s like expecting people in the Stone Age to emulate the complex field movements of the Roman army just by looking at it. You have no concept of how much training goes into building and funding an insurrection like this against the most powerful nation in the world. You have to cut your teeth on doing it to other countries first. Remember Venezuela? Remember Libya? Assad in Syria?

No one credible is claiming that people did not die at the Parkalnd School. But, If you refuse to believe in crisis actors, you probably believe in some variation. But on the other hand, I think one reason there’s an opportunity to perhaps learn how organized protests like this function in modern times.

Have you ever watched the Right try to organize its own protests? Now that is funny. For example, then-Internet celebrity Baked Alaska tried to create pro-Trump flashmobs in Los Angeles during the election. His efforts consisted of posting times and locations online. And that’s it. You see this attitude often among Righties: “We have the Internet! We’ll post a notice and people will show up!” Well, no; they won’t. That’s like asking people to rewteet your post. Hello. There isn’t a single one of you who can describe the process of making something go viral on the Internet.

It’s not that Baked Alaska needed a magical kid, because there are no magical kids. There’s just long hours with dozens of people working every coordinated media simultaneously, and our press and politicos do everyone a disservice when they pretend otherwise. Here’s an example of how to turn out people, cribbed from “Organizing for Social Change,” the globalist activist manual published by the Midwest Academy, which has been around since 1973 and has trained over 30,000 activists, some of whom went on to found their own training schools. Add to that, Obama’s OFA, with more than a billion dollars and nearly 40 thousand trainers strategically working in major cities all over America, and it becomes a ghost army ready to attack at the right moment.

Say you run an organization that wants to impress a city councilman, and you’ve landed a meeting. You want your group to look bigger than it is. You’ve got 15 dedicated people you know will go, but you want to show the councilman 60 people.

The first thing you do is get 10 people from other groups (you do know other ideologically aligned groups in the area, right?). That leaves 35 people. To get them, you don’t post an ad on Craigslist. You look in your database of people who’ve signed your petitions or whatever. Call and ask them to come, bus them to the location and feed them lunch. Give them T-shirts, signs, banners, and hats that look like female body parts if you have to. Now, you have support.

Call them again a day or two in advance to confirm. Make sure the buses are ready, and the Denny’s has the banquet room ready with the all-you-can-eat pancakes. Of course to actually get 2 bus loads of people to say yes, twice and actually get on the bus, expect to make seven times that number of phone calls to get them. That’s about 500 five-minute phone calls, which breaks down to five people a night making phone calls for five straight nights. It’s not magical kids. That is money for buses, signs, T-shirts in all sizes, banners, food, and for callers and scripts to work like a team. It is absolutely NOT a few magical kids.

That’s a little more work than posting an announcement on Facebook. That’s community organizing. That’s part of how organizing fame works these days. Ask Linda Sourass. Ask Kamala Harris, of course she has great skill at climbing the zipper to success. These activist organizers consistently punch above their weight politically even if they don’t win every election.

The people organizing the response to Parkland, and a host of other causes, know exactly how to do it. So should you.

**How America Reacts to Democrat Attacks on the 2nd Amendment**

We had a great caller from Australia this last week on Quantum Connections on Wednesday. I asked him how Australians were enjoying the peace, tranquility, joy, and happiness in their country since the government confiscated all firearms. He was dead serious when he said, “We’re not.”

He said the gun violence has gotten much worse, more widespread, and more frequent that ever before, because people cannot defend themselves. Virtually everywhere is a gun-free zone, which has turned the entire island into one big Grand Theft Auto of a country.

So, how does America react to public efforts by the globalist elites to grab their guns? Here are the words of one young man who typifies the response:

After ten minutes of CNN’s recent town hall “debate” I had already searched for gun safes, the closest firearms dealer near me, classes on gun safety, and an NRA membership. Whether that’s a sign the event was a rousing success or terrible failure depends on who you ask. But whenever the left talks about gun control, significant numbers of people who see value in the Second Amendment run out and purchase a gun.

Normally, that wouldn’t include me. But this time was different. Here’s why.

Everyone watched the same event. Yet, depending on the political perspective it was with horror or glee. The town hall was one long string of thinly veiled accusations against people who had nothing to do with a heinous crime that was committed a week earlier. It was not really a debate or discussion, but a kangaroo court, where the audience held Americans responsible for the actions of an evil individual they had nothing to do with. The behavior of the children and parents at the event, while understandable, was reprehensible. Trauma, no matter how real, is never an excuse for treating other people with contempt.

Emotions aren’t what led me to buy a firearm. That decision was driven by the idea driving the “discussion” at the town hall, that security is more important than liberty.

Liberty is a state of being free from oppression imposed by an authority, but it requires individuals to take responsibility over their own lives. Responsibility is something of a burden, a difficult aspect of liberty conservatives sometimes avoid talking about. Liberty grants people the power to choose and chart a path, but that means that each individual is responsible for their actions, thoughts, and even their own security. Certainly, individuals grant some select members authority to protect in an effort to enhance safety for the whole community, but the responsibility for each person’s safety still rests with that individual.

The left would argue we can have security without consequences of oppression or loss of liberty, that we can live in a state free from danger. But that’s a false hope — we are never truly free from danger. The real security they promise is freedom from responsibility, or the ability to transfer responsibility to a select group of people who can be held accountable when things go wrong. They promise security for all in exchange for a little more, and eventually a lot more, power.

America is seeing this happen everywhere. Give up speech and no longer feel bad for offending others. Give up weapons and the government will protect you. Give up the ability to choose health care and the government will provide it for you. The tradeoff in each of these cases is the promise of some benefit in exchange for a loss of freedom in governing your own life.

The left wants the government to do more than secure our inalienable rights. Liberals want the government to secure things like economic security and free health care and a “proper” minimum wage. They want the government to guarantee emotional security, so girls are told they cannot tell a boy no to a dance. They want enforced psychological security, so people are forced to conform their speech so that liberals don’t have to suffer the hardship of words and labels they disagree with. And most fundamentally, they want the government to shield them from the burden of personal responsibility.

Opposition between liberals and conservatives, in the gun control debate and otherwise, is about placement of power. Liberty places power with individual, which means it places responsibility with the individual. Security places power within a limited amount of people’s hands and thus responsibility away from the individual. They are diametrically opposed, because they are inherently contradictory.

Certainly responsibility is a heavy burden, but it elevates humanity. To choose is to express free will. Yes, failure may be a result, but simply look at the flow of humanity toward freedom. How many people have attempted to “escape” America to Communism? How many people fled away Communism? Seeing a mob of people celebrating baseless and morally reprehensible claims at CNN’s town hall was frightening. More than that, as the evidence continues to mount over the failure of law enforcement in handling the Parkland shooter, it will only heighten the truth that a promise of security from the government doesn’t actually guarantee safety.

The town hall was a display of tyranny. For tyranny has never come from a single person, but rather from a mob cheering for the destruction of liberty and rights from those with whom they disagree.

So I bought a gun.

In short, David Hogg has had two effects. First, he inspired 500,000 new registration for NRA memberships. Second, gun sales are higher than ever…especially for AR-15’s. By the way, for the record, Bass Pro Shop does not sell anything the US Marines would use as a weapon of war.

**South Africa Acts on Globalist Agenda**

America has some semblance of rule of law, for now. What globalists want is to break America and see liberty and freedom disappear from the Earth forever; the way it was for 5,000 years before America’s surprise arrival. It is a mantra. It is repeated on every form of media, every legal bench, and every movie.

The bottom line is that white people are evil and must be cleansed from the planet. Take a look around, Earth explorers. I grew up in Santa Monica and Pasadena, California. The streets there now are lined with tens of thousands of tents, cardboard shacks, and old mattresses where live masses of invaders who demand their land back from the people who stole it from them in 1824 with the annexation of Alta California; actually their ancestors lost the war in 1848. By the way, that was the same year the Democrat Party was founded.

Well, this globalist propaganda is designed to undo all of that by simply invading and reoccupying the territory. But, it isn’t just here in America. It spills out everywhere, like a leaky sewer. Now, South Africa is following the advice.

More than 10,500 Americans have recently signed an emergency petition asking President Donald Trump to let white people in South Africa emigrate to the U.S. amid a vote by the country's parliament in favour of land expropriation, which would strip white farmers of land without compensation.

The petition calls on the U.S. leader to "take the steps necessary to initiate an emergency immigration plan allowing white Boers to come to the United States." Boer is the term used to describe South Africans of Dutch, German or Huguenot descent, who are also commonly referred to as Afrikaners.

The petition suggests that Trump should stop admitting refugees from Somalia and the Middle East, claiming they "cannot be properly vetted," and allow white South Africans into the country instead. They "can be easily vetted and also possess skills that make them compatible with our culture and civilization," the petition says. The only reason why this is politically incorrect is because all of these refugees are white. They are also targeted for extinction if they stay in South Africa.

A similar petition, calling on European Union President Jean-Claude Juncker, German Chancellor Angela Merkel and British Prime Minister Theresa May to allow white South Africans into EU countries, has gained nearly 17,000 signatures. But because these people are white, they are not even being granted an audience with either the Chancellor or the Prime Minister.

In October last year, thousands of predominantly white protesters took to the streets throughout South Africa to protest a string of deadly attacks in rural areas of the country. The black leadership, under the direct influence of speeches by Louis Farrakhan and others, are killing white landowners and seizing their farms, herds, crops, and equipment in the name of the Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs Department.

South Africa's parliament, in a move sure to set back the country by thirty years, stunningly voted to remove white South African farmers from their land without paying them compensation, news.com.au reported. This is larceny on a scale not seen in the civilized world. They did not conquer this land. They did not win it in a card game. South Africa was very close to making the transition from a developing 3rd-world nation to an emerging developed nation. This horrendous vote was supported, albeit amended by the ruling African National Congress (ANC), with the party promising reforms that will address racial disparities in land ownership. That is political speak for completely expunging whites from land ownership in South Africa.

These so-called lawmakers voted overwhelmingly in favor of the move, with the motion passing 241-83, to nationalize all land developments and investments owned by white people.

It was a key part of South Africa’s recently elected President Cyril Ramaphosa's platform. Ramaphosa, who has long supported Nelson Mandela's vision for South Africa, took office last month, replacing former President Jacob Zuma.

A recent land audit conducted by Agri SA, a Black South African agricultural industry association, found that white farmers still control 73 percent of the country's profitable farming land through a development strategy that took nearly 100 years to accomplish The key word here is profitable.

The vast majority of farms in South Africa are owned and operated by blacks, but almost none of them are profitable. White farmers and land developers have invested billions in equipment, advanced water management and harvest technologies, built roads, bridges, and schools to educate and train the African people. They worked without rest for more than 100 years to tame the land, redirect rivers, build reservoirs, design seed dealers and experiment with fertilizers and botanical hybrids until domestic crops thrived enough to feed a nation.

The long-term vision for South Africa has inspired China, America, and a half dozen European countries to invest billions into the local market to make it one of the most promising emerging markets in the world. Sadly, all of this comes to an end with this full-scale, nationalized racism. Investors are running for their lives at this very minute from South Africa.

Agri SA expressed concerns over the parliament vote, saying that while it "fully understands the need for land reform and the frustration with the apparent slow process and is committed to orderly and sustainable land reform...politics and emotion dominated the debate." White people have the money and the assets, and that just cannot be tolerated another moment.

Dan Kriek, Agri SA’s out-voted president, warned that the rights of all property owners in South Africa were at stake. He said that amending the country's constitution property clause would be a step backward into a past where the protection of property rights was not applied across the board.

In an effort to delay the machete mobs as long as possible, Ramaphosa urged people in South Africa not to panic over the results of the vote.

South Africa's Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs Department echoed that sentiment in a series of tweets. "This is a serious matter. It'll be handled through dialogue and in a stable manner. No need for beating war drums and creating unnecessary panic! South Africa belongs to all who live in it!" the CGTA wrote. If the Department has their way, the only people remaining in South Africa will be black.

"As we address the land issue, we'll ensure that land seized from whites is distributed to our poor people in a way that will ensure continued stability," the CGTA added.

Earlier, the department had tweeted, "Land is our heritage, our identity and essentially our dignity. We owe it to our children to dispel the myth that Africans are not interested in commercial farming." History supports this statement, but non-white commercial farms have not been profitable.

"We'll continue to help improve the lives of black South Africans through making these tough and necessary decisions. This is a moment where we all need to rise up and tackle this issue and emerge victorious," the CGTA added, including the hashtag "#LandExpropriation."

Julius Malema, the leader of the Economic Freedom Fighters opposition party, which introduced the motion to seize assets from all whites, told parliament, told lawmakers "we must stop being cowards. We must stop working around the white minorities who are governed by the fear of the unknown when it comes to the question of land expropriation without compensation."

He said land expropriation would end disparity caused by "white criminals who stole our land."

Malema also said "the time for reconciliation in South Africa "is over," News.com.au reported. "Now is the time for justice," he said, adding, "We must ensure that we restore the dignity of our people without compensating the criminals who stole our land."

The message is loud a clear. White people stole the land. White people are the cause of all poverty in South Africa. White people must be killed, and their developments and investments must be seized by the oligarchs who want to control the country.

Malema has been a strong supporter of confiscating land from white farmers, saying in 2016 he was "not calling for the slaughter of white people–at least for now."

The creators of the petition demanding that Trump admit white South Africans into the U.S. as refugees claim that the "increasing murder rate, along with the campaign to dispossess whites of their history, culture, farms, property and jobs, will inevitably lead to a complete genocide of South Africa's white population" if the U.S. does not "intercede."

In October last year, thousands of predominantly white protesters took to the streets throughout South Africa to protest a string of deadly attacks in rural areas of the country. Protesters claimed that white farmers were more likely to be murdered than the average South African, with some admitting that the attacks were racially motivated.

A propaganda piece by the BBC last November claimed that the claim that white farmers are more likely to be murdered than the average South African "is not supported by reliable data." Less than two months later, the truth can no longer be hidden from view. The ditches are filling with the bodies of white people, as globalists incite blacks to rise up and take back what is rightfully theirs from white imperialists.

Farm murders in South Africa are at their highest level since 2010-11. The country's police service says 74 people were murdered on farms between April 2016 and March 2017, compared with 58 in the previous year. Those numbers, however, reflect the number of murdered farmers, farmworkers and visitors to farms who are white, or blacks who are employed by or even visit white farmers.

This is a type and a shadow of what will happen in the Alta-California Territory within 10-20 years. Mexican citizens are already being elected to office in Western States at an extremely rapid pace. In 9 key electoral States, citizens of other countries can register to vote, obtain degrees at universities with free or in-state tuition, and hold public office. In 2016, there were elections where mayors, governors, and even Federal office holders were targeted by coordinated illegal aliens voting, some of them multiple times. In North Carolina, voter ID was required up until a few hours before election day.

A superbly timed and financed court decision, set aside the State’s law and allowed election day registration. More than 100 thousand votes were cast under the last-minute change. Those votes were not set aside for 90 days and validated, but were instead certified practically overnight by the State’s election commissioner. The State lost its governor to this voter insurrection.

You know it, and I know it. Every major city in America has been meticulously invaded by foreign citizens, and millions of them are now eligible to vote in Federal elections. This, Earth Explorers, is called meddling. This is called collusion to influence an election. This is insurrection by paying foreign citizens with foods, housing, health care, and money to come here and defraud the American election system.

It is a revolution as sure as the one occurring in South Africa right now. But remember this. The Democrat revolution against America to seize power over the treasury will not be finished by them. It will be finished by the fighters themselves who have been brought here to overthrow our government. The Democrats will not be able to rule them. The bad news is that they know this.

The Democrats know that this process will rip the guts out of America, and she will bleed out on the global market. This is what the globalists want. The foolish Democrats just hope the end will come after they have lived their lives of wealth and comfort. They don’t care about their own children, and don’t give a single thought about their grandchildren.

Watch South Africa closely. The things that happen there, will happen here unless we do something to stop it.

**Male Hate Group**

Several press outlets have noted that in its latest [annual "Hate Tracker,"](https://www.splcenter.org/news/2018/02/21/year-hate-trump-buoyed-white-supremacists-2017-sparking-backlash-among-black-nationalist) the Thought Police at the Southern Poverty Law Center have added "Male Supremacy" as a "hate group" category.

Associated Press and Reuters stories on SPLC Wednesday ignored their new "Male Supremacy" category. A story at [the Arizona Republic](https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/tempe/2018/02/22/male-supremacy-added-national-hate-groups-list-first-time-southern-poverty-law-center/364867002/) and a [Newsy video](http://https/www.wcpo.com/newsy/what-is-male-supremacy-according-to-southern-poverty-law-center) found at many local and regional news sites recognized it, but ignored the group's smear of women allegedly backing "male supremacy." The New York Times only carried the [AP story](https://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2018/02/21/us/ap-us-ku-klux-klan.html) and the[Reuters story.](https://www.nytimes.com/reuters/2018/02/21/us/21reuters-usa-trump-hate-groups.html) Predictably, several women's magazines -- including [*Elle*](https://www.elle.com/culture/a18378941/male-supremacy-groups-southern-poverty-law-center/) and [*Ms.*](http://msmagazine.com/blog/2018/02/26/southern-poverty-law-center-will-track-male-supremacy-groups/) -- celebrated this development.

What they aren't reporting is that the SPLC has also begun laying the foundation for marginalizing anyone providing intellectual support for mainstream men's rights activists.

The SPLC long ago recognized that tracking the small number of relatively powerless people in white and black nationalist groups (yet somehow [exempting](https://www.splcenter.org/news/2016/07/19/black-lives-matter-not-hate-group) the [violent](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tQJhzx5BGNA), [hate-filled](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2016/07/11/sheriff-david-clarke-its-time-to-stand-up-to-black-lives-matter.html), [exclusionary](http://www.philly.com/philly/columnists/jenice_armstrong/Black-Lives-Matter-blacks-only-meeting-policy-rankles-.html) Black Lives Matter movement) was a losing proposition. Thus, SPLC has in recent years [expanded](https://www.splcenter.org/hate-map/by-ideology) the scope of its identified "hate groups" to those holding non-violent conservative beliefs:

* "Anti-immigrant." Believing that illegal immigration needs to be stopped, and that legal immigration should be sensibly controlled makes you a hater.
* "Anti-LGBT." SPLC thought crimes include believing that homosexual marriage should not be legal (but lacking the guts to go up against the Catholic Church), that Christian businesses should not be compelled to provide services for same-sex marriages, and that gay agenda-driven sexuality discussions don't belong in grade schools.
* "Patriot groups." Thought crimes here [include](https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2017/year-hate-and-extremism) "resistance against any kind of gun control" and "transferring ... federal lands to the states."
* "Christian Identify," and even "Traditional Roman Catholic." Advocating for the Latin Mass is apparently a thought crime.

Expanding its frontiers to maintain its relevance, SPLC's 2018 "[The Year in Hate](https://www.splcenter.org/news/2018/02/21/year-hate-trump-buoyed-white-supremacists-2017-sparking-backlash-among-black-nationalist)" has a new "Male Supremacy" category, whose alleged "vilification of women ... makes them no different than other groups that demean entire populations ..."

Though the two groups in the "Male Supremacy" narrative may qualify as haters, the SPLC has disgracefully smeared the following women who sympathize not with Male Supremacy, but with the awful (in SPLC's view) "Men's Rights Activist" movement (HT [Instapundit](https://pjmedia.com/instapundit/289710/)):



 Prominent MRAs also include [anti-feminist female voices](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2014/08/mens-rights-movement-women-who-love-it/), such as popular Canadian YouTube personality Karen Straughan, **American psychologist Helen Smith**, and the former head of a domestic-violence shelter for women, the British Erin Pizzey. Men’s rights issues also overlap with [the rhetoric of equity feminists](https://www.politicalresearch.org/2017/03/08/mobilizing-misogyny/) like **Christina Hoff Sommers**, who give a mainstream and respectable face to some MRA concerns. Smith's book, [*Men on Strike*](https://www.amazon.com/Men-Strike-Boycotting-Marriage-Fatherhood/dp/1594037620), plausibly claims, based on her decades of experience as a psychologist, that "males have been subjected to intense discrimination in the name of equality."

Sommers, an American Enterprise Institute [resident scholar](http://www.aei.org/scholar/christina-hoff-sommers/), is an SPLC-designated hate-enabler because of [*The War on Boys*](https://www.amazon.com/War-Against-Boys-Misguided-Policies/dp/1501125427/ref%3Dla_B001H6WUC2_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1519660166&sr=1-1), [*Who Stole Feminism?*](https://www.amazon.com/Who-Stole-Feminism-Women-Betrayed/dp/0684801566/ref%3Dpd_sbs_14_3?_encoding=UTF8&pd_rd_i=0684801566&pd_rd_r=AP94R4RYFM500PFMRQAC&pd_rd_w=8xFjL&pd_rd_wg=eaTPe&psc=1&refRID=AP94R4RYFM500PFMRQAC), and her opposition to "gender feminism."

The SPLC's smears of these women as Male Supremacy sympathizers is designed to build support for cutting off their access to speaking engagements, mainstream publishing, social media, and Internet video platforms.

I am trying as we speak to book either one of them on my program, so it doesn’t look like it is working.

**What is Driving the Women’s Movement?**

In late February, Jeremy Pressman from the University of Connecticut and Erica Chenoweth at the University of Denver, writing in the popular political science blog the Monkey Cage, reported that between 1.8 and 2.6 million people participated in the January 2018 Women’s March. What’s driving the crowds? In the latest edition of American Enterprise Institute’s Political Report, there may be some answers.

In January, Gallup updated its battery of questions about satisfaction with different aspects of life. Fifty-eight percent said they were satisfied with the position of women in the nation, but 37 percent, the highest percentage since Gallup first asked this question, said they were dissatisfied. The growing negativity was driven by Democrat men and women; Republicans didn’t change their views. Someone or something was able to rally Democrat women around a message: White men are evil and must be killed off.

It is hard to pinpoint a single reason for the change, but many polls show that Democrats, and particularly Democrat women, are deeply dissatisfied with gender discrimination, responses to sexual harassment, and with President Donald Trump. To put it even more succinctly, they have been tanked up on hatred for white males who refuse to act, dress, and sympathize like women.

Looking at gender discrimination, 63 percent nationally told Pew Research Center in 2017 that there is a lot or some discrimination against women today. Nearly 8 in 10 Democrats, 78 percent, gave that response. Fifty percent nationally told Pew in another survey that the country had not gone far enough in giving women equal rights with white men. Black men, as a matter of fact, were deemed to be NPC’s; Non-Participating Parties. Two facts here. First, 70% of live black births are to homes without a male at home. Second, in New York City, more black babies are aborted than are born alive. It is not much below a consensus in every major city in America. Sixty-nine percent of Democrats and 26 percent of Republicans gave that response (54 percent of Republicans said it was not much of an issue).

In terms of sexual harassment—which has also been redefined in current America—38 percent of Democrats in a January ABC News/Washington Post poll compared to 16 percent of Republicans said recent attention on this issue had not gone far enough. Nearly half, 49 percent, of Republicans compared to 23 percent of Democrats said it had gone too far.

Women have been vastly more critical than men of Donald Trump’s performance as president, his personality, and his policies. He is averaging 10 points higher than Obama at the same point in his presidency, but only a quarter of women in a new Quinnipiac poll thought Trump respected women as much as men.

And nearly 6 in 10 women, 59 percent, said he is biased against them. Women are more Democrat than men, and their antipathy to Trump is fueling their views about the 2018 contests. Most women (56 percent in a February Quinnipiac poll) said they wanted to see the Democrats control Congress. Thirty-two percent preferred the GOP.

What will these poll responses mean in November? In another article, Pressman and Chenoweth cited a paper by AEI economist Stan Veuger and two colleagues, who argued in the Quarterly Journal of Economics that higher levels of participation in Tea Partiers protests produced higher GOP turnout in the 2010 midterms and GOP victories.

Will a higher degree of dissatisfaction in the polls and organized activism on the ground produce more Democrat victories in 2018? We know a large number of women have expressed an interest in running. After all, any man opposing them will automatically and precisely be disadvantaged by this national, multi-billion-dollar anti-Trump campaign. The slightest debate will be labelled sexism and harassment. Filing deadlines have closed in only a handful of states thus far, so we don’t know at this point how many women will actually run. It’s a sure bet, though, that more Democrat women will run in 2018 than GOP ones, and the early indications are that it could be a good night for many of them. I say early in all caps, because the election doesn’t really begin until Labor Day.

**The Open Border Case**

**The No-Borders Crowd**

To paraphrase Rousseau, man is born free, yet everywhere he is caged. Barbed-wire, concrete walls, and gun-toting guards confine people to the nation-state of their birth. But why? The argument for open borders is both economic and moral. All people should be free to move about the earth, uncaged by the arbitrary lines known as borders.

Not every place in the world is equally well-suited to mass economic activity. Nature’s bounty is divided unevenly. Variations in wealth and income created by these differences are magnified by governments that suppress entrepreneurship and promote religious intolerance, gender discrimination, or other bigotry. Closed borders compound these injustices, cementing inequality into place and sentencing their victims to a life of penury.

The overwhelming majority of would-be immigrants want little more than to make a better life for themselves and their families by moving to economic opportunity and participating in peaceful, voluntary trade. But lawmakers and heads of state quash these dreams with state-sanctioned violence—forced repatriation, involuntary detention, or worse—often while paying lip service to “huddled masses yearning to breathe free.”

Wage differences are a revealing metric of border discrimination. When a worker from a poorer country moves to a richer one, her wages might double, triple, or rise even tenfold. These extreme wage differences reflect restrictions as stifling as the laws that separated white and black South Africans at the height of Apartheid. Geographical differences in wages also signal opportunity—for financially empowering the migrants, of course, but also for increasing total world output. On the other side of discrimination lies untapped potential. Economists [have estimated](https://www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/jep.25.3.83) that a world of open borders would double world GDP.

Immigration is the greatest anti-poverty program ever devised.

Even relatively small increases in immigration flows can have enormous benefits. If the developed world were to take in enough immigrants to[enlarge its labor force by a mere one percent](http://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/9781933286105-Pritchett-let-their-people-come.pdf), it is estimated that the additional economic value created would be worth more to the migrants than all of the world’s official foreign aid combined. Immigration is the greatest anti-poverty program ever devised.

And while the benefits of cross-border movements are tremendous for the immigrants, they are also significant for those born in destination countries. Immigration unleashes economic forces that raise real wages throughout an economy. New immigrants possess skills different from those of their hosts, and these differences enable workers in both groups to better exploit their special talents and leverage their comparative advantages. The effect is to improve the welfare of newcomers and natives alike. The immigrant who mows the lawn of the nuclear physicist indirectly helps to unlock the secrets of the universe.

What moral theory justifies using wire, wall, and weapon to prevent people from moving to opportunity? What moral theory justifies using tools of exclusion to prevent people from exercising their right to vote with their feet?

No standard moral framework, be it utilitarian, libertarian, egalitarian, Rawlsian, Christian, or any other well-developed perspective, regards people from foreign lands as less entitled to exercise their rights—or as inherently possessing less moral worth—than people lucky to have been born in the right place at the right time. Nationalism, of course, discounts the rights, interests, and moral value of “the Other, but this disposition is inconsistent with our fundamental moral teachings and beliefs.

The immigrant who mows the lawn of the nuclear physicist indirectly helps to unlock the secrets of the universe.

Freedom of movement is a basic human right. Thus the Universal Declaration of Human Rights belies its name when it proclaims this right only “within the borders of each state.” Human rights do not stop at the border. Today, we treat as pariahs those governments that refuse to let their people exit. I look forward to the day when we treat as pariahs those governments that refuse to let people enter.

Is there hope for the future? Closed borders are one of the world’s greatest moral failings but the opening of borders is the world’s greatest economic opportunity. The grandest moral revolutions in history—the abolition of slavery, the securing of religious freedom, the recognition of the rights of women—yielded a world in which virtually everyone was better off. They also demonstrated that the fears that had perpetuated these injustices were unfounded. Similarly, a planet unscarred by iron curtains is not only a world of greater equality and justice. It is a world unafraid of itself.

**Community of Listeners of America Free Radio**

Policy Resolution Number 001

**Relating to the construction of a border wall along the Southern Border of the United States of America.**

**WHEREAS,** large numbers of unauthorized foreign citizens are arriving into the sovereign territory of the United States of America on a continuous basis across the Southern border, and

**WHEREAS**, it is estimated that significantly more than ten millions of foreign adult citizens are estimated to be currently residing inside said territory, and

**WHEREAS**, unauthorized children also cross into said territory, with and without adult relations, and are currently supported by American taxpayers through social programs at a national cost of more than $100 billion annually, and

**WHEREAS**, a disproportionately high percentage of unauthorized, adult foreign citizens commit violent crimes and are currently incarcerated in America at a cost of an additional $2 billion annually, and

**WHEREAS,** unauthorized foreign citizens continuously take advantage of United States rules classifying children born inside the borders of said territory as American citizens, giving birth to nearly 300 thousand children annually, for which health care, education, housing, and feeding costs are additionally born by American taxpayers, and

**WHEREAS**, whereas Democrats have actively blocked funding for a national security border wall along the Southern border.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that a National Border Security Wall Bond be established to provide funding for the acquisition and development of a Southern United States Border Wall in the fastest and highest quality means possible. The NBSW Bond could be only purchased in whole or in part by American citizens. 100% of the fund would be solely dedicated to the purchase of labor, materials, and/or property as needed to complete, where possible, a physical wall impenetrable by ordinary means across the entire Southern border. The NBSW Bond would pay dividends for a period of ten years based upon audited savings compared to the current taxpayer costs of the invasion and activities by foreign citizens into the sovereign territory of the United States.

**FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the authorization of this bond shall be under the same structure and priority of a war bond, as the security and survival of the United States of America depends upon its success.
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