**FEC Complaint Filed Against Freshman Girls**

Alexandria Ocommunist-Cortez get busted, again. Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez is under hot water right now after some shady payments made to her boyfriend and things aren’t looking good for the freshman Congresswoman. A complaint was just filed with the FEC over these payments, Fox News is exclusively reporting. The complaint alleges the shady payments were part of a scheme to avoid disclosure.

BY the way, these complaints are legally binding and they have real teeth. The FEC is one of the most powerful commissions in Washington. AOC is insisting that her and her team did nothing wrong, but the facts say that can’t be farther from the truth.

A Republican group filed a complaint with the Federal Election Commission on Wednesday alleging that Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s campaign may have illegally funneled thousands of dollars through an allied PAC to boyfriend Riley Roberts.

Members of the Washington, D.C.-based Coolidge Reagan Foundation allege in their complaint that when the Brand New Congress PAC (BNC) — a political arm of Brand New Congress LLC, a company that was hired by Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y., to run and support her campaign — paid Roberts for marketing services, it potentially ran afoul of campaign finance law.

“It’s not illegal for [Ocasio-Cortez] to pay her boyfriend, but it appears that they created some sort of scheme to avoid claiming the money [as a campaign expense],” Dan Backer, a D.C.-based attorney who filed the complaint on behalf of the foundation, told Fox News. “What exactly did he do for that money?”

We reported to you last week that the Brand New Congress PAC paid Mr. Roberts during the early days of the Ocasio-Cortez campaign. Now, according to FEC records, the PAC made two payments to Roberts – one in August 2017 and one in September 2017 – both for $3,000. Doesn’t sound too bad, does it?

The payment is not actually what alerted them to wrongdoing. It was specifically the use of “intermediaries” to make the payments, “the vague and amorphous nature of the services Riley ostensibly provided,” which were actually nothing that raised the smell. It was also the relatively small amount of money raised by the campaign at that stage and “the romantic relationship between Ocasio-Cortez and Riley” that violated campaign finance law. In other words, it looked like the money was laundered through him to her to cover her living expenses. That is clear grounds for felony charges of fraud.

The Coolidge Reagan Foundation noted in the [**complaint**](https://www.scribd.com/document/400645018/Ocasio-Cortez-Complaint#from_embed) the following two campaign finance laws they believe are pertinent to the allegations:

52 U.S.C. § 30114(b)(1) provides campaign contributions “shall not be converted by any person to personal use.”

52 U.S.C. § 30104(b)(6) provides an authorized committee must report “the name and address of each person who has received any disbursement not disclosed” as an expenditure, if it totals more than $200 within an election cycle.

In reference to 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b)(1), the complaint stated:

Ocasio-Cortez converted official funds raised through contributions to her candidate committee to personal use by transferring a total of $6,191.32 from her campaign committee to Brand New Congress PAC in late August and September 2017, which contemporaneously had its affiliated LLC pay $6,000 to her boyfriend, Riley. On information and belief, the amount paid to Riley was either not provided as consideration for bona fide services or exceeded the fair market value of any legitimate servicesRiley provided. On information and belief, the true intent of the payment to Riley was to provide personal benefit to a boyfriend, rather than defray bona fide campaign expenses.

In reference to 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b)(6), the complaint stated:

In an attempt to mask the payment of official campaign funds to her boyfriend, Ocasio-Cortez instead laundered them through intermediaries Brand New Congress PAC and Brand New Congress LLC. Ocasio-Cortez incorrectly reported a payment of $6,191.32 to Brand New Congress LLC on August 27, 2017, for strategic consulting, rather than correctly characterizing the underlying payment of $6,000 to Robert Riley.

When the allegations first surfaced, Ocasio-Cortez responded on Twitter, writing: "The conspiracy machine is in full effect & it’s been disappointing to watch professionals get duped + amplify unvetted Media posts as truth, treating journalism like it’s a high school Livejournal rumor mill or something. No, I don’t shadily pay my boyfriend. Come on & VET."

By the way, she is not the only one of the freshman girls to do this, but there is a legal way of doing it so that it is properly reported. Rep. Rashida Tlabi, D-Mich., disclosed in Federal Election Commission filings that she paid herself from campaign funds a total of $28,000 from May 7 until last year’s Nov. 6 election.

The rules allow payments “through the date of the general election,” the report said.

But, the report said, “following the general election, Tlaib cut herself a $2,000 check on Nov. 16 and disbursed $15,500 to herself on Dec. 1, which was well above the average of what she was paying herself during the campaign.”

A government ethics attorney told the Free Beacon: “On its face, it looks like the $2,000 payment on November 16 might be for the candidate’s salary for the first two weeks of November. But given that the election occurred on November 6 – i.e., part-way through the first November pay period – I am surprised that this last payment wasn’t prorated. In other words, Tlaib stopped being a candidate halfway through this period, but it appears that she kept collecting her full salary as if she was still a candidate throughout the full first two weeks of November.”

The lawyer continued: “The $15,500 payment is interesting. It’s not 100 percent clear what she’s doing, but what she may have done is to low ball her earlier payments for political purposes (at $2k), knowing full well that she would make up any difference at the end by giving herself a lump sum payment.” The FBI calls this structuring, and it is a felony.

Rashida’s “after-the-fact, lump sum payment” is blatant and deliberate violation of FEC regulations. The report also revealed Tlaib received $68,307 income from a “Leadership in Government Fellowship” in 2017. And George Soros’ Open Society Foundation listed an expenditure of $85,307 for Tlaib.

A Soros spokesman said her assignment was to focus on increasing civic participation of “disenfranchised urban communities of color.”

“Tlaib ultimately collected $225,180 from Soros’s organization throughout 2016 and 2017, according to the group’s tax forms,” the Free Beacon reported.

Tlaib is a clear and present danger to the nation. She is a human “F” bomber placed within the Congress.

“Newly elected Democrats are more radical than their predecessors. Lowlife Democrats like Rashida Tlaib and [Alexandria] Ocasio-Cortez, [D-N.Y..,] have no respect for the rule of law. They abhor the constitution and the Judeo-Christian values that shaped this great nation. If we continue electing socialists, Muslims and pro-open border politicians who refuse to enforce our laws and protect our sovereignty – we will lose more American lives and eventually lose our country. They violate our laws with the full knowledge that the Fake Stream News will protect them by crucifying anyone who tries to arrest them for their crimes.

Tlaib is “a Palestinian-American who ran unopposed and became one of the first two Muslim women elected to Congress alongside Ilhan Omar, D-MN.” America didn’t even field a candidate in her district out of fear of violence.

These Socialist soldiers are part of a new breed that is hell-bent on trying to destroy America. They want bigger government, higher taxes, open borders, and they embrace radical Islamists and want to weaken the U.S. military. Their socialist agenda is evil, and it’s antithetical to everything that makes America the greatest and freest nation on this side of Heaven. We cannot allow them to succeed!

Tlaib was registered to vote with a false address and represented a state House district in which she did not reside. Tlaib’s father told the Detroit News in 2010 that his daughter “lied” about her residency to run for office. She signed an election affidavit in 2008 with the Wayne County Clerk claiming she was a citizen of Detroit.

Tlaib represented the 12th district in the Michigan House of Representatives even though actually, she was not a resident of the district. Recently, an investigation by the Daily Caller News Foundation found Tlaib is a member of the Facebook group “Palestinian American Congress,” whose members openly and regularly demonize Jews. They often loudly proclaim that the Holocaust never happened, and that no Jews died by the hands of Hitler. The group’s founder, Palestinian activist Maher Abdel-qader, was a key fundraiser for Tlaib and organized campaign events for her around the country.

One year ago, Abdel-qader posted online an anti-Semitic video that claimed Jews aren’t actually Jewish, invented their historical claim to Israel and secretly control the media.

Tlaib demanded to be sworn into office on Thomas Jefferson’s Quran, perhaps not realizing that Jefferson apparently owned the book to investigate his enemies. The Founding Father was about to launch a war against the Muslim “Barbary Pirates” who had been attacking American ships on the African coast. He formed the Marines, who were nicknamed leathernecks for the thick leather armor they wore to keep from being beheaded when they went to war with the Muslims.

She has unabashedly deceived Michigan voters by claiming to be moderate on Israel, when in fact she supports sanctions against the occupation of Palestinian lands.

**The New America Civil War**

At a moment when the country has never seemed angrier, two political commentators from opposite sides of the divide concurred last week on one point, nearly unthinkable until recently: The country is on the verge of "civil war."

First came former U.S. attorney Joseph diGenova, a Fox News regular and ally of President Trump. "We are in a civil war," he said. "The suggestion that there's ever going to be civil discourse in this country for the foreseeable future is over. . . . It's going to be total war."

The next day, Nicolle Wallace, a former Republican operative turned MSNBC commentator and Trump critic, played a clip of diGenova's commentary on her show and agreed with him - although she placed the blame squarely on the president.

Trump, she said, "greenlit a war in this country around race. And if you think about the most dangerous thing he's done, that might be it."

With the report by special counsel Robert Mueller reportedly nearly complete, impeachment talk in the air and the 2020 presidential election ramping up, fears that once existed only in fiction or the fevered dreams of conspiracy theorists have become a regular part of the political debate. These days, there's talk of violence, mayhem and, increasingly, civil war.

A tumultuous couple of weeks in American politics seem to have raised the rhetorical flourishes to a new level and also brought a troubling question to the surface: At what point does all the alarmist talk of civil war actually increase the prospect of violence, riots or domestic terrorism?

Speaking to conservative pundit Laura Ingraham, diGenova summed up his best advice to friends: "I vote, and I buy guns. And that's what you should do."

He was a bit more measured a few days later in an interview with The Washington Post, saying that the United States is in a "civil war of discourse . . . a civil war of conduct," triggered mostly by liberals and the media's coverage of the Trump presidency. The former U.S. attorney said he owns guns mostly to make a statement, and not because he fears political insurrection at the hands of his fellow Americans.

The rampant talk of civil war may be hyperbolic, but it does have origins in a real crumbling confidence in the country's democratic institutions and its paralyzed federal government. With Congress largely deadlocked, governance on the most controversial issues has been left to the Supreme Court or has come through executive or emergency actions, such as Trump's border wall effort.

Then there's the persistent worry about the 202o elections. "Given my experience working for Mr. Trump, I fear that if he loses the election in 2020 that there will never be a peaceful transition of power," Michael Cohen, Trump's former fixer and personal lawyer, told a congressional committee Wednesday.

On that score, Cohen's not the only one who is concerned. As far back as 2016, Trump declined to say whether he would concede if he lost to Hillary Clinton, prompting former president Barack Obama to warn that Trump was undermining American democracy. "That is dangerous," Obama said.

The moment was top of mind for Joshua Geltzer, a former senior Obama administration Justice Department official, when he wrote a recent editorial for CNN urging the country to prepare for the possibility that Trump might not "leave the Oval Office peacefully" if he loses in 2020.

"If he even hints at contesting the election result in 2020 . . . he'd be doing so not as an outsider but as a leader with the vast resources of the U.S. government potentially at his disposal," Geltzer, now a professor at Georgetown Law School, wrote in his piece in late February.

Geltzer urged both major parties to require their electoral college voters to pledge to respect the outcome of the election, and suggested that it might be necessary to ask the secretary of defense and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reaffirm their loyalty to the Constitution over Trump.

"These are dire thoughts," Geltzer wrote, "but we live in uncertain and worrying times."

His speculation drew immediate reaction from the right. Former Alaska governor and Republican vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin tweeted a link to an article that called Geltzer's warnings "rampant crazy." News Punch, a far-right site that traffics in conspiracy theories, blared: "Obama Official Urges Civil War Against Trump Administration."

Said Geltzer: "I don't think I was being paranoid, but, boy, did I inspire paranoia on the other side."

The concerns about a civil war, though, extend beyond the pundit class to a sizable segment of the population. An October 2017 poll from the company that makes the game Cards Against Humanity found that 31 percent of Americans believed a civil war was "likely" in the next decade.

More than 40 percent of Democrats described such a conflict as "likely," compared with about 25 percent of Republicans. The company partnered with Survey Sampling International to conduct the nationally representative poll.

Some historians have sounded a similar alarm. "How, when, and why has the United States now arrived at the brink of a veritable civil war?" Victor Davis Hanson, a historian with Stanford University's Hoover Institution, asked last summer in an essay in National Review. Hanson prophesied that the United States "was nearing a point comparable to 1860," about a year before the first shots were fired on Fort Sumter, South Carolina.

Around the same time Hanson was writing, Robert Reich, a former secretary of labor who is now a professor at the University of California at Berkeley, imagined his own new American civil war, in which demands for Trump's impeachment lead to calls from Fox News commentators for "every honest patriot to take to the streets."

"The way Mr. Trump and his defenders are behaving, it's not absurd to imagine serious social unrest," Reich wrote in the Baltimore Sun. "That's how low he's taken us."

Reich got some unlikely support last week from Stephen K. Bannon, Trump's former chief strategist. "I think that 2019 is going to be the most vitriolic year in American politics since the Civil War, and I include Vietnam in that," Bannon said in an interview with CBS's "Face the Nation."

All the doom, gloom and divisiveness have caught the attention of experts who evaluate the strength of governments around the world. The Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index, a measure widely cited by political scientists, demoted the United States from "full democracy" to "flawed democracy" in January 2017, citing a big drop in Americans' trust for their political institutions. But, this is more a distrust for the Deep State that has been drawn into the open as one of the world’s most treacherous and powerful anti-American forces in history.

Similarly, Freedom House, which monitors freedom and democracy around the world, warned in 2018 that the past year has "brought further, faster erosion of American's own democratic standards than at any other time in memory." Again, the slant of the report points to President Trump as the source for the unrest, but this civil war is between two governments; one globalist and one American.

Keep in mind, those warnings are about the state of America's governmental institutions trying to overthrow the elected government. Political scientists who study civil wars, which usually take root in countries with high levels of corruption, low trust in institutions and massive populism. In other words, when the people discover just how corrupt their institutions are, then they rebel and dismantle those institutions, often brick by brick and by force.

Barbara Walter, a professor of political science at the University of California at San Diego, said her first instinct was to dismiss any talk of civil war in the United States. "But the U.S. is starting to show that it is moving in that direction," she said. "Countries with the inability to control its people are the ones that experience these wars."

I think it goes without saying that Americans do not believe that their government is there to control them. We believe that government is there to facilitate our pursuit of happiness and to protect the individual from mob rule. The spine of the Democrat Party is mob rule backed up with violence or economic ruin for challenging them.

James Fearon, who researches political violence at Stanford University, called the pundits' warnings "basically absurd." But he noted that political polarization and the possibility of a potentially serious constitutional crisis in the near future does "marginally increase the still very low odds" of a stalemate that might require "some kind of action by the military leadership. I can't believe I'm saying this, but I guess it's not entirely out of the question."

Less clear in the near term is what kind of effect the inflammatory civil war rhetoric has on a democracy that's already on edge. There's some evidence that such heated words could cause people to become more moderate. Americans do not want violence. They are the most well-armed people in history, and the Constitution clearly forbids the military from being used on US soil exactly for that reason. When Americans decide that their institutions, which form a separate and unelected government inside our government, need to be dissolved, they will dissolve them and make new rules that preserve the Republic and its Constitution. We are not a Democracy. All Democracies are doomed to failure from the day they are formed, because they derive their power from the majority. A Republic makes a place in the governing body for every person and every State; not just the mighty and the wealthy.

"Extreme rhetoric can lead some people to pull back from the brink," said Boaz Hameiri, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania and co-author on the study. But that only happens when people already believe a "more moderate version of the extreme views" and find the more extreme message shocking, he said.

In such cases, people recognize the absurdity of their position, worry it reflects badly on them and reconsider it, he said. If the extreme messages become a normal part of the political debate, the moderating effect goes away, the study found. Violence is most likely to occur, Hameiri added, when political leaders use "dehumanizing language" to describe their opponents. Terms like deplorable, racists, homophobes, or white supremacists are typical of the dehumanizing rhetoric. Aborting millions of babies, sanctioning Americans free speech, or using terroristic litigation to suppress people trying to expose the corruption in the agency government are forming the battle lines of this civil war hour by hour. Most experts worried that the talk of conflict here, armed or otherwise, was serving to raise the prospects of unrest and diminish trust in America's already beleaguered institutions. To be clear, when the power of these institutions is aimed at overthrowing an election, after the people have spoken so loudly against them, is seen as the existential threat to the Republic. Once a people have lived under freedom and liberty, they will not go peacefully back into oppression and subservience.

The latest warnings of civil war from diGenova drew an exasperated response from VoteVets, a liberal veterans advocacy group whose members have fought in actual civil wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"Amazing we have to say this but: 1. We are NOT in civil war. 2. Do NOT buy guns (or any weapons) to use against your fellow Americans," Jon Soltz, the group's chairman, tweeted in response to diGenova. "Trust us, we have seen war."

History shows us that civil war goes through stages. The unelected Institutions declare the people to be their enemy. The people respond with an electoral reprimand by electing a leader who will represent them. When that reprimand destroyed by the unelected Institutions, then people will resist their rule by law in favor of the rule of law. In other words, the law is the guide for everyone, and when the Institutions declare that the law does not apply to them, the people will rise up and enforce it themselves. That form of enforcement starts with elections, progresses to legal action, and then to violence when that fails to enforce the law. Read the Constitution. This is exactly the process of preservation of the Republic.

**Global Cooling**

Downtown Los Angeles, California, failed to reach 70º Fahrenheit (21º Celsius) once in the entire month of February, the first time that has happened since temperature records began, 132 years ago.

The *Los Angeles Times* reports (original links):

For the first time since forecasters [began recording data](https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-southern-california-cold-20190219-story.html) — at least 132 years — the mercury did not reach 70 degrees in downtown Los Angeles for the entire month of February.

The average high for the month was 61 degrees, which is significantly lower than the historical average of 68 for February. That makes it the eighth-coldest February on record, said Ryan Kittell, a meteorologist with the National Weather Service in Oxnard.Not a record or even a statistically significant trend, but nonetheless, it does dissolve the argument for global warming. Rather, it adds support for my assertion that the Earth is actually cooling.

It’s a big change for Southern California, where drought and warm winters in recent years have fueled the new Socialist movement. Make no mistake, all changes in the stability of the planet are seized upon by the Socialists as a means to crush America. No other country on Earth is targeted by these economic sanctions. Weather experts said the chilly February doesn’t signal a larger change in some of those trends. Mathematicians, on the other hand, can show a definite shift in the last decade toward the onset of an ice age. It is entirely based upon solar energy reaching the surface and the amount of that energy that is allowed to escape back into space. The albedo of Earth has been increasing steadily since the beginning of Solar Cycle 24. If it continues unabated, the farm belt is predicted to move 300 miles toward the equator.

Other regions of the country also experienced [extreme cold](https://www.breitbart.com/environment/2019/01/30/chiberia-chicago-residents-throw-boiling-water-watch-it-freeze/) earlier this year, with a polar vortex bringing temperatures so cold to Chicago that boiling water froze immediately on contact with the outside air, and clouds of steam rose off Lake Michigan because the lake was so much warmer than the ambient air temperature.

**Socialist Shuffle**

It takes money to operate a Socialist regime. Lots of money. Lots of other people’s money. The Clinton School of Self Enrichment usually calls for a tax-exempt foundation to be established with a righteous name. That way, tax money can be dumped by the truckload into it, and no member of the press will say a thing about it. Here is a great example.

New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio's wife, Chirlane McCray, was given $900 million to start a mental health initiative focusing on helping the homeless in the city. Four years later, no one seems to know what that money was actually used for, according to the New York Post.

The City Council discovered this shocking amount of potential waste during a meeting last Wednesday. And while it sounds good to spend heavily on a mental health initiative, it appears that nobody has noticed any real benefits from that investment.

"I like the fact that money is going toward mental health, but when they say we're seeing a benefit in all areas, I take exception to that, because I don't see it everywhere," Queens Councilman Robert Holden told The Post. "I'm not sure anybody does."

The Thrive program, which had its budget raised to $250 million per year in 2019, has produced some underwhelming numbers in terms of how many people it impacts. Seven mayors attended a 2017 national mental health conference in New York City. Only 570 of the estimated 12-15,000 mothers who experience postpartum depression have been reached by the program, Politico reported, a number NYC disputes.

Of the 78,000 newborn deliveries in the city annually, only 28,560 new mothers have been screened by the Thrive program. Bob McManus harshly assessed the program's effectiveness for the New York Post:

So, ipso presto, co-Mayor Bill coughed up enough cash to break a pack mule's back and sent it off to unelected co-Mayor Chirlane — who then went forth to cure Gotham's mental-illness problems.

Fast-forward to Wednesday, when the City Council was startled to discover that McCray and Team Thrive are closing in on having spent an eye-popping $900 million since the program's inception — and nobody seems to have a clue on what. There are no soup kitchens, no medical facilities, no porta-potties, and no new park benches. Nearly a billion dollars in just a few years, and there is not so much as a poncho on the sidewalks of New York.

The worst thing is that not one single newspaper or law enforcement official is calling for an arrest for fraud, embezzlement, conversion, theft, or money laundering.

**The Globalist Strategy**

Since the last world war, the ability to fight wars anywhere, anytime has been used as a proxy tactic to destroy America. The Soviets used it. The Caliphate uses it to this day. But make no mistake. There is a globalist Syndicate that is so powerful that it takes on supernatural abilities. Since the moment President Trump announced he was going to bring America home from senseless foreign wars, the folks down at Wars R Us have been going insane.

You would almost think this is why they exist, but it is not. You see, a strange thing happens to a soul when it is called up to fight. Normal dads and moms turn into cold-blooded killers. They bomb, shoot, and slice up the enemy, who has been reduced to a number or the equivalent of a loose rodent. The souls of those men and women are lost, once that occurs. Right or wrong, this is what happens to the soldier. The dark lord knows this.

So, a call for love and peace is seen as a death knell for the dark lord. Just as President Trump is ushering in a thousand year period of peace and prosperity for everyone who wants it, two of the most fearsome nations on Earth are ordered to begin fighting.

At about 8:25 PM eastern US time last night, word got out that spy satellites had picked-up Transporter-Erector-Launcher (TEL) vehicles inside Pakistan, being removed from their storage facilities with missiles on them. An hour later, visual verification was sent out by sources on the ground in Pakistan. The missiles are confirmed to be the Shaheen-III medium Range Ballistic Missile, armed with NUCLEAR WARHEAD.

The question we have to ask is why were these TEL’s set into motion? Why would they risk losing them to air attack? Did they deliberately want the missiles to be seen by spy satellites? As it turns out, they were not moved out for a quick wash and wax. They actually moved them to launch locations.

If fired from southeastern Pakistan the Shaheen III can hit India's Nicobar and Andaman Islands which are west of Thailand. India is believed to have placed their own nuclear assets there. At present, it is not known if Pakistan intends a first strike.

They know that if India launches a ground invasion, they will be defeated in a matter of days. India has been preparing for many decades for a two-front war with Pakistan and China at the same time. As far as I can tell, they have never lost a war in history. They are extremely intelligent, very well armed, and outnumber any army in the hemisphere with the best physically trained soldiers in the world. One more thing. None of them fear death.

Yesterday, India turned over their National Highway 1-A to military control. This is their main interstate system in the far north of India. There is only one reason to do that: create a Logistics chain to support a ground invasion to take back all of Jammu and Kashmir from Pakistan control. It would be like America turning over I-40 to Federal control for essential vehicles only. Within three days, an entire army could travel from coast to coast by ground, if necessary.

Apparently, in an effort to deescalate things, Pakistan Prime Minister Khan told a joint sitting of Parliament that Pakistan he would be RELEASING a captured India fighter jet pilot whose plane was shot down by Pakistan in their territory.

For its part, India does not seem interested at all in these developments. India says their air strike against Jaish e-Muhammad terror camps was targeted retaliation for a terror attack against India on February 14 which killed forty (40) India Police Officers. India feels it has the right to attack these terror camps, inside Pakistani territory. India also says that Pakistan's response to those air strikes was to target India military sites and military gear. In other words, an act of war.

Indian Defense Ministry: "We believe that the Pakistan air intrusion was an attack on military installations. We believe that the Indian Air Force Pilot was ill-treated by the Pakistan Army in violation of the Geneva convention."

India claims it did not target any civilians or military installations, but Pakistan escalated by targeting Indian military installations. India did not deliberately cross into Pakistani territory. It was just the only way to get an angle for the attack. India is doing everything it can to avoid war with Pakistan.

Artillery shelling has developed and is ongoing between Pakistani and Indian positions along the LoC.

Said one military intel source "Every time I try to think rationally about this situation, I remember that the Pakistanis protected Osama Bin Laden for years in the middle of a neighborhood surrounded by military staffers."

This may require a phone call from the White House to keep these two nations from plunging the region into war and destroying the global economy. But then again, that is exactly what the Democrats are trying to accomplish.