



JOEL M. SKOUSEN'S

WORLD AFFAIRS BRIEF

COMMENTARY AND INSIGHTS ON A TROUBLED WORLD

WEEKLY EMAIL PRINTED EDITION

December 2, 2011

THIS WEEK'S ANALYSIS:

[Indefinite Detention Battle Lost](#)
[Worldwide Bailout Without Congressional Consent](#)
[Middle East - Iran War Update](#)
[Egyptian Elections: Military Still Holds the Cards](#)
[Cell Phone tracking Taken to a New Level](#)
[Cain is Toast, Gingrich the Only Insider Still Standing](#)
[More Evidence 9/11 Planes were Switched with other Aircraft](#)

INDEFINITE DETENTION BATTLE LOST

The ACLU started a firestorm of controversy this week: "The Senate is going to vote on whether Congress will give this president the power to order the military to pick up and imprison [indefinitely] without charge or trial civilians anywhere in the world." Incredibly, Senate Bill 1867 passed by an outrageous margin of 97 to 3, indicating how bad the thinking is among our elected officials. The worst part is that it is the Republican party that is hammering the nails into the coffin of civil liberties in the US. When are conservative Republicans going to get over this knee-jerk, militaristic patriotism that goads them into supporting every phony action done in the name of fighting terror that government creates?

The sponsors of this bill claim it contains no new powers -- that they're merely codifying the behavior of the current and past administrations. As bad as that would be, it is not true. Codifying indefinite detention is a change, and the bill does away with the Posse Comitatus Act by allowing the military to engage in police work on American soil. The ACLU continues:

"The power is so broad that even U.S. citizens could be swept up by the military and the military could be used far from any battlefield, even within the United States itself. The worldwide indefinite detention without charge or trial provision is in S. 1867, the **National Defense Authorization Act bill**. The bill was drafted in secret by Sens. Carl Levin (D-Mich.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.) [*the same one that*

sponsored a bill banning torture and then allowed an amendment giving the president a wide-open exemption] and passed in a closed-door committee meeting, without even a single hearing [*naturally*].

"In support of this harmful bill, **Sen. Lindsey Graham** (R-S.C.) explained that the bill will 'basically say in law for the first time that the homeland is part of the battlefield' and people can be imprisoned without charge or trial 'American citizen or not.' He also said on the Senate floor, '1031, the statement of authority to detain, does apply to American citizens and it designates the world as the battlefield, including the homeland.'"

Graham is a supporter of amnesty for illegals and in many ways always champions the agenda of the establishment Republicans who align themselves with big government. Charges have circulated for years that Senator Graham is a secret homosexual and, if true, may well fit the pattern of control that is applied to flawed politicians whose raunchy conduct has been recorded by authorities and used against them.

The bill constantly refers to "unprotected enemy combatants." This is an attempt to create new titles that emphasize the US claim that non-uniformed, irregular warfare combatants are NOT protected by the Geneva Convention—an interpretation not accepted by the international community.

Bob Livingston gave the loudest and most negative appraisal: "If this bill is passed, then the Rubicon will have been crossed. America will have become a complete and possibly irreversible totalitarian military state." Truth is, it already is—in its illegal black operations—but slowly, language is emerging to allow it to openly act tyrannically someday.

The proponents, now forced out in the open by the controversy, defend these draconian new powers by pointing out that the language of the bill specifically prohibits its application to US Citizens. It is true, there used to be such a clear prohibition but it was in the previous version of the bill, which I cite here:

S. 1254: “Section 1031(d): CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY TO UNITED STATES PERSONS.—The authority to detain a person under this section does not extend to the detention of citizens or lawful resident aliens of the United States on the basis of conduct taking place within the United States except to the extent permitted by the Constitution of the United States.”

That’s very clear legal language, but apparently that was too iron-clad a protection for the secret powers who wrote the bill. This provision was REMOVED in the latest bill. Why would they want to do that if they really intended not to apply it to US Citizens? What was left in the bill was a controversial section that appears to do the same thing, but doesn’t.

S. 1867 Section 1032 (b): “Requirement Inapplicable to United States Citizens- The requirement to detain a person in military custody under this section does not extend to citizens of the United States.”

This deceptive legal language deserves some analysis: Christopher Anders, senior legislative counsel of the ACLU, explains the problem: “The exclusion on Section 1032 only applies to 1032. It doesn’t apply to 1031. And that only makes it worse, because any judge is going to say, ‘Of course, members of Congress meant for American citizens to be detained because if they didn’t, they wouldn’t have put in the exception they put in one section later.’ ”

At first glance it appears to prohibit detention, but that depends on how you read it. The language against “requirement to detain” can be viewed two ways: 1) that “**detain**” is the operative word which the military must not apply, or 2) that “**requirement to detain**” is the operative word, allowing for the interpretation of MAY detain—but not required to do so. That’s the catch.

The previous version clearly denied any “authority to detain” which is crystal clear. Under the new language, the mandatory nature of detention is the only thing not applied to a citizen. Technically that still allows the military to use their own discretion in detaining a citizen suspect indefinitely. It’s just that they don’t HAVE to. And, that’s no protection at all.

Congressman **Justin Amash** (R-MI) confirms this by saying that the language is “carefully crafted to mislead the public. Note that it does not preclude U.S. citizens from being detained indefinitely, without charge or trial, it simply makes such detention discretionary.”

As you can see, legal language can be very slippery, and when two sets of conflicting language on the same issue are found in a law, the courts are free to choose the one they want to support, and give it superior status over the other as the ACLU counsel explained above.

Senator **Mark Udall** (D-CO) attempted to add an amendment to water down this provision of the bill but it was soundly defeated, Republicans voting to defeat the amendment and Democrats voting for. During the debate, you’d have been shocked to hear US Senators loudly reviewing the few cases of Arab born citizens provoked to attempt minor terror acts by the encouragement of their FBI or CIA handlers and demanding therefore that all US citizens be subject to military indefinite detention.

Yes, false-flag terror like the underwear bomber does work to goad politicians into overreacting. A true terrorist would have known you can't ignite plastic explosives in your shoe or crotch with a match. You need a blasting cap! These would be idiots were manipulated to commit acts that would bolster the government's phony claims about the need to curtail transportation liberty in the US.

Sadly, the Senate also rejected an amendment by Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., that would have ended the authority for using force in Iraq. The vote was 67-30 and shows how Congress continues to support foreign wars of intervention.

Obama claims he will veto this bill if the offending language is included, "The Administration strongly objects to the military custody provision of section 1032, which would appear to mandate military custody for a certain class of terrorism suspects," the White House said in a Nov. 17 release. "This unnecessary, untested, and legally controversial restriction of the President's authority to defend the Nation from terrorist threats would tie the hands of our intelligence and law enforcement professionals."

But I have my doubts. The administration is controlled by the same powers that control the liberal wing of the Republicans who are sponsoring this bill. A quick lesson in history should make us beware of false protestations: In 1913, the government and the Big Banks claimed they were against the establishment of the Federal Reserve, but that was only to goad the public into supporting it. After all, if the big banks are against it, it must be good, right? Wrong.

Section 1031 essentially repeals the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878 by authorizing the U.S. military to perform law enforcement functions on American soil. Former constitutional law teacher Glenn Greenwald says that "in his defense of state secrecy, illegal spying, preventative

detention, harassment of whistleblowers and other issues of civil liberties – Obama is even worse than Bush.

"Indeed, Obama has authorized 'targeted assassinations' against U.S. citizens. Even Bush didn't openly do something so abhorrent to the rule of law [*but he would have if his handlers had told him to*]. Obama is trying to expand spying well beyond the Bush administration's programs. Indeed, the Obama administration is arguing that citizens should never be able to sue the government for illegal spying [*which the courts have always eventually gone along with*]. Obama's indefinite detention policy is an Orwellian nightmare, which will create more terrorists."

Jim Kirwan comments on the slow creep of devious laws that keep chipping away at our protections against government arbitrary detention: "The insidious **Patriot Act** followed by The **Security Enhancement Act of 2003**, the infamous **Military Commissions Act 2006**, followed by the **John Warner Defense Authorization Act 2007** and, which called for the suspension of habeas corpus (4th Amendment due process) all of which gave the president the power to arbitrarily determine on his own, that any one of us was a 'domestic terrorist' and going even further to allow the president to strip us of our citizenship at his discretion with no oversight. Each of these unconstitutional bills was a piece of the puzzle being constructed incrementally as the Constitution and our rights were being trashed.

"These anti-American laws were not the only affront to the Constitution, our rights and the advancement of the police state. Now why, you might be asking, would anyone want to give the president of the United States the arbitrary authority to strip any US citizen of their citizenship with no evidence other than his/her belief that one of us is a terrorist, or supports terrorism, without the evidence supporting that

contention, or being officially charged with a crime? Hmmm. Where to start on this one?

“Let’s go back to the redefining of prisoners of war (POW’s) as ‘enemy combatants’. This change in terminology allowed the Bush regime, and now Obama, to by-pass the Geneva conventions on treatment of prisoners, including what has become our government’s proclivity for torture and avoided much of the international rules of war [*Now they’re adding “unprotected enemy combatants” just to make sure everyone understands they don’t intend to follow the Geneva Convention*]. It didn’t seem like much at the time, but we know now that it was to redefine the individuals targeted; if we don’t call them prisoners of war we don’t have to abide by the rules. Simple.

“Next came Homeland Security’s determination that US citizens who oppose government policy, mention the Constitution, support third party candidates like Ron Paul and Chuck Baldwin, were to be viewed as possible domestic terrorists along with social advocates, religious advocates and anyone who attended a rally or protest among many other things.

“This was followed by the discovery of Homeland Security documents describing who was to be viewed as a clear and present danger to the federal government (not the country) citing the use of REX84 black ops program along with Presidential Directive 51, that no one has been allowed to see, to conduct “Knock & Talk, Sneak & Peek, checkpoints; exigent search and seizure; meaning far more than what would be determined reasonable.

“Next came the launching of TSA which had been planned long before 9/11. The unlawful detaining of legal US citizens with the accompanying exigent search and molestation continues to this day for no other reason than they are traveling. HSD has compiled no-fly lists, suspect lists, black lists, suspected domestic

terrorists list and a host of other lists most of which we will never know we are on for reasons we will never actually know. Originally called Total Information Awareness (TIA), the program was shut down in 2003. Like all things the government does, TIA never went anywhere but simply got parceled out to other agencies making it harder to track while the core program was simply renamed TSA.

“Most recently, Obama has approved a new program which allows him to authorize the targeted killing of people in foreign countries that the administration decides is a threat (to them) and includes targeting of US citizens right here at home and abroad. This program, which is nothing more than sanctified murder, is a violation of international laws which prohibit the killing of individuals outside of armed combat zones.

“The program will allow the CIA or the military the unchecked authority to murder at will, US citizens and others, around the globe without any evidence of crime, threat or violent activity towards the United States, other than they said so.

“The intent through all of these assaults on the Constitution and our protected rights has been to find the means to redefine any one of us as a non-military enemy combatant to facilitate the police state. Once redefined, once the definitive description of who and what we are has been altered to suit the government agenda, it is open season on any one of us.”

Sen Rand Paul (R-KY) gave a spirited attack on indefinite detention on the Senate floor: “Detaining citizens without a court trial is not American. In fact, this alarming arbitrary power is reminiscent of Egypt’s ‘permanent’ Emergency Law authorizing preventive indefinite detention, a law that provoked ordinary Egyptians to tear their country apart last spring and risk their lives to fight.”

Recently, Justice Scalia affirmed this idea in his dissent in the Hamdi case, saying: “Where the Government accuses a citizen of waging war against it, our constitutional tradition has been to prosecute him in federal court for treason or some other crime... The very core of liberty secured by our Anglo-Saxon system of separated powers has been freedom from indefinite imprisonment at the will of the Executive.”

Naturally, the government won't use these powers on anyone but a few so that people will go back to sleep. But eventually, with the appropriate war on American soil, we will see mass arrests of dissidents in this country. That's when these powers will be used.

If you think people in government don't really intend to pursue what I'm describing here, read John Glaser's report on the administration lawyers formally justifying targeted assassinations of US citizens. “The U.S. may target and kill U.S. citizens when they take up arms with al-Qaeda, top lawyers in the Obama administration said Thursday.

“CIA counsel Stephen Preston and Pentagon counsel Jeh Johnson were questioned at a national security conference about the drone strike that killed American citizen Anwar al-Awlaki, but they would not comment on it specifically. They did say U.S. citizens don't have legal rights when they side with al-Qaeda.

“Johnson maintained that only the executive branch [*incredible*], not the courts, can decide who qualifies as an enemy on a battlefield. Unfortunately for U.S. citizens, the secret, peremptory nature of such executive decisions is not up to a review of any kind and do not require that any evidence be put forth proving the individual's guilt or association with al-Qaeda.

“Obama's lawyers were also not bothered by the fact that the "battlefield" in such considerations is amorphous and essentially spans the globe, a fact which makes their legal opinion on targeted assassinations of American citizens a dramatic expansion of unaccountable government power.”

That's what I mean—we have Americans in government, staffing high positions, that simply “aren't bothered” by government's arbitrary power to kill. The last time historically those same calloused tendencies showed their ugly head was in Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia. Don't think it can't happen in America, because it is—right now before our eyes.

WORLDWIDE BAILOUT STARTING WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT

The latest news that the FED was joining with other central banks in and around Europe to provide dollar liquidity at a reduced interest rate demonstrates how quickly people get progressively accustomed to bailouts and cease to question them anymore. It was back in 2008 that the PTB had to threaten Congress with the collapse of the economy if they didn't authorize the TARP bailout. Most went along, to their regret.

Now, the FED announces an open discount window of dollars to the world and no one in Congress even asks by what authority they are making dollars available to European banks. It's as if the FED owns these dollars and can do with them what they will. No one dares ask if the FED is going to have to print dollars to meet the demand, but that's a foregone conclusion.

If anyone is still confused by what has transpired this week, listen to Peter Schiff's analysis. He says this “may be one of the most important economic events of the year.”

“Today's unprecedented announcement by the world's most powerful central banks was a loud and clear bell ringing to buy precious metals. The

move, disguised as an attempt to help the fragile state of the global economy, is in reality a move to prop up failing banks in Europe and the US. By reducing interest rates paid for dollar swaps, central bankers are in effect increasing the quantity of global dollars in circulation. The result? The dollar will weaken, inflation will rise, and gold will soar. Gold was up more than \$30 today, and the dollar got crushed.”

One thing Bloomberg News found in the treasure trove of documents obtained by federal court order from the FED was that the TARP and other secret loans by the FED helped banks rake in profits of a net \$13 Billion.

“The Federal Reserve and the big banks fought for more than two years to keep details of the largest bailout in U.S. history a secret. Now, the rest of the world can see what it was missing. The Fed didn’t tell anyone which banks were in trouble so deep they required a combined \$1.2 trillion on Dec. 5, 2008, their single neediest day. Bankers didn’t mention that they took tens of billions of dollars in emergency loans at the same time they were assuring investors their firms were healthy. And no one calculated until now that banks reaped an estimated \$13 billion of income by taking advantage of the Fed’s below-market rates,” reports Bloomberg Markets magazine.

To repeat, over \$13bn profit was extracted during the TARP bailout and Citibank and Bank of America garnered the largest net gain. As I covered in the WAB at the time, that is why the money never got loaned back into the economy. The member banks were parking their money in the speculative money markets and making 3-8% without any effort.

We can expect the European banks to do the same—shoring up their profits to help defer what losses will come as EU bailouts become ever more insufficient to halt the failure of sovereign debt. But being bailed out wasn’t enough, the

bankers lobbied against government regulations, and against prosecuting any of the principles for the illegalities involved in the subprime mortgage scandal.

But at least one judge recently has had enough. He set aside a settlement between Citi and the SEC, chastising the SEC for not holding repeat offenders (the big banks) to their pledge not to do any more illegal deals. The NY Times wrote, “In his decision, Judge Rakoff called Citigroup ‘a recidivist,’ or repeat offender, for having previously settled other fraud cases with the agency where it neither admitted nor denied the allegations but agreed never to violate the law in the future.

“Citigroup and other repeat offenders can agree to those terms, the judge said, because they know that the commission has not monitored compliance, failing to bring contempt charges for repeat violations in at least 10 years.” In essence, the judge wasn’t going to let Citigroup pay a fine and go on its merry way. Now the agency will have to be prosecuted to the full extent of the law or shop for another judge. Don’t put any bets on the prosecution.

MIDDLE EAST-IRAN WAR UPDATE

Here’s the story behind the mysterious explosion at Iran’s nuclear facility. The Israeli Mossad is desperately trying to provoke Iran into lashing out at Israel. NY Daily News has the story:

“Israeli officials said in a report Wednesday that a mysterious explosion at an Iranian nuclear facility two days ago was no accident [*Iran denies any foul play occurred*]. The eyebrow-raising remarks surfaced in a Times of London story reporting that satellite images show smoke billowing from the uranium enrichment facility in the city of Isfahan. ‘There aren’t many coincidences,’ retired Major-General Giora Eiland told Israel’s army radio, noting that it was the second attack on an Iranian nuclear site in a month.”

So far, none of these goadings have worked on the government. Some of the testy young Iranians, however, are intent on striking back. In anger this week, Iranian supporters of Iran's ruling clerics ransacked the British Embassy and residential compound in Tehran. In response, Britain withdrew its ambassador and an unspecified number of diplomatic staff, and Norway in a show of support withdrew its ambassador. They may well be using the embassy attack as an excuse to get out of the country before war starts.

You'll be able to tell when the attack is getting close by how many aircraft carrier task forces the US puts in the region. The US would need 3 aircraft carrier task forces in the Middle East as a prelude to engaging Iran after an Israeli attack. There is currently only one in the Persian Gulf (USS John C. Stennis), but the USS George HW Bush is in the Mediterranean and positioned to enforce a no fly zone in Syria or protect Israel in the aftermath of a strike on Iran. The USS Carl Vinson is also in the Pacific steaming toward the Persian Gulf. That will put 3 aircraft carriers in the hot zone within another week.

Here's what to watch for: If the Stennis, stays rather than being relieved by the Vinson, that could be a sign that war is imminent. As for reserves, the US has 3 carriers in maintenance which are non-deployable but 5 carrier groups in home port that are fully deployable within a few weeks' notice.

The administration continues to play the game that they are restraining Israel but that doesn't match the warmongering going on in the media—which is always in lock step with what the PTB want done.

Jasmin Ramsey has the media side of the story: "Levelheaded experts [*a pejorative against those of us who don't buy the standard line*] continue to argue that the Obama administration is not

pursuing the military route with Iran. The [*superficial*] facts seem to be on their side.

"The same cannot be said of mainstream news media, U.S. congress and certain think tanks as Lobe Log's 'Daily Talking Points' show. But if Obama is not interested in waging war, there is still the looming possibility—not of Israel directly attacking—but of Israel provoking Iran to the point of confrontation. If this were to happen, the U.S. would be drawn into the conflict and next thing we know, there's an all out war. This is of course speculation, but it's certain that if war was to take place, the U.S. public and much of the world—constantly subjected to the demonization of Iran and hawkish commentary in the news—would have already been prepared for it. Don't believe me? Just keep reading:

"New York Times: The Foundation for Defense of Democracies' principal hawks Reuel Marc Gerecht and Mark Dubowitz explain their reasoning for supporting sanctions—because they are a prelude to war: Iran hawks should not view sanctions as a pusillanimous cop-out. Like President Obama's failed attempt at diplomatic engagement, sanctions are an unavoidable and necessary prelude to any more forceful action to stop Ayatollah Khamenei's nuclear ambitions.

"Washington Post: I've been writing that U.S. congress is growing increasingly militaristic toward Iran, but major U.S. newspapers seem to be way ahead of them. Hawkish op-eds continue to dominate the opinion pages of the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post and the New York Times, among others. This week the Post criticized the Obama administration's latest sanctions on Iran as 'half-steps' because Obama did not make moves which some Iranian officials have called acts of war – blocking Iran's exports and sanctioning its central bank. The Post goes on to congratulate congress for being 'ahead of Mr. Obama' by pushing for more punitive

measures which may come into play as early as December. The article concludes:

“By now it should be obvious that only regime change will stop the Iranian nuclear program. That means, at a minimum, the departure of Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, who has repeatedly blocked efforts by other Iranian leaders to talk to the West. Sanctions that stop Iran from exporting oil and importing gasoline [*the same things that provoked Japan into attacking Pearl Harbor, just as Roosevelt wanted*] could deal a decisive blow to his dictatorship, which already faced an Arab Spring-like popular revolt two years ago. By holding back on such measures, the Obama administration merely makes it more likely that drastic action, such as a military attack, eventually will be taken by Israel, or forced on the United States.” I still think Israel will make the first move.

EGYPTIAN ELECTIONS: MILITARY STILL HOLDS THE CARDS

Preliminary results show that the nation’s two top Islamist blocs have scored major wins, with the Muslim Brotherhood claiming over 40 percent of the vote in their party alone. The second place party, the al-Nour Party claimed around 30 percent. The military junta controlling Egypt has delayed the results—perhaps hoping to tweak the results to a certain outcome.

Dennis Curry writing for NewsWithViews.com had an interesting commentary on the role of the Muslim Brotherhood in enticing people to vote for them. “According to The Washington Post ‘the MB ‘is using its long-standing charity networks to gain an edge over more liberal and secular candidates.... Critics call it vote-buying.’ One of the major reasons for Egyptians demanding the removal of President Hosni Mubarak was the large number of unemployed. However, ‘unemployment has risen since the winter protests that ousted President Mubarak and empowered the nation’s military.’

“In addition to discounted food, the MB has also provided mobile health clinics. They are challenged by the more fundamentalist Islamists named the Salafists, who were a movement begun in Saudi Arabia and who want Sharia law. Could this be the Saudis’ way of influencing the Egyptian election results?

“As the election got nearer, Al Arabia News on November 18 reported that hundreds of thousands of Egyptians protested in Cairo’s Tahrir Square against the army’s continued rule over the people. According to Al Arabia News, ‘Friday’s rally was dominated by the country’s most organized political group, the Muslim Brotherhood.’ With MB member Hani Hegazi saying, ‘The army has no role in ruling people.... We want civilian rule....’”

That’s unlikely to happen. Egypt is much like Pakistan in that the military has the guns and they are not about to be ruled by Islamists nor secular politicians unless they control them. The military seems intent on maintaining power even with the illusion of democracy.

“Reuters reported that ‘Deputy Prime Minister Ali al-Silmi showed a constitutional draft to political groups earlier this month which would give the army exclusive authority over its internal affairs and budget.’

“Protestors demanded removal of the Deputy PM (also a former Field Marshall) in Alexandria... As the protests became violent, the MB withdrew its support because it didn’t want the turmoil to disrupt the elections (though hundreds of younger MB members still protested). In clashes on Sunday (November 20), four protestors were killed, and NBC Nightly News showed one being dragged away by police or security forces and tossed on a pile of garbage! By Friday, November 25, 41 protestors were dead.

“According to CNN in Cairo on November 21, some protestors believe Mubarak is running the military council and the entire country from prison [*I disagree. The military was the power behind the throne in Egypt. They don't need direction from Mubarak*]. Many Egyptians are also worried that a large number of Mubarak's ruling party could win election because the military didn't ban them from running for office unless they were convicted of political corruption.”

As in Iran even with a large minority behind them the MB and other Islamist fundamentalists are not going to be popular with educated Egyptians who have gotten used to a secular state with many personal freedoms unlikely to be allowed by a more Islamist regime. The MB wants power transferred from the military council into its own hands immediately after the election to use it to establish an Islamist state. It will be interesting to see how the military retains power with the MB projected to form the new government.

CELL PHONE TRACKING TAKEN TO A NEW LEVEL

Several months ago I noticed on turning on my cell phone (Verizon) that it started loading an app that I did not initiate. I don't pay for smart phone access to the internet so I have no need of any apps, but there it was anyway. Worse, it took several minutes to load which was somewhat disturbing. Nowhere on the phone could I find any record of the app, nor any way to disable it. Technical support said they didn't know what was going on either, but that I could reset the phone to factory settings and it should go away. That worked.

Zack Whittaker of Zdnet.com writes about the new surveillance technology being installed on cell phones without your consent: “Wikileaks has released dozens of new documents highlighting the state of the once covert, but now lucrative private sector global surveillance industry. Julian

Assange unveiled today the latest batch of released files from the whistleblowing organization.

“Speaking to a number of students and members of the press, bright and optimistic as ever, said: ‘Who here has an iPhone? Who here has a BlackBerry? Who here uses Gmail? Well, you're all screwed.’ According to Assange, over 150 private sector organizations in 25 countries have the ability to not only track mobile devices, but also intercept messages and listen to calls also.

“The technologies developed by this industry can be used to access Internet browsing histories and email accounts, through computing tapping or accessing mobile phones remotely. This information is then sold as wholesale information to governments or other private industry partners.

“He described the interception of this data as lawful, it will lead society to a totalitarian surveillance state. Along with representatives from the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, and Privacy International, documents were shown to suggest that software could not only read emails and text messages on mobile phones, but invasively alter them and send out fake messages to others.

“The UK, one of the most surveilled countries in the world, with more CCTV cameras per person than any other major city, is one of the most prevalent in Internet monitoring, phone and text messaging analysis, GPS tracking and speech analysis technologies. In the past ten years, he highlighted, the private industry had grown from a covert, behind-the-scenes industry, that primarily sold the U.S. National Security Agency, and GCHQ, the UK's third intelligence service.”

Two malls in the US are the first to implement a cell phone tracking program that reads every cell phone location data locally within the mall and tracks where mall customers go during their visit. The only way to avoid this, the mall warns, is to

shut down your cell phone while in the mall. In reality, the only way to be sure your cell phone isn't communicating is to remove the battery. I'm not suggesting no one use cell phones, but if you do anything where you don't want government tracking your movements (even years later) turn off you phone.

CAIN IS TOAST, GINGRICH IS THE ONLY INSIDER STILL IN THE RUNNING

With the credible news of an Atlanta businesswoman breaking her silence and revealing a 13 year affair with Republican presidential candidate Herman Cain, his campaign is toast. Jeff Zeleny reported that "Herman Cain told members of his campaign staff on Tuesday that he was reassessing whether to proceed with his presidential campaign... In a morning conference call with his advisers, Mr. Cain said that he would make a decision in the coming days about whether to stay in the race after his campaign was rocked by another round of allegations about his sexual conduct." The media has already written him off so he will back out quite soon.

Just as Cain was falling fast the media began pushing Gingrich forward with an almost overlaid urgency, publishing false polling data from Florida saying his support there is over 50%. This was ludicrous. Nobody's support rises that fast, and if it does it means the vast majority of Republican voters take all their cues from the media. Gingrich has all the faults of a globalist, deceiver, betrayer and serial womanizer. He accumulates all the faults of Perry (except the dull speech) all the immorality of Cain and all the warmongering of Santorum. If the Republicans buy this government shill, there is no hope.

Congressman Ron Paul is so incensed about the potential of Newt Gingrich winning the nomination that it has motivated him to launch a major attack on the Newt Gingrich's hypocrisy.

Kevin Kervick, of Manchester Independent Examiner wrote, "Presidential Candidate Ron Paul offered a scathing rebuke of Newt Gingrich today. Late last evening the Paul campaign released a hard-hitting ad that portrayed Former Speaker and Presidential Candidate Newt Gingrich as a hypocritical opportunist.

"Today, on the Laura Ingraham Radio Show, Congressman Paul was uncharacteristically critical of Speaker Gingrich, saying he believed he was hypocritical, a Washington Insider, and not a conservative. Paul said he believes Newt Gingrich is part of the problem rather than the solution for America. Earlier this week we learned that at one time, then Speaker Gingrich worked hard behind the scenes to try to unseat Congressman Paul from the House of Representatives.

"This is a powerful line of attack for Congressman Paul because there is such a contrast between his own reputation as a consistent and honest, independent statesman with that of Gingrich who has a reputation for being a pandering politician with questionable integrity." See the ad here:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CWKT0CP45zY>

EVIDENCE 9/11 PLANES WERE SWITCHED WITH OTHER AIRCRAFT

In the following video presentation by Pilots for 9/11 Truth, of which I am a member, the case of the RADES radar tracks is shown where each airplane involved in 9/11 is shown rendezvousing with another aircraft in flight, whereupon one aircraft turns and assumes the other's course heading back to the East Coast.

Airliners cross paths with others all the time on the radar screen, but they almost never make a circling turn at that very point and head off into a new direction. If it happened to only one aircraft, that would be one thing. But it happened to each of the supposed hijacked liners, and that

indicates that there was coordination between twice as many airplanes as struck on 9/11.

This is the “Aircraft Swap” theory which is gaining credibility since it alone explains several anomalies such as 1) Why Flight 93's supposed crash in rural Pennsylvania has almost no debris (indicating no airliner size crash), 2) Why FAA registration numbers for both United aircraft still persisted in the air traffic system two and three years after 9/11 until someone started to notice, 3) why the 757 that hit the South Tower appeared to have a huge bulging modification on the belly. No regular line pilot could have missed that weird belly mod during his preflight inspection and accepted that craft for flight.

Greg Szymanski wrote that “FAA records for four years listed both 9/11 United jetliners as still on the 'active' list. Now the planes were only 'deregistered' in September (2004) after snoopers questioned FAA officials a month earlier. Two of the 9/11 airliners were never 'deregistered' and remained on the 'active' flight list until Sept. 28, 2005, the classification officially changing only a month after two inquisitive flight researchers made repeated calls to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), inquiring about the strange irregularity.

“The two planes in question were Flight 93 and Flight 175, both owned and operated by United Airlines and, according to the official story, both destroyed on 9/11, one in Shanksville, Penn., and the other crashing into the South Tower of the WTC.”

Here's a short video presentation of the Radar tracks showing one of the converging swaps:
<http://pilotsfor911truth.org/forum/index.php?showtopic=21411>

Just recently, Pilots for 9/11 Truth found additional evidence that at least one of the planes was still in the air after the crash into the WTC. “Aircraft Communications Addressing and

Reporting System (ACARS) is a device used to send messages to and from an aircraft. ACARS Messages have been provided through the Freedom Of Information Act (FOIA) which demonstrate that the aircraft received messages through ground stations located in Harrisburg, PA, and then later routed through a ground station in Pittsburgh, 20 minutes after the aircraft allegedly impacted the South Tower in New York. How can messages be routed through such remote locations if the aircraft was in NY, not to mention how can messages be routed to an aircraft which allegedly crashed 20 minutes earlier?” Read the entire article here: <http://pilotsfor911truth.org/ACARS-CONFIRMED-911-AIRCRAFT-AIRBORNE-LONG-AFTER-CRASH.html>

[END]