

July 3, 2006

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Record Information/Dissemination Section
Service Request Unit, Room 6359
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington D.C. 20535-0001

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Omaha Field Office
10755 Burt St.
Omaha, NE 68114-2000

Re: REQUEST UNDER FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT/Expedited Processing Request

This letter constitutes a request under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. §552 (“FOIA”), and the Department of Justice implementing regulations, 28 C.F.R §16.11, by the American Civil Liberties Union of Nebraska and the American Civil Liberties Union of Nebraska Foundation (“ACLU Nebraska”), on the behalf of Nebraskans for Peace, Nebraskans for Justice, Speak Out at StratCom, Joshua Cramer, Malcom Miles, Mark Weddleton, Tim Rinne, Tariq Al-Amin, Mary Dickinson, and Nan Graf (the “Requesters”).

I. The Requesters

1. **ACLU Nebraska and the ACLU Nebraska Foundation** is the statewide affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union (collectively, “ACLU”), a national organization that works to protect civil liberties and civil rights. The ACLU has challenged the United States government’s broad targeting and surveillance of innocent people as part of the war on terrorism, the government’s crackdown on criticism and dissent, the secret and unchecked surveillance powers of the USA PATRIOT Act, the excessive restriction of government information available through the Freedom of Information Act, the unfair questioning and targeting of immigrants, the unfair detention and treatment of people detained in the U.S. as part of the war on terrorism, and the unlawful detention and abuse of prisoners held by the U.S. government in detention facilities overseas.

In particular, ACLU attorneys around the country have provided direct representation to individuals and organizations targeted by the FBI and state and local police for exercising their

First Amendment right to criticize the government, including people who participated in numerous rallies and marches to protest the war in Iraq and who protested at the 2004 Republican and Democratic National Conventions. ACLU advocates have also used litigation, lobbying, and public education to limit oppressive FBI and state and local police monitoring, interrogation, and arrest of people at public rallies, marches and meetings. ACLU attorneys also have filed lawsuits challenging three of the most controversial surveillance provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act: Section 215, which authorizes the FBI to obtain an unlimited array of personal records about innocent people through secret court orders; Section 505, which authorizes the FBI to issue National Security Letters (NSL) demanding certain kinds of personal records without court oversight; and Section 218, which greatly expands the FBI's power to obtain wiretaps. ACLU attorneys have also provided direct representation to thousands of individuals interrogated by the FBI as part of its "voluntary" interview and special registration programs for Muslims and people of Arab and South Asian decent.

The ACLU regularly holds public membership meetings at which a wide range of civil liberties issues are discussed and debated. FBI Director Robert Mueller spoke at the ACLU annual membership conference in June 2003. FBI whistleblower Colleen Rowley and former national security advisor Richard Clarke spoke at the ACLU annual membership conference in July 2004. The ACLU also routinely provides information to the public and the media through print and online communications about the erosion of civil rights and civil liberties after September 11, 2001 and encourages ACLU members and activists to oppose government anti-terrorism policies that unnecessarily violate civil rights and civil liberties. Nebraska staff and volunteers for the ACLU have appeared at numerous public forums sponsored by other organizations to oppose the USA PATRIOT Act and other policies and actions of the Bush Administration since 2001.

2. **Nebraskans for Peace** (NFP) is a statewide grassroots advocacy organization working nonviolently for peace with justice through community-building, education, and political action. NFP advocates for dialogue and peaceful resolution of conflicts, while promoting the rights of all people. They further believe that anger in the developing world largely stems from economic injustice, and that the only way to peace is through the creation of an international economic system driven by human needs. NFP also adheres to the idea that the guarantee of basic human rights for all is the foundation of civil harmony, and that discrimination, imperialism, and economic oppression result in injustice and social unrest. NFP's concerns include fair tax policy, family farms, universal healthcare, promotion of anti-violence education in schools as well as general and racial equality.

3. **Nebraskans for Justice** (NFJ) and its members have been working for the last 36 years as a grassroots organization focused on racial justice issues. The group was formally organized and incorporated as NFJ in 1998. The group is an all-volunteer grassroots nonprofit whose current primary focus is the case of two former Black Panthers, Ed Poindexter and Mondo we Langa (a.k.a. David Rice). Poindexter and we Langa were targeted by the FBI during COINTELPRO for their activity as black activists and have been incarcerated for 36 years for a crime NFJ believes they did not commit. NFJ is currently supporting new legal action on behalf of Poindexter based in part on the newly revealed documents relating to FBI spying. Based on

NFJ's outspoken criticism of domestic spying, they have reason to believe their group may also have been targeted for surveillance.

4. **Speak Out at StratCom (SOS)** is a coalition of loosely affiliated individuals who come together every year to plan a protest outside Offutt Air Force Base in Bellevue, NE. The aim of the protests is to raise awareness of nuclear proliferation and the manufacturing of weapons of mass destruction within the United States.

5. **Joshua Cramer** is a Lincoln resident who has been active in organizing public rallies on controversial public issues. He works as a volunteer coordinator, but in his private capacity he is very active on the political issues that interest him. In 2002, Mr. Cramer was one of the planners of the Speak Out at StratCom (SOS) event that was held in Omaha and Bellevue. Mr. Cramer was one of the primary contacts and primary public faces for the SOS event. Mr. Cramer also has been an activist on other issues, including a public rally in opposition to a demonstration by white supremacists held in front of the Lincoln Federal Building in 2004. Mr. Cramer has received calls from law enforcement agencies around the planning of these events (including one call from the Department of Homeland Security), which indicates he was known to local and federal agencies as an activist. Based on Mr. Cramer's public activities on these issues, he has a belief that he may be the target of surveillance.

6. **Malcom Miles** is a Lincoln resident who assisted in the planning and organizing of the 2002 Speak Out at StratCom event that was held in Omaha, Nebraska. He is a network specialist for an agency providing mental health and substance abuse services, but in his private capacity he is very active on the political issues that interest him. Mr. Miles was coordinator of the SOS concerts and was therefore one of the primary contacts and primary public faces for the SOS event. Mr. Miles has also been an activist on other issues, including assisting with the Lincoln Bill of Rights Defense Coalition, which was a grassroots group that worked to educate the public on the need to reform the Patriot Act. Finally, Mr. Miles is an activist on death penalty issues and is currently President of the Steering Committee for Nebraskans Against the Death Penalty. In that capacity, Mr. Miles has organized and spoken at events around the need to abolish the death penalty. Based on Mr. Miles' public activities on these issues, he has a belief that he may be the target of surveillance.

7. **Mark Weddleton** is a Lincoln resident who has been active in organizing public rallies, marches and debates on controversial public issues. He is a Head Start teacher at a public school. As a private citizen he is very active on several political issues. From the beginning of the Iraq War in 2002 until the present time, Mr. Weddleton has been one of the primary public faces for local anti-war protestors. Mr. Weddleton is also a leader of the Lincoln Bill of Rights Defense Coalition. In that capacity, Mr. Weddleton has debated the US Attorney and provided public testimony on the Patriot Act on numerous occasions, including before the Lincoln City Council. Based on these public activities, Mr. Weddleton has a belief that he may be the target of surveillance.

8. **Tim Rinne** is the State Coordinator of Nebraskans for Peace. His work for NFP includes organizing and speaking at events on behalf of NFP membership. In recent years, Mr. Rinne has spoken at public events regarding nuclear proliferation, military actions in the Middle

East, to protests against the policies of Vice President Dick Cheney and President George W. Bush. Based on Mr. Rinne's public activities on these issues, he has a belief that he may be the target of surveillance.

9. **Tariq Al-Amin** is the President of Nebraskans for Justice. He is retired from the Omaha Police Department, where he worked for 25 years. His work for Nebraskans for Justice includes organizing and speaking at events on behalf of NFJ. In recent years, Mr. Al-Amin has spoken at public events regarding FBI surveillance and infiltration of the Black Panther group in Nebraska. Mr. Al-Amin has been closely involved in the effort to prove Ed Poindexter's and Mondo we Langa's innocence, and based on his public activities, he has a belief that he may be the target of surveillance.

10. **Mary Dickinson** is the Vice President of Nebraskans for Justice. She is a high school teacher. Her work for NFJ includes organizing and speaking at events on behalf of NFJ. In recent years, Ms. Dickinson has spoken at public events regarding FBI surveillance and infiltration of the Black Panther group in Nebraska. Ms. Dickinson has been closely involved in the effort to prove Ed Poindexter's and Mondo we Langa's innocence.

11. **Nan Graf** is a board member of Nebraskans for Justice and an active member of Nebraskans for Peace. She is a retired English professor whose work for NFJ and NFP has included event organizing, public speaking, and writing on behalf of these groups. Since 1974, she has done research for attorneys to help prove the innocence of Edward Poindexter and Mondo we Langa. In recent years, Ms. Graf has spoken at public events about her 32 years of research on FBI surveillance and infiltration of the Black Panther group in Nebraska.

II. The Request for Information

The Requesters¹ seek disclosure of any records² created from January 1, 2000 to the present, that were prepared, received, transmitted, collected and/or maintained by the FBI, the National Joint Terrorism Task Force (“NJTTF”), or any Joint Terrorism Task Force (“JTTF”) relating or referring to the following:

1. Any records relating or referring to any Requester, including, but not limited to, records that document any collection of information about, monitoring, surveillance, observation, questioning, interrogation, investigation, infiltration and/or collection of information of the Requester or its activities;³

¹ The term “Requesters as used herein is defined as the organizations and individuals identified in Section I of this letter, as well as its employees, members, and board of directors.

² The term “records” as used herein includes all records or communications preserved in electronic or written form, including, but not limited to, correspondence, documents, data, videotapes, audio tapes, faxes, files, guidance, guidelines, evaluations, instructions, analyses, memoranda, agreements, notes, orders, policies, procedures, protocols, reports, rules, technical manuals, technical specifications, raining manuals, or studies.

³ The term “activities” as used herein includes, but is not limited to, any activities of the Requester described in Section I above, and any advocacy, provision of services, litigation, lobbying, organizing, fundraising, meetings, marches, rallies, protests, conventions, or campaigns, and any media or communications to, from or about the

2. Any orders, agreements, or instructions to collect information about, monitor, conduct surveillance of, observe, question, interrogate, investigate, and/or infiltrate any Requester;
3. All files and records, including any memoranda of understanding, relating or referring to any formal or informal agreement between the FBI or Department of Homeland Security and the State of Nebraska, the counties in Nebraska, cities included therein, any documents of such counties and/or cities and any agents of said named political entities, to form a JTTF;
4. The factors and/or procedures used to determine whether an individual or organization in Nebraska is to become the target of such monitoring, surveillance, questioning, interrogation, and or/investigation;
5. Any records relating or referring to how, why or when any Requester was selected for collection of information, monitoring, surveillance, observation, questioning, interrogation, investigation, and/or infiltration;
6. Any records relating or referring to how collection of information about, monitoring, surveillance, observation, questioning, interrogation, investigation, and/or infiltration of any Requester was or will be conducted;
7. Any records relating or referring to the names of any other federal, state, or local government agencies participating in any collection of information about, monitoring, surveillance, observation, questioning, interrogation, investigation, and/or infiltration of any Requester;
8. Any records relating or referring to the specific role of the NJTTF or any local JTTF in any collection of information about, monitoring, surveillance, observation, questioning, interrogation, investigation, and/or infiltration of any Requester;
9. Any records relating or referring to the specific role of any federal, state, or local government agency participating in any collection of information about, monitoring, surveillance, observation, questioning, interrogation, investigation, and/or infiltration of any Requester;
10. Any records relating or referring to how records about any Requester have been, will be, or might be used;
11. Any policies or procedures for analyzing records about any Requester;

Requester in any form (including any oral, written, electronic or online communications, including but not limited to any books, pamphlets, brochures, newsletters, fundraising letters, correspondence, action alerts, e-mail, web communications, discussion groups, or listservs).

12. Any policies or procedures for cross-referencing records about any Requester with information contained in any database;
13. Any policies or procedures for cross-referencing records about any Requester with information about any other organization or individuals;
14. Any policies or procedures for cross-referencing records about any Requester with any other information not covered in numbers 12 and 13 above;
15. Any policies or procedures regarding retention of records about any Requester;
16. Any records referring or relating to the destruction of records about any Requester, including any policies permitting or prohibiting the destruction of records;
17. Any records referring or relating to how records of any Requester were destroyed or might be destroyed in the future;
18. Any records referring or relating to the recipient(s) of records about any Requester;
19. The policies or procedures which protect the privacy of persons who are observed or contacted during such monitoring, surveillance, questioning, interrogation, and/or investigation of individuals and organizations in Nebraska;
20. Any policies or procedures in place to protect the privacy of records that refer or relate to the employees, members and/or board of directors of any Requester;

III. Limitation of Processing Fees

ACLU Nebraska requests a limitation of processing fees pursuant to 5 U.S.C §552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II) (“fees shall be limited to reasonable standard charges for document duplication when records are sought for commercial use and the request is made by...a representative of the news media...”) and 28 C.F.R. §§16.11(c)(1)(i), 16.11(d)(1) (search and review fees shall not be charged to “representative of the news media”). As a “representative of the news media,” ACLU Nebraska fits within this statutory and regulatory mandate. Fees associated with the processing of this request should, therefore, be limited accordingly.

First, ACLU Nebraska does not seek disclosure of the records for commercial use. ACLU Nebraska is a “non-profit, non-partisan, public interest organization.” *Judicial Watch, Inc., v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2003).

Second, ACLU Nebraska meets the applicable definition of a representative of the news media. It is “an entity that gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience.” *National Security Archive v. Department of Defense*, 880 F.2d 1381, 1387 (D.C. Cir. 1989).

ACLU Nebraska is part of a national organization, the ACLU, which is dedicated to the defense of civil liberties. Dissemination of information to the public is a critical and substantial component of the ACLU's mission and work. Specifically, the ACLU publishes newsletters, news briefings, right-to-know documents, and other educational and informational materials that are broadly disseminated to the public. Such material is widely available to everyone, including individuals, tax-exempt organizations, not-for-profit groups, law students and faculty, for no costs or for a nominal fee through its public education department. The ACLU also disseminates information through its heavily subscribed web site: <http://www.aclu.org/>. The web site addresses civil liberties issues in depth, provides features on civil liberties issues in the news, and contains many hundreds of documents relating to the issues on which the ACLU is focused. The website specifically includes features on information obtained through the FOIA. See, e.g., www.aclu.org/patriot_foia and see www.aclu.org/torturefoia. The ACLU also publishes an electronic newsletter, which is distributed to subscribers by e-mail. In addition, the ACLU makes archived material available at the American Civil Liberties Union Archives, Public Policy Papers, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. Moreover, after ACLU publications are disseminated to relevant groups across the country, they often circulate them to their members or to additional groups and organizations.

ACLU Nebraska intends to share the information obtained in response to this request for records with the national ACLU for use in any and all of the publications and communications described here, as well as to the public at no cost.

In addition, ACLU Nebraska engages directly in the activities that qualify it as a representative of the news media. ACLU Nebraska regularly provides information to the public and the news media through quarterly newsletters, news briefings, know-your-rights documents and other educational and informational materials that are broadly disseminated to the public in Nebraska. ACLU Nebraska disseminates this material to anyone in Nebraska who requests such information, including individuals, non-profit organizations, students in high school and college, faculty in high school and college, and other requesters. Finally, ACLU Nebraska also disseminates information through its website: <http://www.aclunebraska.org/>.

IV. Waiver of All Costs

ACLU Nebraska also requests a waiver of costs, pursuant to the provision of the Freedom of Information Act that provides as follows:

Documents shall be furnished without any charge...if disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.

5 U.S.C §552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Disclosure in this case meets the statutory criteria, and a fee waiver would fulfill Congress' legislative intent in amending FOIA. *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossoitti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1312 (D.C. Cir. 2003) ("Congress amended FOIA to ensure that it be 'liberally construed in favor of waivers for noncommercial requesters.'").

Disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest. This request will further public understanding of government conduct; specifically, the FBI's political surveillance of political views, activities and associations of groups and individuals who do not constitute any threat and have no connection to terrorism. This type of government activity concretely affects many individuals and groups and implicates basic privacy, free speech, and associational rights protected by the Constitution.

Moreover, disclosure of the requested information will aid public understanding of the implications of the Department of Justice's recent decision to relax guidelines that previously restricted the FBI's ability to spy on organizations without a threshold showing a suspected criminal activity. Understanding the current scope of the FBI's monitoring of the expressive activities and associations of groups and organizations that are not involved in serious criminal activity or terrorism is crucial to the public's interest in understanding the consequences of the Department of Justice's important change in policy.

As a nonprofit organization and "representative of the news media" as discussed in Section III, ACLU Nebraska is well-situated to disseminate information it gains from this request to the general public; to the individuals and organizations whose political views and activities subject them to monitoring under the FBI's current practices; and to groups that protect civil liberties and constitutional rights.⁴

The records requested are not sought for commercial use, and ACLU Nebraska plans to disseminate the information disclosed as a result of this FOIA request through the channels described in Section III. As also stated in section III, ACLU Nebraska will make any information disclosed as a result of this FOIA request available to the public at no cost.

V. Request for Expedited Processing

ACLU Nebraska requests expedited processing of this request. The Freedom of Information Act and Department of Justice regulations provide for expedited processing in the circumstances presented here. The applicable regulation of the Department of Justice provides in relevant part:

Expedited Processing. (1) Requests and appeals will be taken out of order and given expedited treatment whenever it is determined that they involve:

....

⁴ Because the national ACLU clearly meets the standard for a waiver of costs, fees associated with responding to FOIA requests are regularly waived for the ACLU. For example, the Department of Health and Human Services granted a free waiver to the ACLU with regard to a FOIA request submitted in August 2004. In addition, the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Executive Office of the President said it would waive the fees associated with a FOIA request submitted by the ACLU in August 2003. Also, three separate agencies, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Intelligence Policy and Review, and the Office of Information and Privacy in the Department of Justice did not charge the ACLU fees associated with a FOIA request submitted by the ACLU in August 2002.

(ii) An urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged government activity, if made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information; or
....

(iv) A matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government's integrity which affect public confidence

28 C.F.R. §16.5(d)(1)(ii), (iv). ACLU Nebraska is entitled to expedited processing on the basis of Subsection (ii) as well as Subsection (iv).

A. 28 C.F.R. §16.5(d)(1)(ii)

Subsection (ii) applies in this case because ACLU Nebraska is “primarily engaged in disseminating information,” and there is an urgency to inform the public about the actual and alleged activities of the FBI, the NJTTF, and the JTTF in Nebraska. As explained earlier in Section III, ACLU Nebraska must be considered a representative of the news media for FOIA purposes. In addition to dissemination activities carried out through the national ACLU and its publications and web site, ACLU Nebraska’s web site, and ACLU Nebraska newsletter, and other activities discussed in Section III further demonstrate that ACLU Nebraska is primarily engaged in disseminating information. ACLU Nebraska’s website maintains information regarding multiple civil liberties issues in the state and who people can contact for help with such issues.

In addition, ACLU Nebraska disseminates information on civil liberties issues by speaking to a variety of community groups and organizations across Nebraska. ACLU Nebraska also disseminates news releases about developments in ACLU litigation and other civil liberties issues. ACLU Nebraska also posts information regarding civil liberties issues in the state and elsewhere on its website at www.aclunebraska.org. It also disseminates information through the national ACLU website at www.aclu.org, which posts news releases issued by ACLU Nebraska and contains links that lead people to the ACLU Nebraska website.

This request implicates as a matter of urgent public concern: the consequences of recent changes in government policy that has likely resulted in increased political surveillance of organizations and individuals who do not constitute a threat. Such government activity poses the risk of chilling the exercise of the First Amendment rights of speech and association as well as implicating the right of privacy. It may well violate rights protected by the Constitution. This is especially true if the requested records reveal that individuals and organizations are being targeted because they express particular viewpoints, or because of their religion or nationality, which may well violate rights protected by the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses as well as the First Amendment. Requests for information bearing upon potential violations of the Constitution require an immediate response so that any violations are stopped, future violations are prevented, and so that the deterrent effect on targeted groups, which chills their willingness to participate in public affairs and political activity, can be halted.

As explained below, the subject of government agencies collecting files on political beliefs, associations and activities that have no connection to criminal activity is a subject of

widespread media interest. That in itself provides grounds for urgency. In addition, the FBI has denied that it collects information about the political activities of persons who do not constitute a threat. To the extent that the requested records demonstrate otherwise there is additional urgency to inform the public about a matter in which public officials have not been candid.

B. 28 C.F.R. §16.5(d)(1)(iv)

ACLU Nebraska is also entitled to expedited processing because the information sought in this request relates to “a matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government’s integrity which affect public confidence.” 28 C.F.R. §16.5(d)(1)(iv). This request clearly meets these standards.

There is widespread and exceptional media interest in the issue of law enforcement agencies collection information on how persons exercise their First Amendment rights. For instance, the controversy over the Denver Spy Files generated intense media interest across the country. There has also been widespread and continuing media interest in the question whether other law enforcement agencies around the country, including the FBI and the JTTF, have been engaging in similar information collection. There has been intense media interest in the question of whether the JTTF is targeting individuals and groups for monitoring and surveillance on the basis of religion, political viewpoint, and nationality. (See Attachment: Media Interest)

In addition, the subject of this request clearly raises possible questions about the government’s integrity which affect public confidence. The potential targeting of individuals and groups on the basis of group membership, religion, political viewpoints or nationality raises many questions about the government’s integrity and affects public confidence in a profound way. The government’s--and particularly the FBI’s--treatment of persons on the basis of their political viewpoints is a critical issue with a long history dating back at least several generations. Questions about the government’s integrity in these areas substantially affect the public’s confidence in the government’s ability to protect all of its citizens. It also affects the public’s confidence in law enforcement and the legal system. This issue has been of concern to lawmakers, including three members of the House of Representatives who asked the Justice Department to investigate whether the JTTF was engaging in “systematic political harassment and intimidation of legitimate antiwar protesters.” Eric Lichtblau, *Inquiry into F.B.I. Question is Sought*, N.Y. Times August 18, 2004.

Finally, pursuant to application regulations and statute, ACLU Nebraska expects the determination of this request for expedited processing within 10 calendar days and the determination of this request for documents within 20 days. 28 C.F.R. 16.5(d)(4); 5 U.S.C §552(a)(6)(A)(i).

If this request is denied in whole or in part, I ask that you justify all deletions by reference to specific exemptions to the governing statute. ACLU Nebraska expects the release of all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material. ACLU Nebraska reserves the right to appeal a decision to withhold information or to deny a waiver of fees. ACLU Nebraska also reserves the right to supplement or amend this request.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Please furnish all responsive records to: Amy Miller, Legal Director, ACLU of Nebraska, 941 "O" Street, Suite 706, Lincoln, NE 68508 (402) 476-8091.

I affirm that the information provided supporting the request for expedited processing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Sincerely,

Amy A. Miller
Attorney at Law

Attachment: Media Interest

Joe Mandak, *Activites Say FBI Did Surveillance on Anti-war Activities*, Associated Press, March 15, 2006; Paula Reed Ward, *Merton Center Claims Evidence of FBI Spying on War Protesters*, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, March 11, 2006; Rep. Allen: *Revelation of FBI Surveillance of Mainers is Evidence of Alarming Assault on Our Most Basic Liberties*, US Fed News, February 2, 2006; MCLU: *FBI Obtained Email From Maine Peace Group*, Associated Press, February 1, 2006; COINTELPRO and the History of Domestic Spying, News & Notes with Ed Gordon, National Public Radio, January 18, 2006; Dan Eggen, *Coalition Seeks FBI's Files on Protest Groups*, Washington Post, p. A3, December 3, 2004; Kevin Johnson, *Anti-Terrorism Methods Draw ACLU Scrutiny*, USA Today, December 1, 2004; Daily Star Staff, *American Arabs Concerned Over FBI's 'October Plan,'* www.dailystar.com.Ib, October 6, 2004; David Shepardson, *FBI Agents Hunt for Terror Leads; Agency Combs Muslim Neighborhoods for Help in Preventing Election Day Attack*, The Detroit News, October 1, 2004; Eric Lichtblau, *Subpoena Seeks Records About Delegate Lists on Web*, NY Times, August 30, 2004 at P10; Alex Bradley and John Mayer, *The War at Home: Nationwide Crackdown on Activists Part*, www.saveourliberties.com, September 2, 2004; Eric Lichtblau, *Protestors at Heart of Debate on Security vs. Civil Rights*, NY Times, August 27, 2004 at A9; Larry Abramson, *FBI Questioning Political Demonstrators*, NPR.org; Susan Greene, *Activists Decry Pre-Convention Security Tactics: Questions by FBI, The Feds Say They 're Trying to Avoid Terror treats, But Many People Say the Steps Veer Toward Intimidation*, The Denver Post, August 26, 2004 at A-08; Eric Lichtblau, *F.B.I. Goes Knocking for Political Troublemakers*, NY Times, August 16, 2004 at A1 ; Amy Herder, *Teaching the Silent Treatment*, The Denver Post, August 8, 2004 at C-01; Jayashri Srikantiah, *Few Benefits to Questioning Targeted Groups*, San Francisco Chronicle, August 6, 2004; Camille T. Taiara, *New F.B.I Witch-Hunt*, San Francisco Bay Guardian, August 4-10, 2004; Kelly Thornton, *F.B.I.'s Home Visits Have Some Muslims Feeling Harassed, Alienated*, Signonsandiego.com, August 4, 2004; Richard Schmitt and Donna Horowitz, *FBI Starts to Question Muslims in U.S. About Possible Attacks*, latimes.com, July 18, 2004; Karen Abbott, *FBI's Queries Rattle Activist*, www.rockymountainnews.com, July 27, 2004; Mary Beth Sheridan, *Interviews of Muslims to Broaden*, www.washingtonpost.com, July 17, 2004; Jeff Eckhoff and Mark Siebert, *Group Fights Anti-war Inquiry*, The Des Moines Register, February 7, 2004; Jeff Eckhoff and Mark Siebert, *Anti-war Inquiry Unrelated to Terror*, The Des Moines Register, February 10, 2004 at 1A; Jeff Eckhoff and Mark Siebert, *Group Fights Anti-war Inquiry*, The Des Moines Register, February 7, 2004; Monica Davey, *An Antiwar Forum in Iowa Brings Federal Subpoenas*, NY Times, February 10, 2004 at A14; Monica Davey, *Subpoenas on Anti-war Protest Are Dropped*, NY Times, February 11, 2004 at A1 8; Michelle Goldberg, *A Thousand J. Edgar Hoovers*, www.salon.com, February 12, 2004; Michelle Goldberg, *Outlawing Dissent*, www.salon.com, February 11, 2004; Kern Ginis, *Peace Fresno Seeks Damages*, The Fresno Bee, February 28, 2004; Eric Lichtblau, *F.B.I. Scrutinizes Antiwar Rallies*, www.nytimes.com, November 23, 2003