
INDIANA CORPS *LIBERATOR*

A PUBLICATION OF THE INDIANA MILITIA CORPS - ©2008 - WWW.INDIANAMILITIA.ORG

APRIL-JUNE 2008

VOL. 8, ISSUE 2

CONTACTS & SUBMISSIONS

Our Officially "P.C." Disclaimer: This publication and the information contained within, including comments, text, and all hyperlinks, are for educational purposes only. Any use of the information contained within for other than educational purposes is not the responsibility of the Editor, the members or leaders of the IMC.

== Don't tread on us! ==

All clipart graphics are public domain except for the name and organizational graphics of the Indiana Militia Corps, and unless otherwise noted by an external source.

Copyrighted materials from outside sources are used within the context of the "fair use" clause (Title 17, USC sections 501, 506 & 507), and should not, be construed as an infringement upon any rights, privileges, benefits or immunities.

All rights explicitly reserved, without prejudice, per UCC 1-207 and 1-308.



We welcome submissions. Email your editorial or news article to hq.IndMilCorps@yahoo.com, and insert *LIBERATOR submission* in the subject line.

If you have ideas on how we can improve this publication, please contact us.

HQ, INDIANA MILITIA CORPS
<http://www.IndianaMilitia.Org>

Post Office Box 53
Pendleton, Indiana 46064
HQ Mobile: 765-606-0645
HQ Office: 317-219-3228



TO START EACH DAY WITH A POSITIVE OUTLOOK

By D.C. Nantz

To relieve stress every morning, do the following:

1. Create a new file in your computer.
2. Name it 'Hillary Rodham Clinton'.
3. Send it to the Recycle Bin.
4. Empty the Recycle Bin.
5. Your PC will ask you...
'Do you really want to get rid of 'Hillary Rodham Clinton?'

6. Firmly Click 'Yes.'
7. Feel better? GOOD -
Tomorrow, we do Nancy Pelosi.



BREATHING A BIG SIGH OF RELIEF

By MG William Flatt

Recently, we had to contend with both the arrival of the US Marines' 26th MEU and extensive flooding after severe storms left record rainfalls and tornado wreckage.

Fortunately, the Marines did not tear into central Indiana like a tornado, as there were serious concerns that they would set up checkpoints and conduct martial law operations in and around Indy.

In the past, several cities were selected for the sort of exercises we saw in Indianapolis, with the exception that other cities had an undiluted measure of the sort of police state training / conditioning these exercises represent. See http://www.infowars.com/police_state.html and especially scroll down to the bottom of the page and access the "Operation Urban Warrior" archive.

News of the Indianapolis exercise was posted at Infowars: <http://www.infowars.com/?p=2696>

HQ detachment, immediately

Inside This Issue:

2 Jesse Ventura: 'US Gov't. did 9/11'

3 SCOTUS Strikes D.C. Gun Ban

5 Crime watch assumes militia duty

7 Defending the President as Tyrant

8 US escalating covert ops against Iran

after the storm, set up a chainsaw squad and cleared fallen trees for several Pendleton area residents. Wood was hauled away and set aside to season for firewood.

At Camp Atterbury, Marines and National Guard troops were busy cleaning up after the June 3 tornado. They were so busy that their exercise in Indianapolis did not have the scope that we feared. Unfortunately the same tornado that hit Camp Atterbury also caused damage to HQ4BDE, which is being repaired at the time of this newsletter going out.

So in spite of everything that happened, and everything that could have happened but did not because of the storms & flooding, we are able to relax a little.



MARINES ENTER INDY FOR URBAN WARFARE EXERCISES

<http://www.indystar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080529/L/OCAL18/305290003>

<http://www.indystar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080603/L/OCAL18/806030402>



FORGET FREE GAS... CAR BUYERS WANT FREE GUNS

Dealer aims to please by providing \$250 coupon for firearms

May 21, 2008 - By Andy Barnett For WorldNetDaily.com
BUTLER, Mo. – A Missouri car dealership is triggering interest by offering customers free guns or gasoline with any purchase, and despite the skyrocketing price of fuel, patrons are going for the guns.

<http://www.worldnetdaily.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=64942>

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

Perhaps it is not just the state of our economy but the state of mind of our fellow Americans that explains this preference for the firearms offer. Maybe they understand that when it's time to start burying your guns, it's really time to dig'm up (and lock & load)!



JESSE VENTURA ON THE HOWARD STERN SHOW: U.S. GOV'T CARRIED OUT 9/11 ATTACKS

<http://www.nwotruth.com/jesse-ventura-on-howard-stern-show-gov-carried-out-911/>



TERROR PSYOPS: GLOBAL WARMING NOW A CAUSE FOR TERRORIST THREAT

<http://wordpress.com/tag/terror-psyops/>

In other words, America must 'go green' or 'the terrorists will win'. Likely this will be used as a lever to adopt the sovereignty-crushing Kyoto protocols, which were rejected 15 years ago.



BRITONS FEAR THE CARBON COPS ARE COMING

Reuters - June 26, 2008
LONDON (Reuters) - First there were the thought police, then the surveillance society, now Britons fear the carbon cops are coming to ensure compliance with climate change legislation, a survey showed on Wednesday.

And with warnings of global catastrophe ringing in their ears

some people fear that failure to cut personal carbon emissions will eventually result in enforced carbon behaviour re-education, the Energy Saving Trust said.



POLICE USE FORCE AT CHECKPOINTS TO KEEP FLOOD VICTIMS FROM RETURNING TO THEIR HOMES

MARTIAL LAW IMPOSED



Cedar Rapids, Iowa (from CNN)

In Cedar Rapids, residents were allowed to return home temporarily to retrieve keepsakes and other items Sunday, but authorities said Monday that **strike teams** had determined the neighborhoods were no longer safe, even for a quick visit.

Police set up checkpoints to keep people away from the affected neighborhoods, deemed unsafe after weeks of heavy rain forced the Cedar River from its banks, leaving much of Iowa's second-largest city underwater. **Evacuees waited in line at the checkpoints Sunday to receive special wristbands** that allowed them to go home and gather their belongings.



SUPREME COURT STRIKES D.C. BAN ON FIREARM OWNERSHIP

By MARK SHERMAN
Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) - The Supreme Court ruled Thursday that Americans have a right to own guns for self-defense in their homes, the justices' first major pronouncement on gun rights in U.S. history.

The court's 5-4 ruling struck down the District of Columbia's 32-year-old ban on handguns as incompatible with gun rights under the Second Amendment. The decision went further than even the Bush administration wanted, but probably leaves most firearms restrictions intact.

The court had not conclusively interpreted the Second Amendment since its ratification in 1791. The amendment reads: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

The basic issue for the justices was whether the amendment protects an individual's right to own guns no matter what, or whether that right is somehow tied to service in a state militia.

Writing for the majority, Justice Antonin Scalia said that an individual right to bear arms is supported by "the historical narrative" both before and after the Second Amendment was adopted.

The Constitution does not permit "the absolute prohibition of handguns held and used for self-defense in the home," Scalia said. The court also struck down Washington's requirement that firearms be equipped with trigger locks or kept disassembled, but left intact the licensing of guns.

Scalia noted that the handgun is Americans' preferred weapon of self-defense in part because "it can be pointed at a burglar with one hand while the other hand dials the police."

In a dissent he summarized from the bench, Justice John Paul Stevens wrote that the majority

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

"would have us believe that over 200 years ago, the Framers made a choice to limit the tools available to elected officials wishing to regulate civilian uses of weapons."

He said such evidence "is nowhere to be found."

Justice Stephen Breyer wrote a separate dissent in which he said, "In my view, there simply is no untouchable constitutional right guaranteed by the Second Amendment to keep loaded handguns in the house in crime-ridden urban areas."

Joining Scalia were Chief Justice John Roberts and Justices Samuel Alito, Anthony Kennedy and Clarence Thomas. The other dissenters were Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg and David Souter.

Gun rights supporters hailed the decision. "I consider this the opening salvo in a step-by-step process of providing relief for law-abiding Americans everywhere that have been deprived of this freedom," said Wayne LaPierre, executive vice president of the National Rifle Association.

The NRA will file lawsuits in San Francisco, Chicago and several of its suburbs challenging handgun restrictions there based on Thursday's outcome.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., a leading gun control advocate in Congress, criticized the ruling. "I believe the people of this great country will be less safe because of it," she said.

The capital's gun law was among the nation's strictest.

Dick Anthony Heller, 66, an armed security guard, sued the District after it rejected his application to keep a handgun at his home for protection in the same Capitol Hill neighborhood as the court.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled in Heller's favor and struck down Washington's handgun ban, saying the Constitution guarantees Americans the right to own guns

and that a total prohibition on handguns is not compatible with that right.

The issue caused a split within the Bush administration. Vice President Dick Cheney supported the appeals court ruling, but others in the administration feared it could lead to the undoing of other gun regulations, including a federal law restricting sales of machine guns. Other laws keep felons from buying guns and provide for an instant background check.

White House reaction was restrained. "We're pleased that the Supreme Court affirmed that the Second Amendment protects the right of Americans to keep and bear arms," White House spokesman Tony Fratto said.

Scalia said nothing in Thursday's ruling should "cast doubt on long-standing prohibitions on the possession of firearms by felons or the mentally ill, or laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings."

In a concluding paragraph to the his 64-page opinion, Scalia said the justices in the majority "are aware of the problem of handgun violence in this country" and believe the Constitution "leaves the District of Columbia a variety of tools for combating that problem, including some measures regulating handguns."

The law adopted by Washington's city council in 1976 bars residents from owning handguns unless they had one before the law took effect. Shotguns and rifles may be kept in homes, if they are registered, kept unloaded and either disassembled or equipped with trigger locks.

Opponents of the law have said it prevents residents from defending themselves. The Washington government says no one would be prosecuted for a gun law violation in cases of self-defense.

The last Supreme Court ruling on the topic came in 1939 in U.S. v.

Miller, which involved a sawed-off shotgun. Constitutional scholars disagree over what that case means but agree it did not squarely answer the question of individual versus collective rights.

Forty-four state constitutions contain some form of gun rights, which are not affected by the court's consideration of Washington's restrictions.

The case is District of Columbia v. Heller, 07-290.



CHINA HID TRUE STORY OF POW'S FATE

By ROBERT BURNS
Capitol Hill Blue

After decades of denials, the Chinese have acknowledged burying an American prisoner of war in China, telling the U.S. that a teenage soldier captured in the Korean War died a week after he "became mentally ill," according to documents provided to The Associated Press.

China had long insisted that all POW questions were answered at the conclusion of the war in 1953 and that no Americans were moved to Chinese territory from North Korea. The little-known case of Army Sgt. Richard G. Desautels, of Shoreham, Vt., opens another chapter in this story and raises the possibility that new details concerning the fate of other POWs may eventually surface.

Chinese authorities gave Pentagon officials intriguing new details about Desautels in a March 2003 meeting in Beijing, saying they had found "a complete record of 9-10 pages" in classified archives.

Until now, this information had been kept quiet; a Pentagon spokesman said it was intended only for Desautels' family members. The details were provided to Desautels'

brother, Rolland, who passed them to a POW-MIA advocacy group, the National Alliance of Families, which gave them to AP this week.

In a telephone interview Thursday, the brother said he did not follow up on the information he



got in 2003 because he did not believe it. He was not aware it marked the first time China had acknowledged taking a U.S. POW from North Korea into Chinese territory or burying an American there.

Two months after the March 2003 meeting, the Pentagon office responsible for POW-MIA issues sent Rolland Desautels a brief written summary of what a Chinese army official had related about the case.

"According to the Chinese, Sgt. Desautels became mentally ill on April 22, 1953, and died on April 29, 1953," the summary said. It added that he had been buried in a Chinese cemetery but the grave was moved during a construction project "and there is no record of where Desautels' remains were reinterred."

The reported circumstance of Desautels' death — sudden mental illness — may sound improbable. But the key revelation — that he was taken from North Korea to a city in northeastern China and then buried — matches long-held U.S.

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

suspicions about China's handling, or mishandling, of American POWs during and after the war.

It raises the possibility that wartime Chinese records could shed light on the fate of other U.S. captives who were known to be held in Chinese-run POW camps but did not return when the fighting ended in 1953.

And it appears to undercut the Pentagon's public stance that China returned all POWs it held inside China. The Pentagon has focused more on the related issue of China's management of POW camps inside North Korea during the war, which Chinese troops entered in the fall of 1950 on North Korea's side.

Desautels' reported burial site — the city of Shenyang, formerly known as Mukden — is interesting because it is far from the North Korean border and was often cited in declassified U.S. intelligence reports as the site of one or more prisons holding hundreds of American POWs from Korea. Some U.S. reports referred to Mukden as a possible transshipment point for POWs headed to Russia.

Desautels was an 18-year old corporal, a member of A Company, 2nd Engineer Battalion, 2nd Infantry Division, when his unit encountered a swarming Chinese assault near Kunu-ri, North Korea, on Dec. 1, 1950. According to a Pentagon account, Desautels and his fellow captives were marched north to a POW compound known as Camp 5, near Pyoktong, on the North Korean side of the border with China.

Subsequent events are a bit fuzzy, but Desautels was moved among prison camps and apparently was used by the Chinese army as a truck driver. A number of U.S. POWs told American interrogators after their release from captivity that they had seen Desautels alive & well in Camp 5.

One who said he spent four months with Desautels said that in March 1952 Desautels said that if

he should disappear, others should make inquiries with the proper military authorities. Numerous returned POWs said Desautels had spent several months inside China before being returned to Camp 5 in 1952.

Rolland Desautels, 81, recalls his older brother as "a strong character who came off the farm," enlisted in the Army at age 17 and was stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash., before being shipped to Korea in August 1950, two months after the war began with North Korea's invasion of the South.

The Pentagon has taken an interest in the Desautels case for many years. A June 1998 Pentagon cable to the U.S. Embassy in Beijing said the case was one of several on which China should be pushed to provide answers, that "we believe the Chinese should be able to account for these individuals."

Now it turns out that China did provide an accounting, although it is incomplete and was kept under wraps for five years.

Larry Greer, a spokesman for the POW-MIA office at the Pentagon, said Thursday that although U.S. officials asked to see the 9-10 page file on Desautels, China has yet to provide it or additional information.

Mark Sauter, an author and researcher on the subject of POWs from the Korean War, said in an interview that Beijing authorities are to be commended for finally providing useful information.

"The case of Sgt. Desautels has been a focal point of a six-decade cover-up by the Chinese government," Sauter said. "This is the first crack in the dike. From what we can tell, the Pentagon has not aggressively followed up, either on the Desautels case or those of hundreds of other Americans for whom the Chinese should be able to account."

American officials believed from the earliest days of the armistice that concluded the Korean

War without a formal peace treaty in July 1953 that the Chinese and North Koreans withheld a number of U.S. POWs, possibly in retaliation for U.S. refusal to repatriate those Chinese and North Korean POWs who chose not to be returned to their home country out of fear of retribution.

Gen. Mark W. Clark, the American commander of U.S.-led forces during the final stages of the Korean War, wrote in a 1954 account that "we had solid evidence" that hundreds of captive Americans were held back by the Chinese and North Koreans, possibly as leverage to gain a China seat on the U.N. Security Council.

Over time, however, U.S. officials muted their concerns, while periodically pressing the Chinese in private. Publicly, the Pentagon's stance today is that China returned all the U.S. POWs it held.

"Some U.S. POWs spent time across the (Yalu) river in Manchuria, but to the best of our knowledge, all have returned," the Pentagon's POW/MIA office says in a summary of wartime POW camps.



CHARLOTTE, N.C.
CITIZENS FORM
COMMUNITY PATROL

Crime Watch Assumes Militia Duty

WCNC TV – Charlotte, N. Carolina

Armed neighbors are now patrolling the Central Avenue business district in response to a shooting and three armed robberies at nearby businesses.

Overall, neighbors and police say the area is safe.

The Neighborhood Watch Alliance, started by Scott Yamanashi, includes nightly patrols from 9 p.m. to 2 a.m.

Yamanashi says there are up to 20 members who wish to remain anonymous. Nearly all, he says,

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

have conceal and carry permits and take their handguns with them during their patrols.

"It's the pattern of crime, the brazenness of criminals and me getting shot, which may have culminated into this movement," Yamanashi said.

He was shot in the arm earlier this year while breaking up an armed robbery at the Snug Harbor Bar.

"We want to draw a line in the sand and say this is enough," he said.

His injury prompted the idea of armed citizen patrols.

"We just want to be an added set of eyes and ears. A neighborhood watch that has some teeth," he said.

Yamanashi says the patrols are already paying off by calling police about strangers hanging around people's homes and businesses.

"Casing, I guess you could call it," he said.

Police say they support the group's Second Amendment rights. But one blogger says he'd feel better if the guns stayed at home and hopes wisdom and patience prevail if there's ever an armed encounter.

Police caught the man who shot Yamanashi but his accomplice is still out there. Yamanashi says if he comes across him, he's reaching for his cell phone. He says it's about neighbors being vigilant, not becoming vigilantes.

"If I take the law into my own hands then that would be vigilantism. But, under the Second Amendment I have the right to basically patrol my neighborhood and carry a firearm for my own protection," he said.

Yamanashi does not have a conceal-carry permit. He says even for members who do, their first action will be calling 911 if they see a problem.

Yamanashi hopes the alliance gets enough volunteers to expand into Dilworth and North Davidson business districts as well.



WHO IS PLANNING OUR NEXT WAR?

by Patrick J. Buchanan

Of the Axis-of-Evil nations named in his State of the Union in 2002, President Bush has often said, "The United States will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons."

He failed with North Korea. Will he accept failure in Iran, though there is no hard evidence Iran has an active nuclear weapons program?

William Kristol of The Weekly Standard said Sunday a U.S. attack on Iran after the election is more likely should Barack Obama win. Presumably, Bush would trust John McCain to keep Iran nuclear free.

Yet, to start a third war in the Middle East against a nation three times as large as Iraq, and leave it to a new president to fight, would be a daylight hijacking of the congressional war power and a criminally irresponsible act. For Congress alone has the power to authorize war.

Yet Israel is even today pushing Bush into a pre-emptive war with a naked threat to attack Iran itself should Bush refuse the cup.

In April, Israel held a five-day civil defense drill. In June, Israel sent 100 F-15s and F-16s, with refueling tankers and helicopters to pick up downed pilots, toward Greece in a simulated attack, a dress rehearsal for war. The planes flew 1,400 kilometers, the distance to Iran's uranium enrichment facility at Natanz.

Ehud Olmert came home from a June meeting with Bush to tell Israelis: "We reached agreement on the need to take care of the Iranian

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

threat. ... I left with a lot less question marks regarding the means, the timetable restrictions and American resoluteness..."

"George Bush understands the severity of the Iranian threat and the need to vanquish it, and intends to act on the matter before the end of his term. ... The Iranian problem requires urgent attention, and I see no reason to delay this just because there will be a new president in the White House seven and a half months from now."

If Bush is discussing war on Iran with Ehud Olmert, why is he not discussing it with Congress or the nation?

On June 6, Deputy Prime Minister Shaul Mofaz threatened, "If Iran continues its nuclear weapons program, we will attack it." The price of oil shot up 9 percent.

Is Israel bluffing – or planning to attack Iran if America balks?

Previous air strikes on the PLO command in Tunis, on the Osirak reactor in Iraq and on the presumed nuclear reactor site in Syria last September give Israel a high degree of credibility.

Still, attacking Iran would be no piece of cake.

Israel lacks the stealth and cruise-missile capacity to degrade Iran's air defenses systematically and no longer has the element of surprise. Israeli planes and pilots would likely be lost.

Israel also lacks the ability to stay over the target or conduct follow-up strikes. The U.S. Air Force bombed Iraq for five weeks with hundreds of daily runs in 1991 before Gen. Schwarzkopf moved.

Moreover, if Iran has achieved the capacity to enrich uranium, she has surely moved centrifuges to parts of the country that Israel cannot reach – and can probably replicate anything lost.

Israel would also have to over-fly Turkey, or Syria and U.S.-occupied Iraq, or Saudi Arabia to reach Natanz. Turks, Syrians and

Saudis would deny Israel permission and might resist. For the U.S. military to let Israel over-fly Iraq would make us an accomplice. How would that sit with the Europeans who are supporting our sanctions on Iran and want the nuclear issue settled diplomatically? And who can predict with certitude how Iran would respond?

Would Iran attack Israel with rockets, inviting retaliation with Jericho and cruise missiles from Israeli submarines? Would she close the Gulf with suicide-boat attacks on tankers and U.S. warships?

With oil at \$135 a barrel, Israeli air strikes on Iran would seem to ensure a 2,000-point drop in the Dow and a world recession. What would Hamas, Hezbollah and Syria do? All three are now in indirect negotiations with Israel. U.S. forces in Afghanistan and Iraq could be made by Iran to pay a high price in blood that could force the United States to initiate its own air war in retaliation, and to finish a war Israel had begun. But a U.S. war on Iran is not a decision Bush can outsource to Ehud Olmert.

Tuesday, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Adm. Michael Mullins left for Israel. CBS News cited U.S. officials as conceding the trip comes "just as the Israelis are mounting a full court press to get the Bush administration to strike Iran's nuclear complex."

Vice President Cheney is said to favor U.S. strikes. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and Mullins are said to be opposed.

Moving through Congress, powered by the Israeli lobby, is House Resolution 362, which demands that President Bush impose a U.S. blockade of Iran, an act of war.

Is it not time the American people were consulted on the next war that is being planned for us?



DEFENDING THE PRESIDENT AS TYRANT

By Robert Parry
Consortiumnews.com

All over the world down through history, political leaders who have engaged in torture and other grotesque crimes of state have justified their actions as necessary to protect their governments or their people or themselves.

It was true when England's King Edward I had William Wallace – “Braveheart” – drawn and quartered in 1305 for resisting the crown's rule in Scotland, and a gruesome death was what King George III foresaw for America's Founding Fathers in 1776 when they stood up to his abuses in the Colonies.

Kings and tyrants often inflicted special pain on people they viewed as challenging their authority and – at such times – they wiped away the rules of justice. But the United States was supposed to be different.

Indeed, reaction to tyrannical monarchs was what compelled the Founders to establish a government of laws, not men, based on “unalienable rights” for all mankind, including protection against arbitrary detention and prohibition of “cruel and unusual punishment.”

Which is why it was stunning to watch the June 26 hearing before the House Judiciary subcommittee on the Constitution as two representatives of George W. Bush's presidency responded with disdain when pressed on the administration's extraordinary vision of an all-powerful Executive operating without legal limits.

While Vice President Dick Cheney's chief of staff David Addington treated the committee Democrats with haughty contempt, former State Department lawyer John Yoo expressed the ultimate arrogance of power with his

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

muddled responses and evasions of direct questions.

The soft-spoken Yoo, who authored some of the key legal opinions justifying the abuse of detainees, wouldn't even give a clear answer to the simple question of what atrocity might be beyond President Bush's power to inflict.

Rep. John Conyers, D-Michigan, cited a news report quoting an ambiguous response from Yoo, who is now a law professor at the University of California at Berkeley, about whether the President could torture the child of a “war on terror” suspect to induce the suspect to talk.

The Judiciary Committee chairman asked: “Is there anything, Professor Yoo, the President cannot order to be done to a suspect if he believes it's necessary for national defense?”

When Yoo dissembled, Conyers posed the question more pointedly: “Could the President order a suspect buried alive?”

Yoo continued to fence with the congressman, avoiding a direct answer. “I don't think I ever gave advice that the President could bury somebody alive,” Yoo said, adding he believed that “no American President would ever have to order that or feel it necessary to order that.”

Pointedly, however, Yoo avoided a direct response to the question of whether he believed the President had the authority to do it.

Later in the hearing, Rep. Steve Cohen, D-Tennessee, returned to the administration's legal theories that Bush holds “plenary” – or unlimited – power at a time of war and that the President's motivation, i.e. protecting the country, justifies taking extreme actions.

“So, if I want to take somebody's fingernails out if I think it's for the good of the country, that's not torture?” Cohen asked. “If I want to cut someone's appendage

off, it's okay as long as I think it's important for the country? ...

“Is there anything you think the President cannot order in terms of interrogation of these prisoners in a state of war?”

Again, dodging a direct answer, Yoo responded that those examples “are not addressed in these memos. ... I would say there are things I don't think any American President would order in order to protect the national security and one of those things is the torture of detainees.”

At this point, Rep. Jerrold Nadler, D-New York, subcommittee chairman, interrupted:

“This is the second time today ... that you've said that you don't believe an American President would order certain heinous acts. Would you answer the question, not would he order it, but could he order it under the law in your opinion?”

Yoo responded, “It's not fair to ask that question without any kind of facts,” prompting Nadler to rephrase the question again:

“There's nothing conceivable to which you could answer ‘no’ that an American President could not order this without knowing facts and context?”

Yoo: “I can't agree with that because you are trying to put words in my mouth attempting to get me to answer some broad question covering all circumstances and I can't do that.”

Though refusing to answer, Yoo reaffirmed – through his circumlocution – what has been a central tenet of Bush's view of presidential power, that there are no limits to his power for the duration of the “war on terror,” even though it is a vague conflict that has no definable end and that is fought on a global battlefield *including U.S. territory*.

In other words, it is the opinion of the lawyers who have constructed this legal theory that Bush truly can do whatever he wants to whomever he wants anywhere in the world as

long as he couches his actions under his Commander-in-Chief authority.

And when it comes to torture, other word games come into play, such as categorizing "waterboarding," a form of simulated drowning that has been regarded as torture for centuries, as something other than torture.

Though this concept of unlimited presidential power appeals to some Americans who consider their personal safety more important than the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, it is so radical a break with American traditions that even its chief advocates, such as Yoo and Addington, duck and weave when the questions are presented directly.

This theory of an all-powerful President now is at stake in Election 2008, as was made clear after the Supreme Court ruled, 5-4, on June 12 that the administration couldn't deny *habeas corpus* to detainees at the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, some of whom have been held as long as six years.

In his dissent, Justice Antonin Scalia not only challenged the majority's legal arguments but pushed the emotional hot button that by recognizing this ancient right for challenging a government's power to imprison someone, the Supreme Court was putting Americans in danger.

If a President thinks that it might be a good idea to torture someone's child or bury somebody alive, the questions about the limits of his authority might not be hypothetical anymore.



U.S. ESCALATING COVERT OPS AGAINST IRAN

REUTERS – NEW YORK

Congressional leaders agreed late last year to President George

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

But the scale and the scope of the operations in Iran have now been significantly expanded, the article said, citing current and former officials.

Many of these activities are not specified in the new finding, and some congressional leaders have had serious questions about their nature, it said.

Among groups inside Iran benefiting from U.S. support is the Jundallah, also known as the Iranian People's Resistance Movement, according to former CIA officer Robert Baer. Council on Foreign Relations analyst Vali Nasr described it to Hersh as a vicious organization *suspected of links to al Qaeda.*

The article said U.S. support for the dissident groups could prompt a violent crackdown by Iran, which could give the Bush administration a reason to intervene.

None of the Democratic leaders in Congress would comment on the finding, the article said. The White House, which has repeatedly denied preparing for military action against Iran, and the CIA also declined comment.

The United States is leading international efforts to rein in Iran's suspected effort to develop nuclear weapons, although Washington concedes Iran has the right to develop nuclear power for civilian uses.



COMMAND NOTE REGARDING CURRENT MARKET EVENTS

Earlier this year we predicted that gasoline prices at the pump would hit \$4.25; we were correct. Later command briefings warned our militiamen & women to brace for \$5 gas by summer's end. **If this plan to attack Iran goes forward as it has been developing since before 9/11 (the pretext for everything being done in the Mideast), then we can expect gasoline prices to zoon to \$8-10 a**

W. Bush's funding request for a major escalation of covert operations against Iran aimed at destabilizing its leadership, according to a report in The New Yorker magazine published online.

The article by reporter Seymour Hersh, from the magazine's July 7 & 14, 2007 issue, centers around a highly classified Presidential Finding signed by Bush which by U.S. law must be made known to Democratic and Republican House and Senate leaders and ranking members of the intelligence committees.

"The Finding was focused on undermining Iran's nuclear ambitions and trying to undermine the government through regime change," the article cited a person familiar with its contents as saying, and involved "working with opposition groups and passing money."

Hersh has written previously about possible administration plans to go to war to stop Tehran from obtaining nuclear weapons, including an April 2006 article in the New Yorker that suggested regime change in Iran, whether by diplomatic or military means, was Bush's ultimate goal.

Up to \$400 million requested funding for the covert escalation, for which Bush requested \$400 million, was approved by congressional leaders, according to the article, citing current and former military, intelligence and congressional sources.

Clandestine operations against Iran are not new. **U.S. Special Operations Forces have been conducting cross-border ops from southern Iraq since last year, the article said.**

These have included seizing members of Al Quds, the commando arm of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, and taking them to Iraq for interrogation, and the pursuit of "high-value targets" who may be captured or killed, according to the article.

gallon the moment Iran is attacked.

Interestingly, though, the Democrat leadership has long pined for \$10 gallon gas as a way to force people into the cities (liberal strongholds) where populations are more easily monitored, controlled and pacified. Direct recollections of these comments from the senior democrat leadership go back as far as 1992.

Up to the present, gas prices have been driven mainly by speculators. This is of course by design as was the "housing market bubble" that caused so many unwary homebuyers unaware when the bubble popped. (Incidentally, we warned patriots to avoid adjustable rate mortgages or switch to fixed rate notes in 2004, before the market slumped.)

All these market manipulations are nothing less than a high-level design to reduce YOU, the average American, to a state of total financial slavery. Eventually and hopefully sooner, Americans will get fed up with these fuel prices and start developing alternatives like hydrogen fuel. Imagine being able to use distilled water instead of gas!

Unlike the housing bubble, though, the petroleum bubble is hurting consumers on the *front end*. Add to that the massive crop failures this year, caused by flooding and tornadoes, expected to account for one fifth of Midwest agricultural output and a loss of over \$20 Billion.

If you have not been stocking up on dry goods, canned goods, and storage foods, you had best get started **right now**, or you may find yourself among the millions of unlucky unprepared that will either have to endure hunger or pay massively for what actually does make it to the supermarket shelf.

Oh, and by the way, plans have been prepared years ago for food riots in America. Plans don't get made unless planners expect it to happen. So get ready!

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS



CHINA LAUNCHES CRACKDOWN AGAINST PRO-FREEDOM ACTIVISM IN LEAD-UP TO 2008 OLYMPICS

BEIJING (Reuters) June 30, 2008 - China has launched a nationwide campaign to defuse protest ahead of the Beijing Olympic Games, state media reported on Monday, days after a riot in the country's southwest highlighted volatile social strains.

With authorities eager to present China as a harmonious nation during the August Games, the government has ordered local officials to defuse petition campaigns by discontented citizens and to prevent "mass incidents", such as riots and demonstrations, according to the news reports.

"The Beijing Olympics are approaching and properly carrying out petition and stability work, protecting social harmony and stability, and ensuring the Beijing Olympics go safely and smoothly has become a tough battle that every department at every level must win," said one report of a nationwide video conference on a stability drive that was held on Saturday.

"**Now we are entering a state of war,**" said the report on a local government website in the eastern province of Zhejiang (<http://www.dqnews.com.cn>).

Yet at the very time officials were making plans for protest-free Games, a county in the southwest province of Guizhou was shaken by rioting over claimed police and official abuses. Thousands of locals mobbed government offices in Weng'an county, Guizhou. The local police headquarters was torched and police vehicles wrecked after claims spread that authorities

had covered up a teenage girl's death.

Police had said the teenage girl had killed herself by jumping in a river, but residents said the girl had been raped and murdered by a relative of a senior government official.

Another account of Saturday's meeting appeared in the Tibet Daily, where a vice chairman of the regional government, Baima Chilin, told officials to prevent more protests in the restive mountain area where anti-Chinese riots erupted in March.

In Weng'an county, locals contacted on Monday morning said the protest had melted away, but the county town remained tense with heavy police patrols and broadcasts warning rioters to turn themselves in.

More than 300 people had been arrested following the riots, the Information Center for Human Rights and Democracy, a Hong Kong-based group, said in a statement received by fax on Monday.



Command Note: It is more likely that these efforts to crush dissent is to hide from the world any independent, citizen-based effort to expose the corruption and tyranny of the Chinese government. In a movement similar to American patriots' efforts to petition government for redress of grievances, the number of Chinese petitioners over the past decade who have journeyed to provincial capitals and to Beijing has swollen. Nationwide, petitions and complaint visits grew from 4.8 million in 1995 to 12.7 million in 2005.

In response, provincial officials have stated, "Our most fundamental demand that is that zero go to Beijing, zero go to the province capital and there are zero mass petitions and mass incidents."

Perhaps it is instructive that in a nation where the population so

massively outnumbers those who work for the government, and where dissent against corruption in government is so widespread, why they don't simply have another "People's Revolution"? Certainly they are entitled, after recent earthquakes have exposed to the world the fundamental corruption of local and provincial government. But in a land where only the police and soldiers are armed, citizens are helpless against an all-powerful and out of control government. China may be the perfect model for totalitarian N.W.O. government, but it is also the sterling example of why Americans must always remain armed at all costs.

Mao Tse-tung may have been a godless heathen commie, but he was right about one thing: "...All political power grows out of the barrel of a gun". The Chinese government makes a point of reminding its subjects of that fact every day!

This is a key learning point for those who value freedom. From the American Revolution to the Warsaw ghetto uprising, sometimes it is necessary and proper to use force (weapons of military value) to gain, restore or retain one's liberty.



**SAF CALLS CHICAGO
TRIBUNE PLEA TO
REPEAL 2ND AMENDMT.
'UNCONSCIONABLE'**

BELLEVUE, WA (BusinessWire)

The Chicago Tribune's call for repeal of the Second Amendment following the historic Heller Decision is an "unconscionable attack on the entire Bill of Rights and the freedoms it protects," the Second Amendment Foundation said today.

In an editorial published on the day after the Supreme Court handed down its 5-4 ruling, the newspaper called the Second Amendment an

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

"anachronism" that should be repealed. The newspaper supported its argument by falsely claiming that a 1939 case, U.S. v Miller, established the amendment as a "collective right" that applied only to service in some type of militia.

"The Chicago Tribune's editors have demonstrated an appalling short-sightedness," said SAF founder Alan Gottlieb. "If they are so willing to abandon one right for an entire class of American citizens, what's next? Perhaps they would strip some citizens of their First Amendment rights to free speech or religion. Heaven help us should the Chicago Tribune editorial board one day decide that they don't care for the editorial slant of their competitors at the Sun-Times, and call for a restriction on that newspaper's freedom of the press.

"Once you make it acceptable to destroy one right," Gottlieb observed, "it does not take a very big leap to embrace limitations on, or the abolition of, another right.

"Not once, in all the years that gun rights organizations have been vilified in the editorial columns of the Tribune and other newspapers did anyone from the firearms community suggest we should repeal the First Amendment," he stated. "Unlike elitist newspaper editors, gun owners understand that the Bill of Rights is an all-or-nothing document, not a buffet from which we can pick and choose the rights we want to enjoy and those for which we have no stomach.

"We have always known the Second Amendment affirmed an individual right, and a truly objective reading of history by the Chicago Tribune would – if they had any notion of objectivity – lead them to the same conclusion," Gottlieb concluded. "A generation of parents and grandparents of those now writing such nonsense in the Tribune risked, and all too frequently lost their lives to defend all of the freedoms enumerated in the Bill of Rights. The Tribune

editors may as well just spit on their graves."

The Second Amendment Foundation (www.saf.org) is the nation's oldest and largest tax-exempt education, research, publishing and legal action group focusing on the Constitutional right and heritage to privately own and possess firearms. Founded in 1974, The Foundation has grown to more than 600,000 members and supporters and conducts many programs designed to better inform the public about the consequences of gun control.



**POLL: AMERICANS SAY
FOUNDING FATHERS
WOULD BE
DISAPPOINTED**

(CNN) -- How would the likes of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin feel about the way the United States has turned out 232 years after declaring its independence?

Not pleased, a majority of Americans recently polled said.

According to a new CNN/Opinion Research Corp. survey, 69 percent of adult Americans who responded to a poll June 26-29 said the signers of the Declaration of Independence would be disappointed by the way the nation has turned out overall.

Twenty-nine percent responded "pleased," the only other choice given to the 1,026 respondents of the telephone poll.

Americans "didn't always feel that way," according to Keating Holland, CNN polling director. "In 2001, 54 percent thought that the signers of the Declaration of Independence would be pleased with the state of the country today."

Still, most who responded to last month's poll took great pride in their country.

Sixty-one percent said they were extremely proud to be Americans; another 28 percent said they were very proud. Seven percent answered "moderately," 2 percent said "only a little," and 1 percent answered "not at all."

Command Note:

The interesting thing about some polls is in the truths they convey, in spite of what they do not say. In this instance, the 2001 poll was before 9/11, and reflective of the pre-911, post-Clinton, 'honeymoon period' satisfaction of the nation with the Bush administration. The more recent poll reflects the general mood of the public now that it has been tempered with the knowledge of everything that has happened, in secret or officially, that we have tried to educate others about.

Other polls in the last 15 years have mirrored similar views, though the questions have been different.

In 2006, 911Truth.Org reported the results of a Zogby poll, in which 70 million Americans stated that they "distrust the official 9/11 story":

The poll is the first scientific survey of Americans' belief in a 9/11 cover up or the need to investigate possible US government complicity, and was commissioned to inform deliberations at the June 2-4 "[9/11: Revealing the Truth, Reclaiming Our Future](#)" conference in Chicago. Poll results indicate 42% believe there has indeed been a cover up (with 10% unsure) and 45% think "Congress or an International Tribunal should re-investigate the attacks, including whether any US government officials consciously allowed or helped facilitate their success" (with 8% unsure). The poll of American residents was conducted from Friday, May 12 through Tuesday, May 16, 2006. Overall results have a margin of sampling error of +/- 2.9.



**INDEPENDENCE DAY:
COMING SOON BUT
MAYBE NOT SOON
ENOUGH**

HQ INDMILCORPS – 1JUL08

One final parting thought – The Fourth of July is upon us and our thoughts turn to the meaning of Independence Day, both past and present. As we reflect on the sacrifices made by the men who signed the Declaration of Independence, let's also think about how we can honor their memory by actively resisting the tyranny that has encroached upon us during the last four generations.

Let's dedicate ourselves to making a new independence day possible, when Americans of every sort can live free and once again enjoy the full measure of freedom that is our birthright simply because we are created in God's image and endowed with certain unalienable Rights.

Here's what a modern-day Declaration of Independence could look like:

<http://minutemanpatriot.homestead.com/grievances.html>

