
INDIANA CORPS *LIBERATOR*

A PUBLICATION OF THE INDIANA MILITIA CORPS - ©2009 - WWW.INDIANAMILITIA.ORG

JANUARY 2009

VOL. 9, ISSUE 1

LEGAL NOTICE & INFO

This publication and the information contained within, including comments, text, and all hyperlinks, are for informational purposes only. Any use of this content 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.



CONTACTS & SUBMISSIONS

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: 765-602-0866

HQ Office: 317-219-3228



LIBERATOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

Executive Editor: MG William Flatt

Chief of Staff: CPT Michael Barnes

Staff Writers:

CPT Tim Miller

1LT Doug Pfaff



WE MUST PUT AN END TO THE POLICE STATE

By MG William Flatt | 1 Jan 2009

In a story that came to my attention before Christmas, I was shocked to learn about the latest new outrage concerning criminal behavior by police officers. By now most people have become inured to official misconduct; many police have been caught planting false evidence, or ordering criminal informants to do likewise; police have also raided the wrong home, they have shot and killed innocent people, they have assaulted law-abiding women, or taken sexual advantage of them, killed children accidentally, or deliberately terrorized them in loaded-weapon, live SWAT drills done in schools during classroom hours, and so many other types of atrocities that space and time do not permit me to catalogue them all here. Let's also not forget the disturbing and inexplicable instance of an Ohio Department of Agriculture SWAT raid on an organic food Co-Op that was covered in our December 2008 issue.

What was different about this case was the victim's age and circumstance. I imagine that had the same thing happened to my family, at a minimum there would have been many dead cops. Some police think that if they don't

Inside This Issue:

-
- | | |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Galveston, Tex. cops assault 12-year-old, Girl sues |
| 3 | Defending against unlawful arrest, use of force |
| 5 | Gerald Celente: USA depression, revolution |
| 8 | Q.#46: Would you fire on American citizens? |
| 9 | Sowell: 'Change' Can Lead to Catastrophe |
-
-

identify themselves as police and show some ID, that we (the people) must somehow psychically deduce this for ourselves.

If you had a preteen or teenage daughter and an unidentified gang of men tried to kidnap her from off your front lawn, wouldn't you use lethal force to spare the life of your precious child?

What if these men, whom you don't know from Adam and at NO POINT say they are policemen, begin beating your daughter? In this case, the examining physician found the girl suffered *severe injuries from multiple blows* to the head, face, neck, lower back, left shoulder, and left hip/waist area. She suffered contusions to the head (where she was struck with an aluminum "Mag-lite" flashlight); there were abrasions on her arm and wrist. Her throat was swollen; she had difficulty swallowing, nausea and vomiting, and hoarseness of voice due to being struck in the throat. She had black eyes, scalp lacerations, tenderness of the vertebrae. She was experiencing double vision and loss of hearing.

No badge is a license to emotionally scar a young girl for the rest of her life.

The police used to "Serve and Protect" us. Now they do the opposite. Federal agents threatened my own family a few years ago in an attempt to intimidate me from organizing the militia. I warned them right back: we can and will use the appropriate and lawful amount of force against anyone who attempts to bring harm to this homestead. This isn't policing: this is thuggery and domestic terrorism under the color of law!

Let no one be deceived, these goons have done near-permanent damage to the reputation of policing in America, by routinely repeating on a much smaller scale, what patriots railed against in the wake of atrocities like Waco.



INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

POLICE IN GALVESTON, TEXAS ATTACK 12-YEAR OLD GIRL, GIRL SUES

December 18, 2008

<http://www.theagitator.com/2008/12/18/more-on-dymond-milburn/>

It was a little after 7:30 at night on August 22, 2006 when the breaker went out at Emily Milburn's home in Galveston. She was busy preparing her children for school the next day, so she asked her 12-year-old daughter, Dymond, to pop outside and turn the switch back on.

As Dymond headed toward the breaker, a blue van drove up and three men jumped out rushing toward her. *One of them grabbed her saying, "You're a prostitute. You're coming with me."*

Dymond grabbed onto a tree and **started screaming, "Daddy, Daddy, Daddy."** One of the men covered her mouth. Two of the men beat her about the face and throat with a heavy flashlight.

As it turned out, the three men were plain-clothed Galveston police officers who had been called to the area regarding three white prostitutes soliciting a white man and a black drug dealer. The officers were later identified as Officers Justin Popovich, Sean Stewart, and David Roark, and Sergeant Gilbert Gomez of the Galveston Police Department, Narcotics Division. **The van they were traveling in was unmarked and the officers were not in uniform. The officers did not identify themselves as police.**

All this is according to a lawsuit filed in Galveston federal court in late 2008 by Milburn against the officers. The lawsuit alleges that the officers thought Dymond, an African-American, was a hooker due to the "tight shorts" she was wearing, despite not fitting the racial description of any of the female suspects. The police went to the wrong house, two blocks away from the area of the reported illegal

activity, according to Milburn's attorney, Anthony Griffin.

Wilfred Milburn told the officer, "That's our daughter. She's twelve!"

The officer responded, "I don't care if she's twenty-two, thirty-two, or forty-six." The family's five-month-old puppy grabbed the officer's leg. The officer threatened that if they did not grab the dog, he would shoot it. After the incident, Dymond was hospitalized and suffered black eyes as well as throat and ear drum injuries.

According to the lawsuit, three weeks later, police – adding insult to injury – went to Dymond's school where she was an honor student, and arrested her for assaulting a public servant. Griffin says the allegations stem from when Dymond fought back against the three men who were trying to take her from her home. The case went to trial, but the judge declared it a mistrial on the first day, says Griffin. The new trial is set for February 2009.

"I think we'll be okay," says Griffin. "I don't think a jury will find a 12-year-old girl guilty who's just sitting outside her house. Any 12-year-old attacked by three men and told that she's a prostitute is going to scream and yell for Daddy and hit back and do whatever she can. She's scared to death."

Since the incident more than two years ago, Dymond regularly suffers nightmares in which police officers are raping and beating her and cutting off her fingers, according to the lawsuit. She is not even old enough yet to serve in the military, but has already been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder because of what the police have done to her – first, the assault and next, the arrest for defending herself. Griffin says he expects to enter mediation with the officers in early 2009 to resolve the lawsuit.



**JAG CITATIONS:
DEFENDING AGAINST
FALSE ARREST**

"When a person, being without fault, is in a place where he has a right to be, is violently assaulted, he may, without retreating, repel by force, and if, in the reasonable exercise of his right of self defense, his assailant is killed, he is justified." Runyan v. State, 57 Ind. 80; Miller v. State, 74 Ind. 1.

"These principles apply as well to an officer attempting to make an arrest, who abuses his authority and transcends the bounds thereof by the use of unnecessary force and violence, as they do to a private individual who unlawfully uses such force and violence." Jones v. State, 26 Tex. App. 1; Beaverts v. State, 4 Tex. App. 1 75; Skidmore v. State, 43 Tex. 93, 903.

"An illegal arrest is an assault and battery. The person so attempted to be restrained of his liberty has the same right to use force in defending himself as he would in repelling any other assault and battery." (State v. Robinson, 145 ME. 77, 72 ATL. 260).

18 U.S.C. 242

Public Officials who Violate Constitutional Rights; Penalties (Felony)

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than

one year, or both; *and if bodily injury results* from the acts committed in violation of this section *or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire*, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; *and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap*, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, *or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.*"

The US Dept of Justice website adds the following commentary: *For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by federal, state, or local officials within the scope of their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prison guards and other law enforcement officials, as well as judges, care providers in public health facilities, and others who are acting as public officials. It is not necessary that the crime be motivated by animus toward the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status or national origin of the victim.*

<http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/crim/242fin.htm>

In Indiana, the above cites and 18USC242 are further reinforced by our state's "Stand Your Ground" statute (IC 35-41-3-2) and our statute relating to use of force in effecting an arrest or preventing escape (IC 35-41-3-3):

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

IC 35-41-3-2

Use of force to protect person or property

(a) A person is justified in using reasonable force against another person to protect the person or a third person from what the person reasonably believes to be the imminent use of unlawful force.

However, a person:

(1) is justified in using deadly force; and

(2) does not have a duty to retreat;

if the person reasonably believes that that force is necessary to prevent serious bodily injury to the person or a third person or the commission of a forcible felony. No person in this state shall be placed in legal jeopardy of any kind whatsoever for protecting the person or a third person by reasonable means necessary.

(b) A person:

(1) is justified in using reasonable force, including deadly force, against another person; and

(2) does not have a duty to retreat;

if the person reasonably believes that the force is necessary to prevent or terminate the other person's unlawful entry of or attack on the person's dwelling, curtilage, or occupied motor vehicle.

(c) With respect to property other than a dwelling, curtilage, or an occupied motor vehicle, a person is justified in using reasonable force against another person if the person reasonably believes that the force is necessary to immediately prevent or terminate the other person's trespass on or criminal interference with property lawfully in the person's possession, lawfully in possession of a member of the person's immediate family, or belonging to a person whose property the person has authority to protect. However, a person:

(1) is justified in using deadly force; and

(2) does not have a duty to retreat;

only if that force is justified under subsection (a).

IC 35-41-3-3

Use of force relating to arrest or escape

(a) A person other than a law enforcement officer is justified in using reasonable force against another person to effect an arrest or prevent the other person's escape if:

(1) a felony has been committed; and

(2) there is probable cause to believe the other person committed that felony.

However, such a person is not justified in using deadly force unless that force is justified under section 2 of this chapter.

(b) A law enforcement officer is justified in using reasonable force if the officer reasonably believes that the force is necessary to effect a lawful arrest. However, an officer is justified in using deadly force only if the officer:

(1) has probable cause to believe that that deadly force is necessary:

(A) to prevent the commission of a forcible felony; or

(B) to effect an arrest of a person who the officer has probable cause to believe poses a threat of serious bodily injury to the officer or a third person; and

(2) has given a warning, if feasible, to the person against whom the deadly force is to be used.

(c) A law enforcement officer making an arrest under an invalid warrant is justified in using force as if the warrant was valid, *unless* the officer *knows* that the warrant is *invalid*.

(d) A law enforcement officer who has an arrested person in custody is justified in using the same force to prevent the escape of the arrested person from custody that the officer would be justified in using if the officer was arresting that person. However, an officer is justified in using deadly force only if the officer:

(1) has probable cause to believe

that deadly force is necessary to prevent the escape from custody of a person who the officer has probable cause to believe poses a threat of serious bodily injury to the officer or a third person; and

(2) has given a warning, if feasible, to the person against whom the deadly force is to be used.

(e) A guard or other official in a penal facility or a law enforcement officer is justified in using reasonable force, including deadly force, if the officer has probable cause to believe that the force is necessary to prevent the escape of a person who is detained in the penal facility.

(f) Notwithstanding subsection (b), (d), or (e), a law enforcement officer who is a defendant in a criminal prosecution has the same right as a person who is not a law enforcement officer to assert self-defense under IC 35-41-3-2.

As added by Acts 1976, P.L.148, SEC.1. Amended by Acts 1977, P.L.340, SEC.9; Acts 1979, P.L.297, SEC.2; P.L.245-1993, SEC.1.

The astute reader can certainly extrapolate from all of the foregoing that in Indiana, if you are being *criminally assaulted* by someone who is *acting under color of law*, you have the *right to defend yourself* against that criminal assault, using whatever amount of force is *reasonable* to terminate that assault. "One has an undoubted right to resist an unlawful arrest" - *United States v. Di Re*, 332 U.S. 581 (1948)

Moreover, you have the right to effect an arrest of anyone you have *probable cause* to believe has committed a felony.

The foregoing does not constitute legal advice or counsel, but we encourage every reader to study the legal definitions of those italicized terms for the sake of clarity.

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

THE RIGHT OF DEFENSE AGAINST UNLAWFUL ARREST

<http://www.constitution.org/uslaw/defunlaw.htm>

"Citizens may resist unlawful arrest to the point of taking an arresting officer's life if necessary." *Plummer v. State*, 136 Ind. 306. This premise was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case: *John Bad Elk v. U.S.*, 177 U.S. 529. The Court stated: "Where the officer is killed in the course of the disorder which naturally accompanies an attempted arrest that is resisted, the law looks with very different eyes upon the transaction, when the officer had the right to make the arrest, from what it does if the officer had no right. What may be murder in the first case might be nothing more than manslaughter in the other, or the facts might show that no offense had been committed."

"When a person, being without fault, is in a place where he has a right to be, is violently assaulted, he may, without retreating, repel by force, and if, in the reasonable exercise of his right of self defense, his assailant is killed, he is justified." *Runyan v. State*, 57 Ind. 80; *Miller v. State*, 74 Ind. 1.

"These principles apply as well to an officer attempting to make an arrest, who abuses his authority and transcends the bounds thereof by the use of unnecessary force and violence, as they do to a private individual who unlawfully uses such force and violence." *Jones v. State*, 26 Tex. App. I; *Beaverts v. State*, 4 Tex. App. 1 75; *Skidmore v. State*, 43 Tex. 93, 903.

"An illegal arrest is an assault and battery. The person so attempted to be restrained of his liberty has the same right to use force in defending himself as he would in repelling any other assault and battery." (*State v. Robinson*, 145 ME. 77, 72 ATL. 260).

“Each person has the right to resist an unlawful arrest. In such a case, the person attempting the arrest stands in the position of a wrongdoer and may be resisted by the use of force, as in self-defense.” (State v. Mobley, 240 N.C. 476, 83 S.E. 2d 100).

“One may come to the aid of another being unlawfully arrested, just as he may where one is being assaulted, molested, raped or kidnapped. Thus it is not an offense to liberate one from the unlawful custody of an officer, even though he may have submitted to such custody, without resistance.” (Adams v. State, 121 Ga. 16, 48 S.E. 910).

“Story affirmed the right of self-defense by persons held illegally. In his own writings, he had admitted that **‘a situation could arise in which the checks-and-balances principle ceased to work and the various branches of government concurred in a gross usurpation.’** There would be no usual remedy by changing the law or passing an amendment to the Constitution, should the oppressed party be a minority. Story concluded, **‘If there be any remedy at all ... it is a remedy never provided for by human institutions.’** That was the **‘ultimate right of all human beings in extreme cases to resist oppression, and to apply force against ruinous injustice.’**” (From *Mutiny on the Amistad* by Howard Jones, Oxford University Press, 1987; an account of the reading of the decision in the case by Justice Joseph Story of the Supreme Court.)

Also, in *King v. State* [246 Miss. 86, 149 So.2d 482 (1963)] “The right of personal liberty is one of the fundamental rights guaranteed to every citizen, and any unlawful interference may be resisted. Every person has a right to resist an unlawful arrest; and, in preventing such illegal restraint of his liberty, he may use such force as may be necessary.”



Command Note: The point made in the last couple articles is that while *We the People* retain the right to resist unlawful force and illegal or false arrest, we may do so at our own peril; but at some point some fed-up Americans will come to realize that they don’t need to submit to a false or unlawful arrest and also that resisting it will automatically escalate it to lethal force, by virtue of police training and departmental policy anywhere in “Amerika”. That being said, somewhere someday soon, it is safe to predict that someone is going to start a shooting war... People *outside* the militia, *not us*, will be the first to start targeting anyone wearing a badge. It is painful to see how far we’ve fallen, when the country that was supposed to be the beacon of Liberty to the world has become instead the most horrendous lockdown police state in the annals of tyranny, and the policing profession has come to be seen by an ever-increasing segment of the public as an occupying enemy army.

Saddest of all, what will become of the *good* men and women cops who are continuing to uphold the image of the virtuous officer, in spite of the corruption around them? ...And a **system so incorrigible that a Harvard-educated federal judge who is currently serving on the bench has declared our system “corrupted beyond recognition”!** See our 1st quarter 2008 issue of *Liberator*, page 13, for this article:

http://www.indianamilitia.org/files/LIBERATOR/Indiana_Corps_LIBERATOR_-_2008_Jan-Mar.pdf

Here’s what William Grigg wrote about a year ago on this subject:

<http://freedominourtime.blogspot.com/2008/02/restoring-right-to-resist.html>



INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

MORE GERALD CELENTE PREDICTIONS FOR USA

http://www.propagandamatrix.com/articles/november2008/111308_celente_predicts.htm

Following on the heels of last fall’s article highlighting the highly credible predictions of trends forecaster Gerald Celente, a recent story appeared on PrisonPlanet.com reiterating what he (and we) have been saying for a while:

The man who predicted the 1987 stock market crash and the fall of the Soviet Union is now forecasting revolution in America, food riots and tax rebellions - all within four years, while cautioning that putting food on the table will be a more pressing concern than buying Christmas gifts by 2012.

Gerald Celente, the CEO of Trends Research Institute, <http://www.trendsresearch.com> - is renowned for his accuracy in predicting future world and economic events, which will send a chill down your spine considering what he told Fox News this week.



Celente says that by 2012 America will become an undeveloped nation, that there will be a revolution marked by food riots, squatter rebellions, tax revolts and job marches, and that holidays will be more about obtaining food, not gifts.

“We’re going to see the end of the retail Christmas....we’re going to see a fundamental shift take

place....putting food on the table is going to be more important than putting gifts under the Christmas tree," said Celente, adding that the situation would be "worse than the great depression".

"America's going to go through a transition the likes of which no one is prepared for," said Celente, noting that people's refusal to acknowledge that America was even in a recession highlights how big a problem denial is in being ready for the true scale of the crisis.

Celente, who successfully predicted the 1997 Asian Currency Crisis, the subprime mortgage collapse and the massive devaluation of the U.S. dollar, http://www.upi.com/Business_News/2007/11/19/Forecast_US_dollar_could_plunge_90_pct/UPI-48761195499806/ told UPI in November last year that the following year would be known as "The Panic of 2008," adding that "giants (would) tumble to their deaths," which is exactly what we have witnessed with the collapse of Lehman Brothers, Bear Stearns and others. He also said that the dollar would eventually be devalued by as much as 90 per cent.

The consequence of what we have seen unfold this year would lead to a lowering in living standards, Celente predicted a year ago, which is also being borne out by plummeting retail sales figures. <http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=75273§ionid=3510203>

The prospect of revolution was a concept echoed by a British Ministry of Defence report last year, which predicted that within 30 years, the growing gap between the super rich and the middle class, along with an urban underclass threatening social order would mean, "The world's middle classes might unite, using access to knowledge, resources and skills to shape transnational processes in their own class interest," and that, "The middle classes could become a revolutionary class."

In a separate recent interview, <http://www.earthfiles.com/news.php?ID=1485&category=Environment>

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

PRESIDENT BUSH IS A "LAME DUCKER"

Celente went further on the subject of revolution in America.

"There will be a revolution in this country," he said. "It's not going to come yet, but it's going to come down the line and we're going to see a third party and this was the catalyst for it: the takeover of Washington, D. C., in broad daylight by Wall Street in this bloodless coup. And it will happen as conditions continue to worsen."

"The first thing to do is organize with tax revolts. That's going to be the big one because people can't afford to pay more school tax, property tax, any kind of tax. You're going to start seeing those kinds of protests start to develop."

"It's going to be very bleak. Very sad. And there is going to be a lot of homeless, the likes of which we have never seen before. Tent cities are already sprouting up around the country and we're going to see many more."

"We're going to start seeing huge areas of vacant real estate and squatters living in them as well. It's going to be a picture the likes of which Americans are not going to be used to. It's going to come as a shock and with it, there's going to be a lot of crime. And the crime is going to be a lot worse than it was before because in the last 1929 Depression, people's minds weren't wrecked on all these modern drugs – over-the-counter drugs, or crystal meth or whatever it might be. So, you have a huge underclass of very desperate people with their minds chemically blown beyond any comprehension."

<http://www.nationalexpositor.com/News/1509.html>

BAGHDAD — On a whirlwind trip shrouded in secrecy and marred by dissent, President George W. Bush hailed progress in the wars that define his presidency and got a size-10 reminder of his unpopularity when a man hurled two shoes at him during a news conference in Iraq with Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki on Sunday, Dec. 14, 2008.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BUltgEIfc-g>

"This is a gift from the Iraqis; this is your farewell kiss, you dog!" shouted the protester in Arabic, identified as Muntadar al-Zeidi, a correspondent for Al-Baghdadia television, an Iraqi-owned station based in Cairo, Egypt.

Al-Zeidi's political statement has not only made him into an instant national hero, but also catapulted him into high esteem around the world. He summed up, in a single gesture, how much of the world feels about the 43rd president of the United States – including Americans, who can hardly wait to see the departure of inarguably the most unpopular president in history.

"This is from the widows, the orphans and those who were killed in Iraq" said Zeidi when he threw his other shoe. Throwing a shoe at someone, in Arabic culture, is the greatest of insults; a point that was made to Bush even though he cavalierly disregarded the significance of the act.

Also cavalierly disregarded by our nation's leaders in the aftermath of the shoe-toss at our lame-duck president was the wrenching personal story of Muntadar al-Zeidi and why he was motivated to make the toss.

Al-Zeidi has been kidnapped by gunmen, severely treated by them during his captivity, then poorly treated at the hands of U.S. troops, who he now claims to despise, because of the deaths of over 1 million Iraqis that are

immediately attributable to the U.S. invasion since 2003.

Officials have yet to disclose where he's being held, but al-Sharqiya TV claims he is being held

<http://www.roadstoiraq.com/2008/12/16/urgent-just-reported-al-zaidi-in-us-run-camp-cropper-prison/>

in the infamous US-run Camp Cropper at the Baghdad airport. The TV Channel announced that Al-Zaidi is in a difficult condition, with broken ribs and signs of tortures on his thighs. Also he can not move his right arm. The camp, meant for "high value detainees," has been a popular location for media members swept up by US forces over the past several years.

Afif Sarhan reports for the New Zealand Herald that Al-Zaidi was viciously beaten after being taken into custody, according to a police officer who accompanied him to prison.

Wrestled to the ground and then buried under a frantic mound of security officers, Muntadar al-Zeidi was last seen being dragged into detention. Family members complain that they have been denied access to him, and fear he is being denied medical care for injuries that are more severe than what has been officially reported.

Witnesses to his arrest and imprisonment have said Zeidi was badly beaten, during and after his arrest, and that he risks losing the sight in one of his eyes.

Controversy has since raged over what treatment was meted out to the man hailed a hero in many parts of the Arab and Muslim world for his protest against the invasion of Iraq. There were further demonstrations in the Middle East calling for his immediate release.

Zeidi is expected to be charged with insulting a foreign leader, which carries a prison sentence of up to two years. His family has received offers from hundreds of lawyers willing to represent him.

An Iraqi judge said Zeidi had bruises on his face and around his eyes. These, said the judge, had been sustained during his arrest.

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

One police officer who accompanied him to prison said the journalist, a Baghdad correspondent for Cairo's Al-Baghdadia TV, had been subjected to violence throughout the journey. The officer, who asked not to be named, said he witnessed security forces beating Zeidi in the car with such force that his ribs were broken.

"I felt sorry when I saw them beating him. His mouth was badly injured and he did not utter a single word throughout until one of the guards hit him in his left eye with a gun. Then he cried out that he couldn't see, and I saw blood inside his eye. I am a police officer but even I have to say I felt proud of what he did."

A doctor called to examine Zeidi said his right arm had been broken and he had hematomas - indicative of internal bleeding - all over his body, particularly on his left leg, shoulders, face and head. The doctor, who also asked to remain anonymous, said specialists called in to treat him warned security guards that they must make sure his eye was protected for fear of a further hemorrhage which could cause him to lose his sight.

Zeidi's family alleges that it is because of the severe nature of his injuries that he has not been called before a public court.

Born into a traditional Shiite family, Zeidi made no secret of his vehement opposition to the US-led occupation of Iraq and, according to family and friends, had said many times he would like revenge on Bush.

A younger brother, Haythem, said Zeidi had unexpectedly found himself called on to cover the press conference held by Bush and Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri Maliki. His first action was to return home immediately to change his foreign-made shoes for Iraqi-made ones.

A colleague at the TV station said Zeidi mentioned just before going home that "if something had

to be done, it had to be 100 per cent Iraqi".

His family believes his actions may have placed both them and himself in danger and they claim to have received threatening calls.

al-Zeidi told his family he would never to apologize to President Bush for hurling his shoes at the American leader, his brother said after visiting the detained correspondent for the first time.

The Iraqi government announced last week that Zeidi had written a letter to Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki requesting forgiveness for attacking Bush. But the journalist's brother, Uday Zeidi, challenged the government's assertions after Sunday's visit.

"Muntadar said that he was forced to apologize to al-Maliki, and he will never, never apologize to Bush, even if they cut him into small pieces," Uday Zeidi said after his visit with his brother.

Zeidi said his brother had lost a tooth and his nose had required stitches because of the beatings he had suffered in custody.

"There were multiple bruises all over his body," Zeidi said. "There were cigarette burns behind his ears. He was beaten with metal rods. His eyes were swollen. They have assigned two medical doctors ... to provide him with treatment in order to hide the evidence of torture."

His statements could not be independently confirmed. However, a judge investigating the case told the Associated Press on Friday that Muntadar Zeidi showed signs of having been beaten while in custody.

Command note: Zeidi would have been treated *far worse* had he been an American citizen throwing his shoes; the Secret Service may have been instructed to 'shoot to kill'.

QUESTION #46: MARTIAL LAW AND FIRING ON AMERICANS

By MG William Flatt

Taken from the "29 Palms Survey":
46. The U.S. government declares a ban on the possession, sale transportation, and transfer of all non-sporting firearms. A thirty (30) day amnesty period is permitted for these firearms to be turned over to the local authorities. At the end of this period, a number of *citizen groups* refuse to turn over their firearms. Consider the following statement: ***I would fire upon U.S. citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the U.S. government.***

- Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Neutral / no opinion
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

Recently, Will Grigg published an article at Pro-Libertate <http://freedomourtime.blogspot.com/2008/12/question-46-revisited.html> & <http://www.nationalexpositor.com/News/1542.html> elsewhere *that revisited the issue of whether U.S. soldiers would fire on American citizens.* The impetus of this review is undoubtedly tangential to the predictions of Gerald Celente (economic crash, tax revolts, 2nd American Revolution) and recent developments concerning the reassignment of tens of thousands of U.S. troops to NORTHCOM for domestic civil unrest "consequence management" (i.e.: martial law).

<http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/pentagon-to-deploy-20000-troops-on-domestic-%e2%80%9canti-terror%e2%80%9d-mission/4963/>

We already identified the military commanders that led the martial law operation in NOLA in 1995; and that the operation (in violation of the Posse Comitatus Act) was - in their own words - "combat operations".

http://www.indianamilitia.org/combat_ops.html

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

While there's substantial intel showing that much of the ground-based small arms fire directed at rescue aircraft was a covert op by Blackwater mercenaries, this was only the manufactured pretext: the object ...the response... was the crackdown on the remaining citizens of NOLA. Our intel shows that this was the test-bed for a much larger scale martial law operation yet to come.

Test-bed ops are nothing new. The *Ruby Ridge* killings & standoff were the test-bed for Waco; The Oklahoma City bombing was the test-bed operation for 9/11.

But at some point if the plan for martial law is to go forward, the confiscation of guns and open warfare against patriots and militia units will have to be undertaken. It will be necessary beforehand to assess how ready the troops are to obey illegal orders and assume their role as aggressors. Enter LCDR Ernest 'Guy' Cunningham and the *29 Palms Survey*, which he purported was to fulfill requirements for a Master's degree.

However, in my research I found that while initially the 'survey' was limited to Navy personnel, it was expanded to all services and was officially designated as "DD Form 3206" by 1999. I personally contacted Lt. Commander Cunningham and questioned him about his master's thesis and underlying motivation for studying UN peacekeeping operations and military attitudes toward loyalty to the Constitution & 2nd Amendment.

He emphatically denied that his research had sub-rosa motivations, but I didn't get a sense of his sincerity so I informed him that his survey was continuing to be used and was assigned that DD Form number. He expressed what seemed to be genuine surprise at that revelation, but also at being informed that the survey was being used to identify soldiers favorable to firing upon Americans and

increasing their numbers in our military while being used to also derail or sideline the careers of officers and senior NCOs who answered negatively to question 46.

My exchanges with Mr. Cunningham were based on original research as well as what I learned reading copies of a newsletter called *The Resister*.

The Resister was a samizdat <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samizdat> newsletter published in the 1990's by some former Green Beret NCOs who had this to say about the 29 Palms Survey:

The RESISTER has confirmed that US Navy SEAL platoons, including SEAL Team Six, Marine combat veterans stationed at Twenty-Nine Palms, CA, and Marine basic trainees at Camp Pendleton, CA, have been administered a questionnaire asking, among other things, if they would "...fire upon US citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the US government."

The questionnaire was first administered to operators by the commanders of SEAL Team Six on 15 September 1993, then subsequently to the remaining SEAL platoons throughout September and October. Rumors began circulating in November that US Army DELTA operators were given the same or similar questionnaire. The SF Underground had been aware of the questionnaire since late September but our observers had been unable to secure a copy or confirm other than its substance consisted of questions pertaining to the subordination of the US Military to the UN and confiscation of the firearms of US citizens. In early January, 1994, we obtained a copy of the questionnaire from one of our DOD sympathizers but lacking corroboration we ran the story in Vol.I, No.1 of The RESISTER as a rumor.

On January 22, 1994, one of our observers copied a chilling message off the Internet from Petty Officer 2nd Class W. Kelly, US Navy Special Warfare Team Six, to

D. Hawkins, Re: Gun Confiscation. Kelly began by stating that the questionnaire was "...to find out if we would follow the orders of commanding officers without question." (Kelly omitted the fact that the questionnaire assumes "commanding officers" gives equal authority to UN officers commanding US forces.) Kelly continued; "If you wish to find out how I answered I said yes I would fire and kill all persons attempting to resist...we aren't around to be the good guys." Remember, Kelly is referring to American civilians.

In February, 1994, MODERN GUN magazine ran a story on the elusive questionnaire which was subsequently circulated by various patriotic citizens groups. Then, on 10 May 1994, the questionnaire was administered to Marine Desert Storm veterans at Twenty-Nine Palms, CA. A Marine smuggled a copy of the questionnaire out of the testing center and mailed it on 15 May, 1994, with a cover letter, to the editor of THE NEW AMERICAN, which ran the story in their July 11, 1994, issue. THE NEW AMERICAN quotes the Marine's impression that the survey "was just research for this (Navy) commander's degree." The RESISTER obtained a copy of the Marine's letter, which actually states: "A Navy Commander came before us and said he was working on his masters degree and he was writing a paper about giving up our military's sovereignty to the United Nations Secretary General."

The official DOD lie surrounding the questionnaire entitled "Combat Arms Survey," supports that of the Navy Commander. Significantly, the Combat Arms Survey was first given at the time Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 25 was being prepared. The RESISTER's correspondent in the Pentagon staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff confirms that PDD 25 surrenders control of the U.S. military to the United Nations. (A cursory survey of articles written by MACOM commanders and staff members in official military journals for the past year reveals a universal acceptance of U.N. control of the American military.)

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

'CHANGE' CAN LEAD TO CATASTROPHE

By Thomas Sowell

Telling a friend that the love of his life is a phony and dangerous is not likely to get him to change his mind. But it may cost you a friend.



It is much the same story with true believers in Barack Obama. They have made up their minds and not only don't want to be confused by the facts, they resent being told the facts.

An e-mail from a reader mentioned trying to tell his sister why he was voting against Obama but, when he tried to argue some facts, she cut him short: "You don't like him and I do!" she said. End of discussion.

When one thinks of all the men who have put their lives on the line in battle to defend and preserve this country, it is especially painful to think that there are people living in the safety and comfort of civilian life who cannot be bothered to find out the facts about candidates before voting to put the fate of this nation, and of generations yet to come, in the hands of someone chosen because they like his words or style.

Some of Sen. Obama's most fervent supporters could not tell you what he has actually done on such issues as crime, education, or financial institutions like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, much less what he plans to do to stop Iran from becoming a nuclear nation supplying nuclear weapons to the international terrorist networks that it has supplied with other weapons.

The magic word "change" makes specifics unnecessary. If things are going bad, some think that what is needed is blank-check

The RESISTER has been eliciting responses to the questionnaire for the past year. Frighteningly, among service members with less than 10 years of service, 63% agree or strongly agree with question # 46: "I would fire upon U.S. citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the U.S. government." Among new recruits almost 90% give the response: "If it's the law and they order me to do it I guess it's okay." Our federally controlled public schools have done their job.

Of those with more than 15 years of service, 87% replied "disagree" or "strongly disagree." Responses by members of the Special Forces Underground were unprintable; basically, there will not be many officers who give that order more than once.

Americans now have to face the likelihood that we will be plunged into a civil war; those who would disarm us are prepared to kill everyone that doesn't submit like a slave. This sets the stage for a contest of arms on American soil the likes of which has not happened in over 150 years.

When this happens, we will see history repeat itself and it may be like a brisk April morning in 1775, when the people of Lexington found themselves being targeted by soldiers under orders from their own government.

http://www.indianamilitia.org/Spirit_of_April19.html

Except this time, the soldiers will operate without moral restraint under a regime that employs torture as well as worse crimes against humanity. So, buy more ammo!!



"change." *But history shows any number of countries in crises worse than ours, where "change" turned problems into catastrophes.*

In czarist Russia, for example, the economy was worse than ours is today and World War I was going far worse for the Russians than anything we have faced in Iraq. Moreover, Russians had nothing like the rights of Americans today. So they went for "change."

That "change" brought on a totalitarian regime that made the czars' despotism look like child's play. The communists killed more people in one year than the czars killed in more than 90 years, not counting the millions who died in a government-created famine in the 1930s.

Yet, many today seem to assume that if things are bad, "change" will make them better. Specifics don't interest them nearly as much as inspiring rhetoric and a confident style. But many 20th century leaders with inspiring rhetoric and great self-confidence led their followers or their countries into utter disasters.

These ranged from Jim Jones who led hundreds to their deaths in Jonestown to Hitler and Mao who led millions to their deaths.

What specifics do we know about Barack Obama's track record that might give us some clue as to what kinds of "changes" to expect?

We know that he opposed the practice of putting violent young felons on trial as adults. We know that he was against a law forbidding physicians to kill a baby that was born alive despite an attempt to abort it.

We know that Obama opposed attempts to put stricter regulations on Fannie Mae — and that he was the second largest recipient of campaign contributions from Fannie Mae. We know that this very year his campaign sought the advice of disgraced former Fannie Mae CEO Franklin Raines.

Fannie Mae and Raines were at the heart of "the mess in Washington" that Barack Obama claims he is going to clean up under the banner of "change."

The public has been told very little about what this man with the wonderful rhetoric has actually done. What we know is enough to make us wonder about what we don't know. Or it ought to. For the true believers — which includes many in the media — it is just a question of whether you like him or not.



RON PAUL: US SHOULD NOT TAKE SIDES IN THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Congressman gives warning about unintended 'blowback' consequences

<http://ca.youtube.com/watch?v=4Z6vMAoFwf4>

Command note: We have omitted all reporting on the Gaza conflict this month because it is a foreign policy matter that bears little if any impact on our domestic situation. Our only comment on this issue is that while the grievous loss of life on both sides is as bad as ever, both sides share in the blame and both sides can resolve the dispute *if they choose to do so*. The mainstream news focuses on events such as these to the near exclusion of events even more newsworthy here at home. This is called a *strategic distraction*, and just as when the members of the Branch Davidian church were being laid siege to while the media focused on O.J., we must be mindful not to become transfixed by the latest Mideast drama. These Israeli-Palestinian crises have occurred perennially ever since the modern state of Israel was created *by the United Nations* about 60 years ago.



INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

PARTING SHOT

Obama offered 'Change'; expect none

By MG Will Flatt | 19 Jan 2009

Today I am uploading this issue of the LIBERATOR to our website, tomorrow Obama will be sworn in as the de-facto 44th President of the United States.

I know that questions still linger about whether Obama is even qualified to be President, if indeed he is disqualified in some way. It doesn't matter, operatively, because if it were not Obama then someone else would have been selected simply because they have proven themselves to be the most dynamic traitor to the Constitution in their service to the New World Order.

My main point is, Obama got to where he is at by *promising* to give us 'change'. In reality, nothing will. Do not expect the sky to fall or Blackwater mercenaries to show at your doorstep for your guns, nor should you expect for Obama to wave a magic wand and make all our nation's ills go away.

What Obama will *not* do is correct the wrongs committed by previous administrations. He will not do any of the things Ron Paul would have done on January 21st if America really had control over our electoral process (after all, it's not who votes that counts; it's who counts the votes. Thanks again, Diebold!)

Obama won't get us out of the UN and get the UN out of the US. Obama will not abolish the FED. Obama will not downsize DC. He will not get us out of Iraq and he will not put an end to the military-industrial-complex.

Most of all, do not expect Obama & the Democrats to rescind the police state powers accrued by President Bush over the last seven years. Their help was needed to pass unconstitutional bills like the P.A.T.R.I.O.T. Acts (1 thru 3). Once they gave Bush what he wanted, they disingenuously

castigated him for accepting this unprecedented expansion of power, knowing full well that as soon as he left office that they would be the inevitable beneficiaries of it all. I have warned about this for the last two years when it became clear by the end of February 2007 that the Democrat-controlled Congress was not going to undo what has been done up to that point, including an exit from Iraq.



It makes me wonder whether they intend to quietly move S. 1959 (PATRIOT 4) out of committee as soon as Obama takes office, and make criminals out of all of us who are critical of this out-of-control government. When meaningful, peaceful change is thwarted and honest dissent is outlawed, violent revolution becomes inevitable. This sentiment was expressed by both President John F. Kennedy as well as Malcolm X, and timeless truths such as these endure for as long as we fail to learn the lessons of history.

The issue here is control. The obstacle is the Constitution and our willingness to defend and *enforce* it, even when doing so is dangerous.

What the globalist elites have intended, from long before when you were born, is for American

sovereignty to gradually and incrementally be eroded into nothingness, and when we appear (by design) to be on the verge of dissolution as a nation will we be offered the ‘salvation’ of merging into a ‘North American Union’. If a crisis is needed, it could be the economy – the foundations of which are already apparent – or it could be a terrorist attack or health threat (biological agents), all of which could be used to scare America into surrendering the very last of its liberties. Or, ‘The Siege’ meets ‘Outbreak’.

As David Rockefeller said, all we need is the right major crisis... and the people will accept the New World Order. In reality, people already are, it’s just a matter of degree – and to guys like Rockefeller, they want it all, to the very last Nth.



Whatever happens, Obama will play his part dutifully, and the beat goes on. Just remember, the players may change every few years but the overall plan will not. It will be ‘business as usual’ in DC, just as it has always been for about a century.

In the meantime, we have our mission and our goals to work toward, let’s stay focused and we *will* get there!

INDIANA MILITIA CORPS

DID YOU KNOW...?

According to data collected by radio talk show host Alex Jones, and broadcast on his program, fully 1/3rd of the 1.5 million active-duty soldiers serving today in the U.S. military are not citizens, but foreigners!

