

Welcome to Obama's Indefinite Military Detention America

by snowy Sunday, May 27 2012, 12:46am

international / injustice/law / commentary

State prosecutors, with the approval of Constitutional LAW professor, cocaine snorting, pot smoking, Barack 'errand boy' Obama, recently 'urged' a female judge ('onya girl) to lift her ruling against a provision in the NDAA Act for indefinite military detention, which was passed into law by 'puff, puff,' Obama. A most curious 'urging,' wouldn't you think? The provision is unambiguously/CLEARLY unconstitutional, yet Obama's legal henchmen want the Nazi inspired provision to stay! [But bear in mind, "when the President does *it*, it's not (Fascist or) illegal!"]



Let's refresh our blank-slate memories, shall we? This draconian law received huge BI-PARTISAN support from the democratically elected Congress in its original form; it provided for the unfettered, unrestricted, indefinite detention of anyone deemed 'suspicious,' without recourse to due process, trial and without the need for a charge! What's wrong with that in a totalitarian State, I ask YOU? [Though there is that pesky matter of the Posse Comitatus Act, but when 'we' trash good laws and replace them with bad, it's not illegal, remember?]

Now consider another 'minor issue.' The traditional role of the military is to defend the State from attack and engage in warfare if necessary; soldiers are NOT criminal investigators or police and have no time to engage in Sherlock Holmes antics, they are fighters pure and simple - 'let me at 'em,' got it? But as we are aware, it is the military that has been charged with enforcing this new LAW, *not* the POLICE, who have been trained specifically for the task!? But again when the representatives of the people, Congress, pass bills and the pot smoking President passes those bills into law on New Year's Eve - everything is honky dory, isn't it? Who's complaining here?

We live in a 'democracy' and the criminals running the country are 'our' representatives acting in our best interests, aren't they? After all, WE elected them to high office, didn't we?

Need I continue? The situation is so criminally ABSURD I can't go on; be sure never to look yourself in the mirror, America, you may get the shock of your life!

Report from Reuters follows:

U.S. asks judge to undo ruling against military detention law

by Basil Katz

(Reuters) - Federal prosecutors on Friday urged a judge to lift her order barring enforcement of part of a new law that permits indefinite military detention, a measure critics including a prize-winning journalist say is too vague and threatens free speech.

Manhattan federal court Judge Katherine Forrest this month ruled in favor of activists and reporters who said they feared being detained under a section of the law, signed by President Barack Obama in December.

The government says indefinite military detention without trial is justified in some cases involving militants and their supporters.

But critics worry that the law is unclear and gives the Executive Branch sole discretion to decide who and what type of activities can be considered as supporting militants.

The judge's preliminary injunction bars the government from enforcing section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act's "Homeland Battlefield" provisions.

The section authorizes indefinite military detention for those deemed to have "substantially supported" al Qaeda, the Taliban or "associated forces."

In a brief filed in New York late on Friday, the government said the plaintiffs in this particular case had nothing to fear.

"As a matter of law, individuals who engage in the independent journalistic activities or independent public advocacy described in plaintiffs' affidavits and testimony, without more, are not subject to law of war detention as affirmed by section 1021," prosecutors in the Manhattan U.S. Attorney's office wrote.

During oral arguments in March, Forrest heard lawyers for former New York Times war correspondent and Pulitzer Prize winner Chris Hedges and others argue that the law would have a chilling effect on their work.

The judge said she was worried by the government's reluctance at the March hearing to say whether examples of the plaintiffs' activities - such as aiding the anti-secrecy website WikiLeaks in the case of Birgitta Jonsdottir, a member of parliament in Iceland - would fall under the scope of the provision.

Bruce Afran, a lawyer for the plaintiffs, said the government's brief failed to address fundamental concerns about what type of conduct is outside the law, and which person or group is deemed sufficiently "independent" of enemy forces.

"It is surprising that the government is pursuing this case because it has other statutes that specifically target terrorist groups," Afran said.

The government noted that courts rarely intervene in matters directed by the Executive Branch.

"Issuing an injunction regarding the President himself, or restraining future military operations (including military detention) ... would be extraordinary," prosecutors wrote, noting that they were considering an appeal of the judge's order.

Chris Hedges and the other malcontents that opposed this law would do well to consider that American democracy is at work here, and that they should be very happy with the decisions of the democratically elected government. Come to think of it, if Chris Hedges' actions didn't warrant indefinite detention previously, they sure do now, don't they, Barack? Or are you too busy railroading Bradley Manning for exposing American war crimes and telling the TRUTH about the US military?

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/05/26/us-usa-security-lawsuit-idUSBRE84P01H20120526>

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-3264.html>