

Obama Codifies Indefinite Detention Without Trial for US Citizens

National Defense Authorization Act could threaten religious people, pro-lifers, or anyone the Government deems suspect.

by John Vennari

Editor's note: In the famous 1946 interview, historian William Thomas Walsh asked Sister Lucy if all the nations of the world, including the United States, would fall under Communism if the Pope failed to consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Sister Lucy's simple answer was "yes". In 1946, it appeared unthinkable that America, which had the reputation of being a "bastion of freedom," would adopt Communism or totalitarian practices. But in the 66 years since that famous interview, Americans have seen the growth of a kind of Police State from their own government. The most startling of these new measures is the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), signed by Barack Obama on December 31, 2011. Mr. Vennari explains the manifold dangers of this new law.¹

Igor Birman, a Soviet refugee who is now chief of staff to California Rep. Tom McClintock, wrote a December 21 article entitled, "Americans Should Fear New Detention Law".

Speaking against the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), Birman remembers living in dread in the Soviet Union wherein Soviet Secret Police would

pull up to a neighbor's house and whisk away innocent people who would never be seen again.

"Such was the abject terror of living in the claws of despotism," Birman writes. "Unsurprisingly, it wasn't tempered by that infamous platitude: 'if you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to fear.' How very different from a life in



Kenneth Roth, Executive Director of Human Rights Watch, said, “President Obama will go down in history as the president who enshrined indefinite detention without trial in US law.”

America, secured from fear by the assurances of individual liberty. But in the 17 years since I became an American we’ve been averting our gaze as these sacred assurances slowly waned. With passage this month of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), we look away again as Congress exposes Americans to the specter of prison without charge or trial and smothers that basic right of free citizens to invoke the law against their government ...”

Birman warns of what the future might hold.

“Americans should know that, to eyes familiar with tyranny by experience, congressional consent to these broad new powers marks a major milestone on the road to serfdom. Before it’s too late, let us resolve to renew and reinvigorate our vigilance for freedom.”²

The NDAA

On December 31, while New Year’s celebrations and the impending Iowa Caucus distracted the country, Barack Obama quietly signed the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) from his holiday haven in

Hawaii.

The NDAA, a \$662 billion defense measure approved by Congress, "authorizes defense and counterterrorism spending through fiscal year 2012 and regulates the detention, interrogation and prosecution of suspected terrorists."³

The bill also contains provisions that effectively abolish the United States Bill of Rights. It grants dictatorial power to the president to order the military arrest of US citizens on US soil and detain them for an indefinite period.⁴

The measures of the law are scheduled to go into effect 60 days after the signing of the bill.

Through the NDAA, the entire United States has been redefined as a "battlefield" wherein the military can arrest a suspected terrorist or undefined "belligerent", and send him to a military prison indefinitely without charge and without trial.

Obama stated he had "reservations" about this aspect of the bill, but merely promised that his Administration would not use this extreme power. Yet there are those who say, behind the scenes, he pushed

for these provisions.

The pro-Obama media widely ignored the NDAA, as did many neo-con "conservative" outlets. What should have been blazing front-page news – the abolition of due process and the trampling of the Bill of Rights – received barely a peep from the press.

Numerous other organizations, however, castigated the Defense Bill. Condemnation of the NDAA came from almost every point of the political spectrum; including the ACLU, the John Birch Society, Amnesty International, Trends Research, Democrat Senator Diane Feinstein and Republican Senator Rand Paul.

Four predominant human rights groups, usually associated with left-wing politics, were of one voice denouncing Obama's signing of the NDAA.

"President Obama's action today is a blight on his legacy because he will forever be known as the president who signed indefinite detention without trial into law," said Anthony D. Romero, Executive Director of the ACLU. "The statute is particularly dangerous

because it has no temporal or geographical limits, and can be used by this and future presidents to militarily detain people captured far from any battlefield.”⁵

In its statement condemning Obama’s signing of the bill, The Center for Constitutional Rights said, “the NDAA contains no geographic limitations and allows the president to indefinitely detain even American citizens. President Obama did pledge in a signing statement not to use this law to detain American citizens but this provides little comfort, as signing statements have no legal force, and he has repeatedly failed to uphold similar promises in the face of political pressure – including his pledge to close Guantanamo within his first year in office.”⁶

Amnesty International declared, “The bill places enormous power in the hands of future Presidents, and the only answer the President has to say is ‘trust me’. Once any government has the authority to hold people indefinitely, the risk is that it can be almost impossible to rein such power in.”⁷

Kenneth Roth, Executive Director of Human Rights

Watch said, “President Obama will go down in history as the president who enshrined indefinite detention without trial in US law.”⁸

**“Shut up.
You don’t get a lawyer.”**

Congress approved the NDAA on December 14 by a 283 to 136 vote. The next day the Senate approved it by a vote of 86 to 13. The bill was passed after brief but fierce debate. Republican Senators John McCain and Lindsey Graham fought for the bill’s passage, including the section that approves military arrest and detention of US citizens on American soil without Constitutional protection. This is necessary, they claim, in the “War on Terror”.

Graham said, “It is not unfair to make an American citizen account for the fact that they decided to help Al Qaeda to kill us all and hold them as long as it takes to find intelligence about what may be coming next. And when they say, ‘I want my lawyer’, you tell them, ‘Shut up. You don’t get a lawyer’.”

Senator Rand Paul countered that there were already strong laws against support for terrorist groups. The danger, he noted, was that

the definition of terrorism is so broad that millions of Americans can fall into it.

Paul testified, "There are laws on the books now that characterize who might be a terrorist: someone missing fingers on their hands is suspect according to the Department of Justice; someone who has guns; someone who has ammunition that is weatherproofed; someone who has more than seven days of food in their house can be considered a potential terrorist. If you are suspected of these activities, do you want the government to have the ability to send you to Guantanamo Bay for indefinite detention?"

Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) backed Paul's objections. "Congress is essentially authorizing the indefinite detention of American citizens without charge," she said. "We are not a nation that locks up its citizens without charge."

Feinstein introduced an Amendment to prohibit the indefinite detention of US citizens, but this was rejected by a vote of 55-45.

Deceit

Obama had threatened to veto the legislation, not

because he objected to the citizen detention provision, but because the original NDAA did not give the president *enough* power.

At first, Obama appeared to oppose the NDAA for the right reasons. On November 17, he said, "The military custody of individuals inside the United States, as some members of Congress have suggested is their intention, would raise serious and unsettled legal questions and would be inconsistent with the fundamental American principle that our military does not control our streets."⁹

By the time mid-December rolled around, however, Obama threatened to veto the NDAA until Congress gave the president the immediate power to issue a waiver of the military custody requirements, instead of the Defense Secretary, which gave the president discretion in implementing new policies. In short, Obama wanted to ensure the bill gave him even more power than what the NDAA had first authorized.

Obama finally signed the bill on New Year's Eve. "His decision to sign the bill at a moment uncondusive to press attention was probably intentional," noted Joanne

"Obama could have refused to sign the bill and the Congress would have rushed to fund the troops. Instead, as confirmed by Senator Levin, the White House conducted a misinformation campaign to secure this power while portraying the president as some type of reluctant absolute ruler, or as Obama maintains, a reluctant president with dictatorial power." – Jonathan Turley



*Mariner, director of Hunter College's Human Rights Program.*¹⁰

The ultimate insult was Obama's "signing statement," allegedly expressing reservation about the section of the NDAA that authorizes military detention for US citizens, and assuring us this new power would not be used on his watch.

"My administration," said Obama, "will not authorize the indefinite military detention without a trial of American citizens. ... Indeed I believe that doing so would break with our most important traditions and values as a nation."¹¹

This appears to be deceit on Obama's part, since Democrat Senator Levin had already revealed on the Senate floor that *it was Obama's White*

House that insisted there be no exception for citizens in the indefinite detention provision.

Levin said,

"[T]he language which precluded the application of section 1031 to American citizens was in the bill that we originally approved in the Armed Services Committee, and *the [Obama] administration asked us to remove the language which says that U.S. citizens and lawful residents would not be subject to this section.*"¹²

In a blistering critique titled, "The NDAA's Historic Assault on American Liberty," George Washington University law professor Jonathan Turley exposed the duplicity within the bill itself.

"The Obama Administration and Democratic members

are in full spin-mode – using language destined to obscure the authority given [by the bill] to the military,” said Turley. “The exemption for American citizens from the *mandatory* detention requirement (section 1032) is the screening language for the next section, 1031,¹³ which offers no exemption for American citizens from the authorization to use the military to indefinitely detain people without charge or trial.” [Emphasis in the original]

As for the claim that Obama had no choice but to sign the bill to ensure the military’s 2012 funding, Turley counters, “Obama could have refused to sign the bill and the Congress would have rushed to fund the troops. Instead, as confirmed by Senator Levin, the White House conducted a misinformation campaign to secure this power while portraying the president as some type of reluctant absolute ruler, or as Obama maintains, a reluctant president with dictatorial power.”¹⁴

Counterterrorism expert Joanne Mariner noted that even though Obama pledged not to authorize indefinite military detention without

trial of American citizens, “The public should bear in mind, however, that President Obama’s promise does not bind any future president.”¹⁵ Nor does it even bind him.

The NDAA has been called “The Patriot Act on Steroids”, invoking emergency needs in the “War on Terror.” President George W. Bush had claimed the right to arrest and detain US citizens without charge or trial.¹⁶ The NDAA takes this a step further by codifying this extreme power.

Laws Trampled

Laws enshrined in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the 1878 Posse Comitatus Act protecting US citizens are effectively nullified by a stroke of Obama’s pen.

“The writ for *habeas corpus* – a civil right so fundamental to Anglo-American common law that it predates the Magna Carta – is voidable upon the command of the President,” writes Joe Wolverton, “The Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel is also revocable at his will.”¹⁷

Along the same lines, Alexander Cockburn notes, “Since 1878 here in the US, the Posse Comitatus Act has limited the powers of local governments and law enforcement agencies

from using federal military personnel to enforce the laws of the land. The [NDAA] detention bill renders the Posse Comitatus Act a dead letter.”¹⁸

It should come as no surprise that Barack Obama tramples these laws in a cavalier manner. He knows the press and his liberal sycophants will let him get away with almost anything. He fears no backlash from an informed public, as the mainstream media ensures the public remains misinformed.

We must recall that Obama favors the effective destruction of the U.S. Constitution.¹⁹

In a 2001 radio interview, Obama argued that the Warren Court, which started a long line of activist decisions in a number of areas, did not go far enough:

1. it failed to bring about “redistributive change” and a “redistribution of wealth”;

2. it failed to, in Obama’s words, “*break free from the essential constraints that were placed by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution.*”²⁰

Elsewhere, Obama had this to say:

“Ultimately, I have to side

with Justice Breyer’s view of the Constitution – that it is *not a static but rather a living document*, and must be read in the context of the ever-changing world.”²¹

This is a kind of modernist “living-tradition” mindset applied to the US Constitution.

In short, Obama belongs to the clique of doctrinal liberals who basically say, “the only law of the land should be what we say it is at the moment,” which is a formula for tyranny.

Alinsky:

“Crush the Opposition”

Looking into the immediate future, we may ask: Will Obama use these new powers in a tyrannical manner against his enemies; or against religious, pro-life and pro-family organizations?

While we cannot answer for certain, it is safe to conclude he is willing to use these powers if he can get away with it. When it comes to acts of malice, it is fair to deem Barack Obama capable of anything. He has no fixed rule of ethics except that which is expedient for the moment.

Obama was a student of Saul Alinsky, the left-wing radical whose landmark *Rules*

for *Radicals* was dedicated to the devil.²² Mike Kruglik, Obama's Chicago instructor in Alinsky methods, said Obama was the best student of Alinsky tactics he ever had.²³ Even Obama zealot Chris Matthews, in a December 2010 broadcast of "Hardball", referred to Obama as "the guy who comes from Saul Alinsky".²⁴

As is stated in his *Rules for Radicals*, Alinsky's foundational principles are:

1) There is no such thing as dogma, all truth is relative: "For the organizer, everything is relative and changing," said Alinsky. The organizer "does not have any fixed truth." This places the organizer in a superior position, Alinsky insisted, because he is "free from the shackles of dogma."²⁵

2) There is no such thing as a fixed rule of ethics. For Alinsky, the end justifies the means, and all ethics are *elastic* according to the situation you are in or the strategy you need to employ. Alinsky taught, "Ethical standards must be elastic to stretch with the times."²⁶ If you need to lie, you lie. If you need to make promises you know you won't keep, you do it anyway.

3) Corruption in the leader is a kind of virtue: Alinsky asserted: "The real arena is corrupt and bloody. Life is a corrupting process. He who fears corruption, fears life." Alinsky castigates the leader who places his personal conscience and personal salvation above the needs of the people, claiming such a leader "does not care enough for the people to be corrupted for them".²⁷

This is the school in which Barack Obama was formed: no dogma, no objective truth, no fixed standards of ethics, the end justifies the means, and corruption in the leader is raised to the level of virtue. How can anyone believe anything Obama says? There is no fixed standard of ethics preventing him from lying to achieve whatever aims he deems fit.

Finally, as a student of Alinsky (as is Hillary Clinton²⁸), Obama may think nothing of ruthlessly stamping out those who stand in his way. In his 1946 *Reveille for Radicals*, Alinsky wrote that if the radicals become stronger than the opposition, they must "**crush the opposition**".²⁹

Obama now has the power granted him by the National

Defense Authorization Act to “crush the opposition”. The NDAA permits him to arrest and jail anyone whom he deems to be a terrorist or belligerent, and to lock him or her away indefinitely without charge or trial. This can also be a powerful means of intimidation, for Obama only need order a handful of illegal arrests for the rest of his enemies to get the message, and to fear, “Could I be next?”³⁰

And here is something frightening for US citizens to consider: What will Obama do with this near-absolute power if he wins a second term and can act freely, unimpeded by re-election constraints?

“This law can apply to pro-lifers.”

Commentators warned that these illegal arrests could be used against Tea Party members as well as those in “Occupy” movements. Vice-President Joe Biden has already referred to Tea-Partiers as “terrorists”.³¹ Such reckless redefinition of terms fits the classic Humpty-Dumpty mindset: “*When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean.*”³²

Wendy Kaminer, a lawyer and civil libertarian, writes: “The government

could conceivably not only prosecute dissidents, it could imprison them without the bother of a prosecution. Protesters from Tea Partiers to Occupiers ... could face the threat of indefinite summary detention, depending upon the political preference of whoever holds power.”³³

John W. Whitehead, constitutional attorney and founder of the Rutherford Institute told *LifeSiteNews* in early January that the NDAA can be used against those fighting abortion.

“This law can apply to pro-lifers, yes,” said Whitehead. The NDAA “would allow the military to show up at your door if you are [deemed] a ‘potential terrorist’ and put you in military detention where seeing a lawyer is difficult.”³⁴

Pro-life activists “are already classified as domestic terrorists on some FBI lists”, said Dana Cody, president and executive director of Life Legal Defense Foundation.

“If it’s within the discretion of the government under the National Defense Authorization Act,” said Cody, “of course it will be used by the government to intimidate and silence pro-life people, especially those

who are in the public forum.”

Whitehead further told *LifeSiteNews* that one of his clients, a “street preacher”, Michael Marcavage, is now the target of an FBI ‘terrorist’ investigation. Whitehead wrote the FBI asking why Marcavage is being investigated, but the FBI never responded.³⁵

Along the same lines, we must not forget that in April 2009, the Department of Homeland Security issued its Report on “Rightwing Extremism” that named as potential terrorists Americans who:

- Oppose abortion;
- Oppose same-sex marriage;
- Oppose restriction on firearms;
- Oppose lax immigration laws;
- Oppose policies of Barack Obama regarding immigration, citizenship, and the expansion of social programs;
- Oppose continuation of free trade agreements;
- Are suspect of foreign regimes;
- Fear communist regimes;
- Oppose a ‘one world’ government;

- Bemoan the decline of US stature in the world;
- Are upset with the loss of US manufacturing jobs to China, India and more.³⁶

The Report also pegged “disgruntled veterans” returning from war as potential terrorists. This raised the ire of American Veteran Associations throughout the country, and Janet Napolitano, the head of the Department of Homeland Security, promised to reword the document.

It is said the Report has since been withdrawn, but this is small relief, since the list released in the 2009 report *reflects that present thinking of the Department of Homeland Security*.

This truth is borne out by an event from last summer.

In August 2011, Planned Parenthood, the National Abortion Federation, and the Feminist Majority Foundation hosted a terrorist training seminar attended by agents of both the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI. The seminar equated free speech and distributing literature with violence. Under such loose definitions, pro-lifers distributing pro-life literature can be branded “potential terrorists”.



John W. Whitehead, constitutional attorney and founder of the Rutherford Institute, said the NDAA “can apply to pro-lifers, yes”. It “would allow the military to show up at your door if you are [deemed] a ‘potential terrorist’ and put you in military detention where seeing a lawyer is difficult.”

The seminar also released an 84-page resource guide that listed three pages of “potential extremist” websites that included Priests for Life, National Right to Life, the American Life League, Concerned Women for America, Human Life International, the American Center for Law and Justice, and the Christian Broadcast Network.³⁷

Pro-life groups are on the verge of being proclaimed potential Enemies of the State. The intimidation they could face under the new NDAA is staggering to consider. Such alleged pro-life ‘terrorists’ could be

permanently arrested and detained indefinitely without trial.

In mid-December, we saw perhaps a foretaste of this type of intimidation.

Bogus “Security Threat”

On December 14, 2011, Andrea Lafferty, President of Traditional Values Coalition (TVC), was detained by Hillary Clinton’s Security Personnel on the specious charge that Lafferty represented a “security threat”.

Lafferty, whose (Protestant) pro-family organization, among other projects, opposes the homosexual

agenda, was covering a three-day closed-door conference in Washington. The purpose of the meeting was to advance the implantation of U.N. Resolution 16/18 that effectively favors the Islamic agenda.

"Lafferty was circled by several members of Secretary Clinton's staff before being approached by a member of the security detail, demanding Lafferty follow him. When asked why she was being removed from the reception hall, the security detail announced that a phone call had identified Lafferty as a 'security threat' to Secretary Clinton," said a TVC press release.

"I was shocked and angry at the pressure and shameful intimidation tactics our State Department put on," said Lafferty, "even to the point of identifying me as a threat to Hillary Clinton."³⁸

USA, RIP?

In late December, Congressman Jeff Landry (R-La) introduced legislation that would add a qualification to the NDAA wherein due

process would be guaranteed to all citizens.³⁹ The bill now has 30 co-sponsors including representatives of both political parties, a development we will continue to monitor.

Constitutional lawyers and civil liberties groups take heart in the fact that the NDAA's indefinite detention of citizens has yet to be challenged in the Supreme Court, where they hope it may be overturned.⁴⁰

Yet the threat is dire. Never before in the United States have we so felt the beast breathing down our backs.

America has no Divine promise that the gates of hell will not prevail against it. The sun may be setting on the United States. The country is well on the way to becoming a Police State.

May we oppose these measures by any legitimate means possible, may we be faithful to our daily Rosary, may Our Lady of Fatima protect us, and may we work like never before to petition the Pope to consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. **FC**

Notes: (1) According to St. Thomas Aquinas' definition: "Law is the ordination of reason, for the common good which is promulgated by one having such authority." This "Law" of Obama is not for the common good, is not reasonable and therefore cannot in strict justice be called a law. (2) "Americans Should Fear New Detention Law," Igor Birman, *Orange County Register*, December 21, 2011. (3) "Obama Signs Defense Bill – With Objections", *Politico*, December 31, 2011.



In 1946, William Thomas Walsh asked Sister Lucy if all the nations of the world, including the United States, would fall under Communism if the Pope failed to consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Sister Lucy's simple answer was "yes".

(4) Section 1021 of the NDAA speaks of "Detention under the law of war without trial until the **end of the hostilities** authorized by the Authorization for Use of Military Force." [emphasis added]. This amounts to an unlimited detention, since in the "War on Terror", there appears to be no end to the hostilities. Speaking of the "War of Terror", US General Petraeus said, "This is the kind of fight we're in for the rest of our lives and probably our kids' lives." Quoted from *Obama's Wars*, Bob Woodward, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2010) pp. 332-333. (5) "President Obama Signs Indefinite Detention Bill into Law," ACLU, December 31, 2011. (6) "Center for Constitutional Rights Condemns President Obama for Signing the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act," January 4, 2012. (7) "'Trust Me' is Not Enough of a Safeguard, says Amnesty International, as President Obama signs the NDAA into Law," January 1, 2012. (8) "US: Refusal to Veto Detainee Bill a Historic Tragedy for Rights," Human Rights Watch, December 14, 2011. (9) "Reality Check: The Obama administration demanded power to detain U.S. citizens," *Fox19.com*, December 16, 2011. (10) "The NDAA Explained: Part Two in a Two-Part Series of Columns on the National Defense Authorization Act," Joanne Mariner, *Justia.com*, January 2, 2012. (11) Obama's complete signing statement was posted on *Redstate* on December 31, 2011. (12) "Obama Expresses Objections to Indefinite Detention of US Citizens While Signing the Bill (But it was His Administration that Insisted the Language was Included in the Bill)", *Gateway Pundit*, January 2, 2012 (emphasis added). The video of Senator Levin's statement is also available on YouTube. (13) It should be noted that the original sections 1031 and 1032 in the earlier version of the NDAA became section 1021 and 1022 in the final version. Thus in news reports, sometimes the reference is to 1031-1032, sometimes to 1021-1022. Both refer to the same provision. (14) "The NDAA's Historic Assault on American Liberty: By signing into law the NDAA, the president has awarded the military extraordinary powers to detain US citizens without trial," Jonathan Turley, published in *The Guardian*, January 2, 2012. It should be noted that Turley is usually an advocate of liberal causes, yet is correct in his condemnation of the NDAA. (15) "The NDAA Explained: Part Two in a Two-Part Series of Columns on the National Defense Authorization Act," Joanne Mariner, *Justia.com*, January 2, 2012. (16) For the differences between the September 2011 Authorization of Use of Military Force (9/11 AUMF)

and the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act, see “The Truth About the New Detainee Policy,” Rep. Justin Amash, *Redstate.com*, December 18, 2011. (17) “Obama Signs National Defense Authorization Act into Law,” Joe Wolverton, II, *The New American*, January 2, 2012. (18) “Thud of the Jackboot: Obama gives military extreme powers,” Alexander Cockburn, *Counterpunch.com*, December 23-25, 2011. (19) We take it as a given that *Fatima Crusader* readers are aware the U.S. Constitution is imperfect. It is a document that nowhere mentions Jesus Christ (Who said, “Without Me, you can do nothing”), and is ultimately a document of naturalism in that it appeals to no higher authority than itself. Obama and his like-minded comrades in Washington, however, appear willing to shred the Constitution to make everything far worse. For a recent example, see “Obama’s Naked Thuggery,” Charles Hurt, *Washington Times*, January 9, 2012. (20) “Obama’s ‘New World Order’,” *Phyllis Schlafly Report*, March 2009 (emphasis added). (21) *The Audacity of Hope*, Barack Obama (New York: Vintage Books, 2006 – paperback edition), p. 108 [emphasis added]. (22) Alinsky’s dedication page in *Rules for Radicals* reads: “Lest we forget at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgment to the very first radical; from all our legends, mythology, and history ... the first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom – Lucifer.” *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*, Saul Alinsky (New York: Vintage, 1971). (23) “The Agitator: Barack Obama’s Unlikely Political Education,” Ryan Lizza, *The New Republic*, March 19, 2007. (24) Transcript: “Hardball with Chris Matthews,” MSNBC, December 20, 2010. (25) *Rules for Radicals*, p. 11. (26) *Ibid.*, p. 32. (27) *Ibid.*, p. 25. (28) “Alinsky has attracted other, more famous admirers, including Hillary Clinton, who wrote an undergraduate thesis about him...”, Ryan Lizza, “The Agitator”. (29) *Reveille for Radicals*, Saul Alinsky (New York: Random House, 1969 – Reissue of original 1946 book), p. 150 (emphasis added). (30) “Left-wing” writer Naomi Wolfe, author of *The End of America*, wherein she outlines the threat to innocent civilians under abuse of the 2001 Patriot Act and other ‘counter-terrorism’ measures, admitted in a 2007 speech that she continues to speak out. But if one or more outspoken friends ends up being illegally arrested and detained, she will cease to speak out. (31) “Sources: Biden Likened Tea Partiers to ‘Terrorists,’” *Politico*, August 1, 2011. (32) *Alice in Wonderland*, Lewis Carroll (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 2005), p. 238. (33) “NDAA 2012 and SOPA: Do They Target the Tea Party and Wall Street Movements?,” *International Business Times*, December 20, 2012. (34) “The NDAA allows the president to arbitrarily determine whether or not a various group may be considered terrorists, without judicial or congressional oversight, though the Secretary of Defense is required to ‘regularly brief’ Congress about ‘covered persons.’” Quoted from “Constitutional Experts: Pro-Life ‘Terrorists’ Could Be Permanently Detained Without Trial,” Ben Johnson, *LifeSiteNews*, January 4, 2012. (35) *Ibid.* (36) List drawn up by Bob Unruh. See “‘Extremism’ report ‘tip of the iceberg,’” Bob Unruh, *World Net Daily*, May 21, 2009. The list conforms to what is found in Homeland Security’s report: “Rightwing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment”, April 7, 2009. (37) “FBI, Obama Admin Join Pro-Abort Groups to Host Training Seminar against Pro-Life Activity,” Kathleen Gilbert, *LifeSiteNews*, September 20, 2011. (38) “Lafferty Detained by State Department,” Traditional Values Coalition, December 15, 2011. (39) “Rep. Landry Offers Amendment to NDAA to Protect Civil Liberties,” *The New American*, December 23, 2011. (40) Even the ACLU pledges to “fight worldwide detention authority wherever we can, be it in court, in Congress or internationally.” See, “President Obama Signs Indefinite Detention Bill into Law,” ACLU, December 31, 2011.