

ATSNN Home

U.S. Attempts to Vote

War on Terrorism

Iraq Abuse Crisis

Politics

Science/Technology

Business

General News

Opinion & Editorial

Political Cartoons

ATS Topics

Contributors

About ATSNN

Terrorism News

Bush Suspends Posse Comitatus, Active Military Pour into New Orleans

Posted by: **djohnsto77**

On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 04:12 GMT

President Bush announced that the Defense Department will assist in rescue efforts of Hurricane Katrina afflicted areas, especially New Orleans. Reports indicate that dozens of military helicopters are now evacuating the New Orleans Convention center at a rapid pace. The posse comitatus law prevents the U.S. active military from participating in American law enforcement, but President Bush has suspended the law for the affected areas.

original news source:

www.msnbc.msn.com

WASHINGTON - President Bush said Saturday he will send 7,000 additional active duty forces to the Gulf Coast region.

"The enormity of the task requires more resources and more troops," he said in his weekly Saturday address. "We will not rest until we get this right and the job is done."

"Where our response is not working we will make it right," he added, reflecting his earlier statements that the federal relief effort could be better.

Please visit the link provided for the complete story.



Main News RSS Feed

War RSS Feed

Sci/Tech RSS Feed

Conspiracy RSS Feed

News RSS Feed

Exclusives RSS Feed

Op/Ed RSS Feed

This should have been done a long time ago, but better late then never...the live reports from FOX's Geraldo Rivera are good, it looks like finally these last people in these horrible centers are being taken out by the active duty military.

[Click here to read comments or post your own.](#)

Displaying the first 40 replies to this news story...

Posted by: **TrueAmerican**

On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 04:42 GMT

Wow, so Bush can suspend laws at will, eh? I wonder if a bunch of these people will try to sue the government over the dismal response. Of course they probably can't because of immunity.

Posted by: **djohnsto77**

On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 04:44 GMT

Bush sending Federal active duty troops into here is probably illegal and could probably be impeached for it, but I doubt anyone would dare suggest that since it's obviously needed.

Posted by: **subz**

On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 04:48 GMT

You dont need to suspend Posse Comitatus to allow the military to aid refugees and rescue people.

Removing Posse Comitatus would only serve to allow the military to "execute the laws" i.e. searches, seizures and arrests.

ATSNN.com is brought to you by the staff and members of the **Above Top Secret discussion board**, the Internet's most respected source for discussion on alternative topics. All content on ATSNN is pulled from the discussion threads in the AboveTopSecret.com news forum.

About AboveTopSecret.com
ATS 2004
ATS 2003
9/11 Conspiracy
John Titor
ATS Most Viewed
ATS Most Replied
ATS Member Blogs

Posted by: **djohnsto77**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 04:58 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by subz

You dont need to suspend Posse Comitatus to allow the military to aid refugees and rescue people.

Removing Posse Comitatus would only serve to allow the military to "execute the laws" i.e. searches, seizures and arrests.

I agree with you subz, but an overbroad interpretation, as in some other laws, has endangered America before.

Here is a link talking about it:

quote:

The Posse Comitatus Act (Section 1385 of Title 18 of the United States Code) states: "Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or Act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or the Air Force as a posse comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

The Act is an intimidating, irritating and insidious anachonism that has endangered America's security instead of enhancing it, even though no one ever was prosecuted under it.

Like the "wall" between intelligence and law enforcement that finally came down AFTER the Twin Towers were destroyed and The Patriot Act became law, because very persuasive liberals apparently had feared America's government and military more than America's enemies, foreign and domestic, and their egregious error had become obvious, its effect extended beyond its express terms.

Full Story: <http://www.renewamerica.us/columns/gaynor/050827>

Posted by: **Sugarlump**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 05:00 GMT

Are we supposed to herald this as some sort of brilliant move, or maybe forgive the earlier fumbles because of this?

If this was followed up with news that FEMA was being stood down, and being put under a serious congressional investigation for their severe mishandling of the situation and wasting 500 million dollars a day of our money, I might almost be happy with this. Yet instead we are seeing further involvement of the alphabet soup agency emergency response theory. And setting a dangerous precedent by allowing regular military to take over duties that could and should be handled by other agencies.

No this is much too little much too late to give me any satisfaction. if anything the dangerous precedent it sets coupled with the total incompetence of FEMA and other agencies coupled with our inability to accept other nations extremelly generous offers of aid and rescue teams in the critical first 72 hours has me more worried and angrier than ever.

Edit: No amount of cheap tricks and spare no expense federal aid now will make up for the shameful way this was handled. It took almost a week to shame this administration into doing anything truly effective. While I am happy something is being done, we should never forget what we have seen in the last week. This should be a wake up call that real change is needed and we cannot wait until next election to make it happen. Write your representatives, call them, send E-mail. It is imperative we make ourselves heard before this is allowed to happen again.

[edit on 3-9-2005 by Sugarlump]



Posted by: **stumason**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 05:08 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by subz

You dont need to suspend Posse Comitatus to allow the military to aid refugees and rescue people.

Removing Posse Comitatus would only serve to allow the military to "execute the laws" i.e. searches, seizures and arrests.

And that is exactly what he is using them for:

quote:

Their main priority, he said, would be to maintain law and order.

[From the BBC](#)

Posted by: **Relentless**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 05:12 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by Sugarlump

No amount of cheap tricks and spare no expense federal aid now will make up for the shameful way this was handled. It took almost a week to shame this administration into doing anything truly effective. While I am happy something is being done, we should never forget what we have seen in the last week.

You have voted Sugarlump for the Way Above Top Secret award. You have two more votes this month.

NEVER!

Posted by: **Off_The_Street**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 05:18 GMT

subz is pretty much correct.

Here's what the Coast Guard says, since they're the military most often engaged in such activities:

quote:

The "Posse Comitatus Act" (18 USC 1385): proscribed use of Army (later, Air Force) to "execute the laws" except where expressly authorized by Constitution or Congress. Limit on use of military for civilian law enforcement also applies to Navy by regulation. Dec '81 additional laws were enacted (codified 10 USC 371-78) clarifying permissible military assistance to civilian law enforcement agencies--including the Coast Guard--especially in combating drug smuggling into the United States. Posse Comitatus clarifications **emphasize supportive and technical assistance** (e.g., use of facilities, vessels, aircraft, intelligence, tech aid, surveillance, etc.) while **generally prohibiting direct participation of DoD personnel in law enforcement (e.g., search, seizure, and arrests)**.

Of course, I'm sure that the military can return fire if attacked, and, given the exigencies of the situation, probably have an 'understood' permission to hold people if the situation warrants (however you'd care to define that).

But the only way you're going to have the military do actual cop work is if the president or the governor **enacts martial law** -- which, despite the hysterical assertions to the contrary by some of the people here, **has not been done** (yet).

There are two rather interesting sidebars to the discussion I have noticed in the past week or so.

First, The United States is unique in having a Constitution which deliberately weakens the central government. Although the Feds have been encroaching on traditional local powers over the past 70 years, there are still many responsibilities which are, by the Constitution, the states', cities', counties', and (in the case of Louisiana alone) parishes'. Foreigners (especially New Zealanders, Canadians, Australians, and Brits who share a lot of our culture and language but not our type of government) simply can't understand how the sole superpower in the world does not simply mobilize everyone by emergency fiat. It's because our government doesn't work that way.

Second, you may have noticed it, but I'm afraid I missed all the television pictures of the tens of thousands of refugees being sent to the pre-prepared and stocked FEMA centers throughout the United States.

You know, the Secret Centers with the railroad cars and facilities for hundreds of thousands of people?

Of course, they never existed, and the crazies are strangely quiet about the fact that if there actually were such things, they'd be used now, but given the depths of human silliness, within a week or so, they will start to come up with a theory about why these non-existent facilities were deliberately withheld.

Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.

Posted by: **victor was right**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 05:54 GMT

:)

it just makes sense that the government would have facilities like that. we had them during world war two and if that taught us anything it's that it would probably be better to keep their existence secret.

in simple scenarios, FEMA would simply comander schools and large buildings for use as interment facilities. under more turbulent conditions, they'd probably implement some version of what the tinfoil hat gang have been telling us.

all i'm saying is, knowing what we know, about history and governments in general, why wouldn't there be a FEW "secret" places ready for use as camps? :puz:

Posted by: **they see ALL**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 06:39 GMT

it says that massive amounts of helicopters are helping now...

but, why did it take so long!?!?!?

why NOW and not THEN???

:)

Posted by: **elderban**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 06:57 GMT

I can understand why everyone asks why it took so long for the Federal Government to get there, but as I stated in another post the local government is as much to blame.

If you're going to ask the President why, then you need to ask the Mayor of New Orleans and the Governor of Louisiana why as well.

Mr. Mayor, why did 2/3 of the New Orleans's Police Force skip town?

Mr. Mayor, why didn't you command the local law enforcement until Federal help arrived?

Mr. Mayor, why didn't you assist the people in New Orleans UNTIL the Federal help arrived?

Mr. Mayor and Ms. Governor, why didn't you personally call up the Louisiana State Guard instead of waiting for the Federal Government to do it?

Posted by: **smallpeeps**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 07:00 GMT

quote:

But the only way you're going to have the military do actual cop work is **if the president or the governor enacts martial law** -- which, despite the hysterical assertions to the contrary by some of the people here, has not been done (yet).

The Mayor of New Orleans says he asked the governor for martial law in his city "two days ago", which would have been Tuesday. I think his interview was on Thursday.

IMO, if camps do or do not exist, it matters very little. For example: Texas Stadium exists, and Cowboy's owner Jerry Jones is mega-rich. He doesn't open his doors or stadium to the refugees, so why would FEMA, Moonies, Mormons or anybody else have to open theirs, secret or otherwise?

If FEMA has secret camps, etc, why would Katrina automatically cause them to reveal such? The conspiracy continues, probably.

[edit on 3-9-2005 by smallpeeps]

Posted by: **magnito_student**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 07:09 GMT

Anyone that steps up to the line and defends this administration at this point says one thing about their psyche: "They will never wake up from the lie no matter what and will follow this runaway locomotive called the New World Order off the cliff into the abyss":lol:

Posted by: **subz**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 07:10 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by djohnsto77

quote:

The Posse Comitatus Act (Section 1385 of Title 18 of the United States Code) states: "Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or Act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or the Air Force as a posse comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

The Act is an intimidating, irritating and insidious anachonism that has endangered America's security instead of enhancing it, even though no one ever was prosecuted under it.

Like the "wall" between intelligence and law enforcement that finally came down AFTER the Twin Towers were destroyed and The Patriot Act became law, because very persuasive liberals apparently had feared America's government and military more than America's enemies, foreign and domestic, and their egregious error had become obvious, its effect extended beyond its express terms.

Full Story: <http://www.renewamerica.us/columns/gaynor/050827>

Sorry dj but the "very persuasive liberals" the quote you posted is referring to is actually your founding fathers. There is a reason why there were checks and balances written into your countries greatest achievement: its constitution.

Posse comitatus is not a hinderance to the United States, its a protection against military dictatorship. It might sound far fetched now but give it 10, 15, 20 years and things would change. You can add another, albeit not quite succinct, certainty to the list of **death** and **taxes** and that is create a loophole and it will eventually be exploited.

Removing posse comitatus wont help with the rescue efforts and it should be reinstated as soon as law and order is restored in New Orleans. If it is not you would have to rip up the 6th and 7th amendments, they would be useless.

[edit on 3/9/05 by subz]

Posted by: **Phoenix**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 07:20 GMT

The idea that Posse Comitatus has been suspended is wrong

The feds finally were able to take over the bumbled effort once Governorette Blanco signed the papers to federalize the Guard.

It would take congress to repeal Posse Comitatus.

Posted by: **mOjOm**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 07:24 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by subz

Removing posse comitatus wont help with the rescue efforts and it should be reinstated as soon as law and order is restored in New Orleans.

[edit on 3/9/05 by subz]

This is exactly what I'm thinking and worried about. As most of us already know all too well. *They* have a really bad habit of leaving these holes open and exploiting them indefinitely. Does anyone really think that this will be any different???

Who else has the feeling that this is exactly what they wanted all along and just needed the excuse to do it???

Who else has the feeling that from this day on, the Military and Local Law Enforcement are going to be one in the same???

Welcome to the Begining of a Military Police State and America's New Fuhrer!!!

Posted by: **Seekerof**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 07:30 GMT

Agreed, Pheonix.

Found this, may be of interest to some.

[The Myth of Posse Comitatus](#)

[Posse Comitatus](#)

seekerof

Posted by: **Muaddib**

On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 07:38 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by magnito_student

Anyone that steps up to the line and defends this administration at this point says one thing about their psyche: "They will never wake up from the lie no matter what and will follow this runaway locomotive called the New World Order off the cliff into the abyss":lol:

Please Neo...wake us up...we seem to need your enlightenment to wake to what you call the real world.

Do you have a blue pill?...or is it the red one?... :@@:

Yeah, I think we can see whose "psyche" is out of the loop here...

Posted by: **billybob**

On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 08:52 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by Off_The_Street

Foreigners (especially New Zealanders, Canadians, Australians, and Brits who share a lot of our culture and language but not our type of government) simply can't understand how the sole superpower in the world does not simply mobilize everyone by emergency fiat. It's because our government doesn't work that way.

Second, you may have noticed it, but I'm afraid I missed all the television pictures of the tens of thousands of refugees being sent to the pre-prepared and stocked FEMA centers throughout the United States.

You know, the Secret Centers with the railroad cars and facilities for hundreds of thousands of people?

Of course, they never existed, and the crazies are strangely quiet about the fact that if there actually were such things, they'd be used now, but given the depths of human silliness, within a week or so, they will start to come up with a theory about why these non-existent facilities were deliberately withheld.

Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.

the crazies say, 'why intern them? let them literally eat each other. they are interned by nature, OTS, in case you missed that little detail. maybe you missed that not only was american response slow, but offers of assistance from 'foreigners' were refused outright. canadian emergency teams were blocked by homeland security from entering the country. russians were refused, australians were refused. now, homeland security is being used to block aid(food) from the red cross. the army is being used to protect property, instead of human life. priorities, priorities. the tinfoil hat crowd says, "the more things change, the more they stay the same". even when there is a blatant NWO move being pulled, the blind lead the blind into the hole.

Posted by: **intrepid**

On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 09:15 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by Muaddib

quote:

Originally posted by magnito_student

Anyone that steps up to the line and defends this administration at

this point says one thing about their psyche: "They will never wake up from the lie no matter what and will follow this runaway locomotive called the New World Order off the cliff into the abyss":lol:

Please Neo...wake us up...we seem to need your enlightenment to wake to what you call the real world.

Do you have a blue pill?...or is it the red one?... :@@:

Yeah, I think we can see whose "psyche" is out of the loop here...

Both of you, if this is the extent of your contribution here, please feel free to NOT hit the Post Reply button.

Posted by: **bodebliss**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 10:35 GMT

Americans hate armed regular troops on every street corner and I suspect in areas where this happens the citizens will feel the need to bulk-up on arms for years after the fact.

Posted by: **Koka**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 10:51 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by Off_The_Street

Of course, they never existed, and the crazies are strangely quiet about the fact that if there actually were such things, they'd be used now, but given the depths of human silliness, within a week or so, they will start to come up with a theory about why these non-existent facilities were deliberately withheld.

Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.

I believe these complexes do exist, maybe not all those that can be found in conspiracies.

A large privately owned engineering company has 60% of it's work provided by the construction of them.

And the reason they were not used?

Well, if you read the conspiracies you will already know.

Posted by: **The Vagabond**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 11:09 GMT

There are several points that only a few people here probably grasp. Allow me to bring a few of them up.

1. You have to read the article for yourself if you want to understand what's going on.

quote:

Active-duty soldiers would not be involved in law enforcement, Inge said, but would provide a variety of security and humanitarian assistance.

So, does this contradict what Bush said? No, it does not. Bush said that they would restore order, not that they would make arrests, searches or seizures. The Deputy Commander of NORTHCOM said that they would provide security. If we read these statements in the context of what is

legally allowable and do not make unwarranted inferences on the specific meaning of generalized phrases, it is clear that the military will be acting in accordance with the laws listed in my second point to enable the police to do their job, not that there will be anything amounting to martial law.

2. Not all use of the military within the United States constitutes a violation of the Posse Commitatus Act.

There is a misconception floating around that Congress must OK the use of troops within the United States. What the Posse Commitatus Act actually says is this:

quote:

except in such cases and under such circumstances as such employment of said force may be expressly authorized by the Constitution or by act of Congress

In other words, if a law or the constitution permits it, the president, acting as commander in chief can use the military within our borders.

Posse Commitatus obviously does not prevent the military from being used to keep government facilities off limits, or protecting government assets, etc. They do that all the time. Acts of Congress establishing our armed forces enumerate their duties, which include in some cases the securing of bases and other government facilities, as well as other duties as might be appointed to them by the Commander in Chief.

Furthmore, as Off The Street pointed out, and I have as well in past discussions, 10 USC 371-78 does allow the military to assist law enforcement operations.
[10 USC 371-81](#)

375 Says that enlisted personel can not directly participate in arrest, search, or siezure. 374 However makes it clear that the military may operate equipment in support of civilian law enforcement for any purpose not otherwise forbidden by law, may establish bases of operation for civilian law enforcement, and may provide transportation (logistical support) for civilian law enforcement.

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 (often mistakenly referred to as The War Powers Act) enumerates the circumstances under which the president can send our troops into action. The first two, which I have ommitted for brevity, are declaration of war, and other authorizing statutes.

[War Powers Resolution, Section 2C3](#)

quote:

(c) The constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities,...

(3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.

That law does not stipulate foreign attack. Where citizens take up arms against local governments, it can be argued that this constitutes an attack. There is precedent for this. The National Guard actively supported law enforcement agencies by fire during the Rodney King Uprising in 1992 without any Supreme Court rulings, Articles of Impeachment, or other noteworthy question as to legality arising.

[Wikipedia on 1992 LA Riots, second day](#)

3. The deployment of US troops to a disaster in no way threatens the rise of martial law on a national level, much less a facsist power grab by Bush. For the last four years it's been "just wait and see, any minute now der fuhrer will make his move..." well time is ticking away. Bush is a lame duck, he's coming up on a midterm election that could put an already uncooperative senate into opposition hands, and we're virtually no closer to a police state than we were the day after the Patriot Act passed. Granted the federal government has steadily continued its century old trend of encroaching on local powers and moving the United States closer to unitary government, but as much of this has come at the hands of liberal chief justices (with Scalia's help I concede) as has come from Bush. Nor have the Congress and Senate been innocent by any standard.

This is not a recent problem. Bush is not the problem. Bush is the latest and most widely publicized symptom of our federal system's deteriorating health. I advise those who are terrified of Bush to examine the problem more closely and start gnawing on the hind quarters of their representitives, senators, and state legislators to push for a correction back towards our tradition

of a comparatively weak central government and stronger state governments. I feel that when you panic every time the the federal government steps up to the plate to do exactly what it was meant for (assist the states with something that's simply too big for them), especially in the case of a massive catastrophe and subsequent breach of peace, which certainly should be opposed in every way, just because it came from a president you don't trust, you are really missing the boat.

Posted by: **marg6043**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 11:38 GMT

People welcome troops in the streets because they bring comfort and security.

One of the arm forces branch that he doesn't have to ask the congress for aproval is the Marines so I imagine they will make the majority of the troops.

I think is a very smart move.

If somebody cover the Marines VS any other branch already I appologized for bringing again this littler fact.

Posted by: **iori_komei**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 11:43 GMT

quote:

You have voted Sugarlump for the Way Above Top Secret award. You have two more votes this month.

Really good post.

I'm not to sure if sending the military in is such a good idea myself, I'm actually rather apathetic about this whole thing.
I can picture many different scenarios in my head, both good and bad.
I suppose all we can really do, is hope that it doesn't turn into a blood-fest because of this.

Posted by: **bodebliss**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 11:45 GMT

Partial to the Jar heads ,huh, Marg?

Well I was an Airborne Ranger stationed w/ the 82nd airborne(4yrs) and they've been called up as well, "All The Way, Sir"

[edit on 9/3/2005 by bodebliss]

Posted by: **marg6043**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 11:56 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by bodebliss
Partial to the Jar heads ,huh, Marg?

Well I was an Airborne Ranger stationed w/ the 82nd airborne(4yrs) and they've been called up as well, "All The Way, Sir"

He,he, hey I am married to one and still going, my husband is a retired Jar head of 22 years of military services.

I have learned to respect and appreciate them very well in my years as a military wife.

Once a soldier always a soldier.;)

Posted by: **The Vagabond**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 14:28 GMT

Since the title of this article remains miraculously unchanged, I think I'll point back up to my post near the top of this page. The Posse Comitatus Act has not been suspended, nor has it been violated. I've gone to some length to demonstrate that.

Anybody awake? Somebody even tossed out the idea that our nation was on the brink of martial law, so I assume somebody would like to discuss my assertions to the contrary.

By the by though, I mentioned the larger problem of the strengthening of federal power over the states in my post above. I've got a PTS thread on it now- a tad long, but fairly well researched, and I would like to think compelling.

[Fear and Partisanship: Stealing your Liberty to make you vote](#)

Posted by: **djohnsto77**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 14:33 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by The Vagabond
Since the title of this article remains miraculously unchanged,

I didn't invent this myself, I got it from MSNBC live television...if it is incorrect I think it should be changed but I can no longer do it.

Posted by: **Indy**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 14:38 GMT

Would any of this be necessary if the National Guard was here like they were supposed to be instead of out in Iraq fighting for oil? When they say National Guard maybe we need to ask which nation they guard.

Posted by: **The Vagabond**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 14:45 GMT

I assumed as much djohnsto77. I chose not to alert it because I feel that I know you well enough to know that you were not trolling or baiting. I figured somebody might come along and edit it as we got into the discussion and established that indeed nothing had been suspended.

I'm really more anxious to hear from those who are sure that we are with holding aid so that the "concentration camps" which don't exist will remain secret, especially those who implied by the use of words like fuhrer that this heralds a declaration of martial law.

I beg you to take no personal offense :).

Edit to add: Indy, please do not change the subject. The community, lead by the staff, are in the middle of an effort to tone down the partisan rhetoric, and one of the crucial rules we identified in the discussion that policy is that making inflammatory statements tangent to the subject of a

thread is a no-no. I'm not alerting your post, I'm just asking you to help keep ATSN on topic and at least marginally civil.

[edit on 3-9-2005 by The Vagabond]

Posted by: **Indy**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 15:15 GMT

You may disagree with my post but it is right on topic. And it has to do with the need to send in military because of the lack of National Guard members. And the reason there is a lack is because our president has sent them overseas to fight this nonsense war. If the Louisiana National Guard was at home where they should be it would not be necessary to send in the military. That isn't partisan. That isn't rhetoric. That is just simple fact. Alert if you wish. That won't change the reality of what I said and how it applies to the need to send in troops.

Posted by: **The Vagabond**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 16:24 GMT

quote:

Originally posted by Indy

You may disagree with my post but it is right on topic. And it has to do with the need to send in military because of the lack of National Guard members. And the reason there is a lack is because our president has sent them overseas to fight this nonsense war.

This thread is not about the justification of the war in Iraq and will not be derailed to that topic. Key inflammatory statements such as "war for oil" and "nonsense war" pushed your post over the edge from an observation to a tangent and an attempt to start a political pissing contest. I strongly recommend that you find a thread better suited to that topic, or get more into the swing of THIS topic.

Posted by: **Indy**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 16:41 GMT

I think its interesting that at the top of this page it encourages you to post your opinion, twist or take on the news item. I'm sorry my opinion on this doesn't agree with you. Your opinion of the war might be something else. I'm not the one starting a pissing contest. We are in a war that has left our own people vulnerable. It has taken away national guards members that are supposed to protect the people of Louisiana. It has taken these people and moved them abroad inappropriately. This has left a huge hole that now needs to be filled by other troops.

The title of this thread is "NEWS: Bush Suspends Posse Comitatus, Active Military Pour into New Orleans"

Active military pour into New Orleans because the National Guard is extremely thin. And why is it extremely thin? Because they are in Iraq. Feel free to insert your own reason why they are in Iraq. I stated my OPINION as the message at the top of the page encourages. There was nothing like "right wing this" or "liberal that".

My OPINION is that an inappropriate war has taken away people whose job it is to protect the state of Louisiana. Correct me if I am wrong. It was the president that ordered the national guard to be mobilized and sent to Iraq just like it was the president that mobilized troops to go into New Orleans.

You all are free to say how the troops are sent in to enforce the law. I'm saying if things had been handled appropriately they shouldn't have been needed and that the Guard would have been there to do their job.

Additional note to show how this is relevant..

"Thousands of National Guardsmen have failed to regain control of New Orleans. Fires continue to belch smoke over the city and sporadic gunfire echoes through the flooded streets."

why?

"There are currently 4,000 members of the Louisiana National Guard and no fewer than 12,000 guardsmen from neighbouring Mississippi serving in Iraq."

Source: <http://news.scotsman.com/index.cfm?id=1886932005>

The result is...

"Bush Suspends Posse Comitatus, Active Military Pour into New Orleans"

[edit on 9/3/2005 by Indy]

Posted by: **Majic**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 17:14 GMT

Just Cause For Legitimate Concern

quote:

Originally posted by Indy

Active military pour into New Orleans because the National Guard is extremely thin. And why is it extremely thin? Because they are in Iraq. Feel free to insert your own reason why they are in Iraq. I stated my OPINION as the message at the top of the page encourages. There was nothing like "right wing this" or "liberal that".

I doubt anyone here would mistake me for a partisan Bush-basher, and while I support the U.S. invasion of Iraq in particular (and no, not because of a snipe hunt), I find it disturbing that the National Guard, which was created *specifically to defend the U.S. homeland*, is so heavily deployed in Iraq -- doing the work that we're supposed to hire full-time active-duty soldiers for -- that the president sees fit to mobilize active duty troops here at home.

Iraq is not a national emergency, it is a strategic engagement that *we* initiated. Meanwhile, at a time of *genuine* national emergency, we seem to be coming up short-handed, and Americans are dying because of it.

If that sounds demagogic, I recommend bearing in mind that we are witnesses to this very thing happening. Something is wrong with this picture. *Very* wrong.

Meanwhile, there is *nothing* wrong with Americans questioning the decisions of our government, and *everything* wrong with giving them a free pass on something as significant as *suspending posse comitatus*.

Something stinks, and it's not just the bodies of U.S. citizens left to the maggots in New Orleans.

[edit on 9/3/2005 by Majic]

Posted by: **Indy**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 17:20 GMT

Maybe this will be a good learning experience for this president and those that follow. Keep the guard at home. Today it was Katrina and 1 to 2 million people. Next time it could be the New Madrid fault and 50 million people. Who honestly knew until this past week how bad things could really get here at home. I certainly never expected this kind of mess. Yes I expected that NO would get flooded if the storm hit direct. I never expected the civil unrest.

Posted by: **BaastetNoir**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 17:30 GMT

LOL...Bush just cant win... If he doesnt send troops to help he hates balck people, if he does, he is doing illlgal things and should be impeached... go figure !

:@@:

Posted by: **bodebliss**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 17:46 GMT

quote:

Taipei Times:

The Iraqi insurgency is in its last throes. The economy is booming. Anybody who leaks a CIA agent's identity will be fired. Add another piece of White House rhetoric that doesn't match the public's view of reality: Help is on the way, Gulf Coast.

As New Orleans descended into anarchy, US President George W. Bush and his emergency-response team congratulated each other on Friday for jobs well done and spoke of water, food and troops pouring into the ravaged city. Television pictures told a different story.

"What it reminded me of the other day is `Baghdad Bob' saying there are no Americans at the airport," said Rich Galen, a Republican consultant in Washington.

ORIGIN

Extremely long quote edited

[edit on 4-9-2005 by Thomas Crowne]

Posted by: **shadowstriker**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 18:22 GMT

if bush really wants to help our country and make it a better place he should get some of our troops out of the middle east and send them new orleans and then pull the rest out faster than he wants to

Posted by: **Icarus Rising**
On: Sat September, 3 2005 @ 18:33 GMT

What really strikes me about the 'containment of New Orleans' is the reports given by Geraldo and Shepard Smith last night on Fox. Geraldo was in the convention center, nearly in tears as he watched the suffering entering its fifth night. He was pointing out the infants and babies going without food and water. He kept saying "get them out of here!" over and over, it was very compelling.

Fox then cut to Shepard and he was outside the center saying "the government" had just set up a check point closing the only exit from the city and was turning everyone back to be processed for evacuation. He seemed somewhat incredulous at this, and questioned why "the government" would cordon off the devastated city and turn back those attempting to evacuate on their own. Both reporters were obviously upset and angry at the way the disaster relief was being conducted.

Its almost as if there is a subplot to the evacuation aimed by law enforcement and the military at identifying and detaining the individuals behind the rampant criminal activity that has reportedly overwhelmed the city in the wake of the flood disaster. Something is going on behind the scenes, I'm almost sure of it.

[Click here to post a reply to this story.](#)