

## TORTURE-SICK SYMPTOM OF ALL TOTALITARIAN DICTATORSHIPS

### **Pity us Poor Torturers and Executioners:**

***“The few words of the sentence ‘The Jews must be exterminated’ are easy to say. Yet for those who must carry it out, what it demands is the hardest and most difficult thing there is. I ask you really to listen to what I have to say in this circle, and never to talk about it. The question has arisen: what about the women and children? I resolved to find an utterly clear solution for this as well. For I do not consider myself justified to eradicate the men—that means kill or have killed—and allow the avengers of their deaths to grow up in the form of the children and grandchildren. Thus the difficult decision had to be taken to make this people disappear from the face of the earth”***

**Heinrich Himmler, Reichsfuhrer SS, Poland, November 6, 1943**

Although Bush has fiercely denied that his regime approves of Torture; there is a growing ***corpus delecti*** body of gruesome evidence, that he and his medieval inquisitors have abandoned the century old Laws of War, and ***authorized the Physical and Psychological torture, and murder, of captives and POWs, by American CIA and Army Intelligence;*** and authorized the widespread practice of ***extraordinary rendition*** to surrogate countries known to routinely torture their prisoners.

### **Like The Holocaust- Torture Never Happened:**

***“Lies have poisoned the whole subject of Auschwitz for more than a quarter century...Since 1945, the whole world has been assailed by this legend. Hundreds of lies have been repeated in thousands of books in an increasingly virulent rage”***

**Belgian Leon Degrelle, Letter to the Pope on visit to Auschwitz, 1979; Leader of the REX Fascist Movement in Belgium, Joined Waffen SS in 1943, Commander of the Wallonie Brigade in 1944, defended the Hitler bunker in 1945, Received asylum In Franco’s Spain.**

The brutality of the methods used by the U.S. in the War on Terror, have permanently and unnecessarily damaged the moral leadership and reputation of the U.S. people. Experts in interrogation all agree; torture is not necessary or effective for eliciting useful information from captives. These policies have

created many thousands of bitter captives that will hold a deep hatred for the American people for the rest of their lives. One of these victims may very well become the Ali Agca deranged fanatic that kills millions of Americans someday. By 2005 a growing critical mass of soldiers were coming forward with allegations of abuse and outright criminal torture:

***“There were freaking horrible things people were doing. I saw (detainees) who had feet smashed with hammers”***  
**Anthony Lagouranis, Army Enlisted Specialist**

In August 2005, a Washington Post story written by Josh White contained the following excerpt of a description of the **murder** of an Iraqi General Officer obtained from official documents. General Mowhoush had voluntarily visited the prison looking for his son:

***“Iraqi Maj. Gen. Abed Hamed Mowhoush was being stubborn with his American captors, and a series of intense beatings and creative interrogation tactics were not enough to break his will. On the morning of Nov. 26, 2003, a U.S. Army interrogator and a military guard grabbed a green sleeping bag, stuffed Mowhoush inside, wrapped him in an electrical cord, laid him on the floor and began to go to work. Again.***

***It was inside the sleeping bag that the 56-year-old detainee took his last breath through broken ribs, lying on the floor beneath a U.S. soldier in Interrogation Room 6 in the western Iraqi desert. Two days before, a secret CIA-sponsored group of Iraqi paramilitaries, working with Army interrogators, had beaten Mowhoush nearly senseless, using fists, a club and a rubber hose, according to classified documents.***

***The sleeping-bag interrogation and beatings were taking place in Qaim about the same time that soldiers at Abu Ghraib, outside Baghdad, were using dogs to intimidate detainees, putting women's underwear on their heads, forcing them to strip in front of female soldiers and attaching at least one to a leash. It was a time when U.S. interrogators were coming up with their own tactics to get detainees to talk, many of which they considered logical interpretations of broad-brush categories in the Army Field Manual, with labels such as "fear up" or "pride and ego down" or "futility."***

**Hours after Mowhoush's death in U.S. custody on Nov. 26, 2003, military officials issued a news release stating that the prisoner had died of natural causes after complaining of feeling sick. Army psychological-operations officers quickly distributed leaflets designed to convince locals that the general had cooperated and outed key insurgents.**

**The U.S. military initially told reporters that Mowhoush had been captured during a raid. In reality, he had walked into the Forward Operating Base "Tiger" in Qaim on Nov. 10, 2003, hoping to speak with U.S. commanders to secure the release of his sons, who had been arrested in raids 11 days earlier.**

**Army Chief Warrant Officer Lewis Welshofer Jr.,** was eventually convicted of negligent homicide and dereliction of duty in the interrogation death of General Mouhoush, but he received **only a reprimand!** At a hearing at Fort Carson, Colo., a military jury recommended that he receive no jail time. It also said his salary should be docked \$6,000 and that he be restricted to barracks for 60 days.

The **NFC Republican** controlled Congress has become a **particeps criminis** in the continuing torture scandals, by continuously turning a blind eye to the gruesome evidence of these awful war crimes committed by U.S. Military, CIA agents, and the civilian and military Chain-of-Command; which has continued throughout the War on Terror. Except for one reserve MP officer, Captain Christopher Beiring ( the Army later dropped the case); no one above the rank of enlisted soldiers has ever been prosecuted, none in a General Court Martial, and none will, because the evidence that would be presented in Court, by anyone with direct evidence, would lead directly back to Mr. Bush himself.

In July 2005, the Washington Post reported that Bush and Vice-President Cheney had been actively involved in efforts to stop a series of amendments and bills being circulated by a few embarrassed Republicans led by Senator John McCain; a former Vietnam War POW. The Bush administration had been trying to block legislation, supported by these Republican Senators; that would bar the US military from engaging in "**cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of detainees, regardless of physical location,**" from hiding prisoners from the Red Cross, and from using interrogation methods not authorized by a new Army Field Manual.

Vice President Cheney met with these three senior Republican members of the Senate Armed Services Committee to press the administration's case that legislation on these matters would usurp the president's authority and - in the words of a White House official - interfere with his ability "**to protect Americans effectively from terrorist attack.**" At a minimum, the Vice-President demanded that the phrase "**regardless of physical location**" be removed from the amendment.

The Senate meeting was attended by Armed Services Chairman John W. Warner (R-Va.) and committee members John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.). Warner and Graham had recently chaired hearings that explored detainee abuse and interrogation tactics at Guantánamo Bay and the concerns of senior military lawyers, that administration policies have left the door open to abuse.

The McCain amendment sets uniform standards for interrogating anyone detained by the Defense Department and would limit interrogation techniques to those listed in the Army Field Manual on interrogation, now being revised. Any changes to procedures would require the defense secretary to appear before Congress.

It requires that all foreign nationals in the custody or effective control of the U.S. military must be registered with the International Committee of the Red Cross - a provision specifically meant to block the holding of **ghost detainees** in Iraq, in Afghanistan or elsewhere.

Sensing a Public Relations disaster in the next election, these and other concerned Republican Senators expressed concern with the Bush regime torture policies; and in a rebuke to Bush and Cheney, the Senate passed the McCain legislation in October 2005, by a lop-sided vote of **90-9**. Senator McCain, a former POW, wants to require the Bush regime and all future U.S. Presidents to adhere to the Geneva Conventions and the International Law on Human Rights.

**(The 9 pro-torture Republicans were Wayne Allard (CO\*), Kit Bond (MO), Tom Coburn (OK), Thad Cochran (MS\*), John Cornyn (TX), James Inhofe (OK\*), Pat Roberts (KS\*), Jeff Sessions (AL\*), Ted Stevens (AK\*) – remember these names; those with \* are up in 2008, the others in 2010.)**

On July 26, 2005, McCain issued a press release which included the following comments:

***“Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment that would establish the Army Field Manual as the uniform standard for the interrogation of Department of Defense detainees and I ask for its immediate consideration. I also ask that Senator Collins . . . be added as a cosponsor.***

***To fight terrorism it is obvious that we must obtain intelligence, but we have to ensure that it is reliable and acquired in a way that is humane. To do otherwise not only offends our national morals, but undermines our efforts to protect the nation’s security. Abuse of prisoners harms – not helps – us in the war on terror, because inevitably these abuses become public. When they do, the cruel actions of a few darken the reputation of our honorable country in the eyes of millions. Mistreatment of our prisoners also endangers U.S. service members who might be captured by the enemy – if not in this war, then in the next....***

***Mr. President, let me just close by noting that I hold no brief for the prisoners. I do hold a brief for the reputation of the United States of America. We are Americans, and we hold ourselves to humane standards of treatment of people no matter how evil or terrible they may be. To do otherwise, as I have noted, undermines our security, but it also undermines our greatness as a nation. We are not simply any other country. We stand for something more in the world – a moral mission, one of freedom and democracy and human rights at home and abroad. We are better than these terrorists, and we will win. The enemy we fight has no respect for human life or human rights. They don’t deserve our sympathy.***

***“But this isn’t about who they are. This is about who we are. These are the values that distinguish us from our enemies”***

Senator Frist, Majority leader and administration stooge; promptly tabled the entire Defense Authorization Bill, but McCain threatened to put it on every bill coming before the Senate.

The McCain amendment was probably the most threatening to Bush and his deputies. A truly independent investigation will uncover criminal liability all the way up the chain of command to the White House.

The following letter was sent to Sen. McCain on Sept. 16, 2005:

***“Dear Senator McCain:***

***I am a graduate of West Point currently serving as a Captain in the U.S. Army Infantry. I have served two combat tours with the 82nd Airborne Division, one each in Afghanistan and Iraq. While I served in the Global War on Terror, the actions and statements of my leadership led me to believe that United States policy did not require application of the Geneva Conventions in Afghanistan or Iraq.***

***I am certain that this confusion contributed to a wide range of abuses including death threats, beatings, broken bones, murder, exposure to elements, extreme forced physical exertion, hostage-taking, stripping, sleep deprivation and degrading treatment. I and troops under my command witnessed some of these abuses in both Afghanistan and Iraq.***

***Since clear standards only limit interrogation techniques, it is reasonable for me to assume that supporters of this argument desire to use coercion to acquire information from detainees.***

***This is morally inconsistent with the Constitution and justice in war. It is unacceptable.***

***I strongly urge you to do justice to your men and women in uniform.***

***Give them clear standards of conduct that reflect the ideals they risk their lives for.***

***With the Utmost Respect,***

***Capt. Ian Fishback, 1st Battalion,  
504th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division,  
Fort Bragg, North Carolina***

In early 2003, several senior uniformed military lawyers from each of the services voiced vigorous dissents to the policies outlined in a 2002 Justice Department memo to the President; that alleged that the rules against torture did not apply in the War on Terror.

Maj. Gen. Jack L. Rives, the Air Force deputy judge advocate general, wrote that several of the "**more extreme interrogation techniques, on their face, amount to violations of domestic criminal law**" as well as military law. In fact, Rives added, use of many of these techniques "**puts the interrogators and the chain of command at risk of criminal accusations abroad.**" Rives was talking about the well-established concept of **universal jurisdiction**, according to which any nation has the authority to prosecute any person for the commission of war crimes.

The tactics proposed in the 2002 memorandum also troubled Rives because he felt the new interrogation policies threatened to undo progress the military had made since the Vietnam War. Accusations of war crimes committed by U.S. forces during Vietnam damaged the military "**culture and self-image,**" Rives wrote. Post-Vietnam military programs that emphasize compliance with the laws of war have "**greatly restored the culture and self-image of US armed forces,**" according to Rives.

Moreover, Brig. Gen. Kevin M. Sandkuhler, a senior Marine lawyer, wrote that military lawyers believed the harsh interrogation system could have adverse consequences for American service members. These might include diminished "**public support and respect of US armed forces, as well as loss of pride, discipline, and self-respect within the US armed forces.**" The interrogation regime could also jeopardize military intelligence-gathering and efforts to obtain support from allied countries.

On August 13, 2005, Liberal Columnist Joe Conason gave liberal credit to the three Southern Senators, and wrote in the New York Observer:

**"Among the most durable stereotypes of American political culture is that military officers secretly yearn for authoritarian rule and blind brutality, especially if they happen to be from the South, while civilian officials and intellectuals supposedly cherish our constitutional order.**

**Those fissures were exposed when Senator (Lindsey) Graham released declassified memoranda written by top Judge Advocate General officers. Pried loose from the Pentagon by the Senator, those memos show that in early 2003, ranking J.A.G. officers from every service branch tried to warn against interrogation methods**

**that violate the human and legal rights of prisoners in U.S. military detention facilities.**

**In essence, the J.A.G. officers worried about the effect of the military of policies that encouraged torture and other interrogation practices prohibited under U.S. and international law. Doing so endangered American troops, who could be prosecuted in U.S. or international courts—and undermined their own protection against enemy abuses. The J.A.G. officers could barely conceal their astonishment that the Bush administration would consider discarding decades of training and tradition for the sake of dubiously effective interrogation methods.**

**“Treating [the] detainees inconsistently with the [Geneva] Conventions arguably ‘lowers the bar’ for the treatment of U.S. POWs in future conflicts,” wrote Air Force Maj. Gen. Jack Rives. “How will this affect their treatment when incarcerated abroad and our ability to call others to account for their treatment?” asked Navy Rear Adm. Michael Lohr.**

**The “implementation of questionable techniques will very likely establish a new baseline for acceptable practice in this area,” wrote Army Gen. Michael Romig, “putting our service personnel at far greater risk and vitiating many of the POW/detainee safeguards the U.S. has worked hard to establish over the past five decades.”**

**Somehow, those concerns appear to have made little impression on Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and his advisors. But then, as Marine Corps Gen. Kevin Sandkuhler noted dryly in his own dissenting memo, those zealous lawyers promoting torture in the Justice Department and the White House “do not represent the services; thus, understandably, concern for service members is not reflected in their opinion.”**

**More broadly, the J.A.G. officers were troubled by the implications for the military and the nation, of the high-handed attitude exemplified by the Bush advisors. What kind of country would the United States become if we allowed our military officers to behave like criminals? What kind of country would we become if we accepted the dangerous theory, promoted by the Pentagon**

***civilians, that in wartime a President can issue whatever orders he may choose, regardless of U.S. and international law?***

***We have yet to confront the full consequences of that theory, as applied in U.S. military detention facilities. At the moment, the Pentagon and the White House are withholding photos and videos that reportedly document abuses even graver than what we've already seen, despite a court order demanding their release.***

***The warnings of the J.A.G. officers were prescient indeed. Someday, when historians consider how this President and his associates sought to overturn American values, traditions and statutes in pursuit of absolute power, they will praise the officers and politicians who resisted those illegitimate maneuvers”***

Military officers in active service cannot openly criticize their CINC as it is potentially a court martial offense. However, Mr. Conason should have given more credit to the many retired ***traditional-conservative*** high ranking military officers that have continuously spoken out against the war, the occupation, and the captivity and torture policies. Professional officers of all ranks and services are appalled by the torture policies of the Bush regime; but there is little more they can do for now, as long as the Congress fails to act.

Three former U.S. Flag officers filed an Amicus brief with the Supreme Court, through their attorneys, on behalf of the Captives at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. (Case # 03-334, 03-343)

B/Gen. David M. Brahms, USMC Ret., Rear Admiral Donald J.Guter, USN, and Rear Admiral John D. Hutson,USN; had formerly served as the Judge Advocate General or the Senior Legal Advisor for a branch of the United States military, with extensive experience in U.S. military regulations and the Laws of War.

Each dedicated his military career to the principle that the mission of the nation's Armed Forces must be consistent with the rule of law. This is an excerpt from their Curiae Brief:

***“The government’s contention is that no court any where on earth has jurisdiction, even to entertain the Guantanamo prisoner’s claims---that the federal courts could not intervene even if***

***prisoners were being executed or tortured. The government's position is based on the proposition that only Cuba, not the United States, has sovereignty over the base"***

***"Applying the rule of law to the Guantanamo is especially important to the members of the United States Armed Forces."***

***"...if the United States refuses to apply the competent tribunal requirement in the Geneva Conventions to the prisoners being held at Guantanamo, it increases the likelihood that foreign authorities holding American captives will decide to ignore the Geneva Conventions entirely—thereby putting the lives of American prisoners at risk"***

### **NFC Republicans Nullify Supreme Court Decision**

Senator Graham has been outspoken on the need for Congress to get involved in the issue of detainee treatment, said in an interview that he intended to pursue additional amendments that would define the term ***enemy combatant***, for purposes of detention and regulate the military trials of detainees held at Guantánamo Bay. Some believed this was a ploy to essentially legislative authorization for Torture; so that the President and those in the Chain-Of-Command can not be prosecuted for their actions in the War on Terror.

It didn't take long to find out what the NFC Republican from the right wing red state of South Carolina meant by getting "***Buy In***" to Guantanamo. The Senate voted on November 10, 2005 on a Graham amendment to strip captured ***enemy combatants*** at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, of the principal legal tool given to them last year by the Supreme Court, when it allowed them to challenge their detentions in United States courts.

The vote, ***49 to 42***, on an amendment to a military budget bill came at a time of intense debate over the government's treatment of prisoners in American custody worldwide, and just days after the Senate had passed the measure by Senator McCain banning abusive treatment and torture.

In an unbelievable act of disrespect for the Rule of Law; five Democratic Senators;

***Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut, Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Ben Nelson of Nebraska, Kent Conrad of North Dakota, and Ron Wyden of Oregon...***

voted ***with*** most Republicans in support! Several Courageous honorable traditional-conservative Republicans voted against it including the powerful ***Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.***

If approved in its current form by both the Senate and the House, the law ***would nullify a June 2004 Supreme Court opinion*** that detainees at Guantanamo Bay had a right to challenge their detentions in court.

Nearly 200 of roughly 500 detainees have already filed habeas corpus motions; which are making their way up through the federal court system. As written, the amendment would void any suits pending at the time the law was passed.

### ***Mengele Returns from Dante's Inferno***

On July 1, 2005, the Washington Post ran a story written by Burton J. Lee III, a former White House physician, and a military medical officer who is concerned that U.S. Medical services personnel have been directed to assist in the abuse and torture of prisoners, by the civilian leadership. It is important to be included here in its entirety. These are from a web mail copy of his story;

#### ***The Indelible Stain of Torture***

***"Having served as a doctor in the Army Medical Corps early in my career and as presidential physician to George H.W. Bush for four years, I might be expected to bring a skeptical and partisan perspective to allegations of torture and abuse by U.S. forces. I might even be expected to join those who, on the one hand, deny that U.S. personnel have engaged in systematic use of torture while, on the other, claiming that such abuse is justified. But I cannot do so.***

***It's precisely because of my devotion to country, respect for our military and commitment to the ethics of the medical profession that I speak out against systematic, government-sanctioned torture and excessive abuse of prisoners during our war on terrorism. I am also deeply disturbed by the reported complicity in***

***these abuses of military medical personnel. This extraordinary shift in policy and values is alien to my concept of modern-day America and of my government and profession.***

***The military prides itself, as do physicians, on being professional in every sense of the word. It fosters leadership and discipline. When I served as White House physician, my entire professional staff was drawn from the military, and they were among the best and most competent people I have met, without qualification.***

***The military ethics that I know absolutely prohibit anything resembling torture. There are several good reasons for this. Prisoners should be treated as we would expect our prisoners to be treated. Discipline and order in the military ranks depend to a large extent on compliance with the prohibition of torture --indeed, weak or damaged psyches inclined toward torture or abuse have generally been weeded out of the military, or at the very least given less responsibility. In addition, military leaders have long been aware that torture inflicts lasting damage on both the victim and the torturer.***

***The systematic infliction of torture engenders deep hatred and hostility that transcends generations. And it perverts the role of medical personnel from healers to instruments of abuse.***

***Today, however, it seems as though our government and the military have slipped into Joseph Conrad's "Heart of Darkness." The widespread reports of torture and ill-treatment -- frequently based on military and government documents -- defy the claim that this abusive behavior is limited to a few noncommissioned officers at Abu Ghraib or isolated incidents at Guantanamo Bay.***

***When it comes to torture, the military's traditional leadership and discipline have been severely compromised up and down the chain of command. Why? I fear it is because the military has bowed to errant civilian leadership.***

***Our medical code of ethics requires us to oppose torture wherever it is inflicted, for any reason. Guided by this ethic, I served as a volunteer with the international group MEDICO in 1963, taking care***

***of people who had been tortured by the French during Algeria's civil war. I remain deeply affected by that experience today -- by the people I tried to help and could not, and by their families, which suffered the most terrible grief. I heard the victims' stories, examined their permanently broken bodies and looked into faces that could not see me because of the irreparable damage done not only to their senses but also to their brains. As I have studied reports of torture throughout our troubled world since then, I have always found comfort in knowing that at least it did not occur here, not among Americans.***

***Now that comfort is shattered. Reports of torture by U.S. forces have been accompanied by evidence that military medical personnel have played a role in this abuse and by new military ethical guidelines that in effect authorize complicity by health professionals in ill-treatment of detainees. These new guidelines distort traditional ethical rules beyond recognition to serve the interests of interrogators, not doctors and detainees.***

***I urge my fellow health professionals to join me and many others in reaffirming our ethical commitment to prevent torture; to clearly state that systematic torture, sanctioned by the government and aided and abetted by our own profession, is not acceptable.***

***As health professionals, we should support the growing calls for an independent, bipartisan commission to investigate torture in Iraq, Afghanistan, Guantanamo Bay and elsewhere, and demand restoration of ethical standards that protect physicians, nurses, medics and psychologists from becoming facilitators of abuse.***

***America cannot continue down this road. Torture demonstrates weakness, not strength. It does not show understanding, power or magnanimity. It is not leadership. It is a reaction of government officials overwhelmed by fear who succumb to conduct unworthy of them and of the citizens of the United States”***

The writer is a former physician to President George H.W. Bush and a board member of Physicians for Human Rights.

In August 2005, a Conference of representatives of Medical Professional Organizations such as the AMA and the American Psychological Association was broadcast on C-Span. The purpose of the conference was to announce that the various professional medical Associations were in opposition to the use of Army Medical and Psychological personnel to facilitate Interrogations and Torture, and that any such personnel participating in such activities might lose their professional recognition. This issue, it was observed, could impact on the recruitment of Doctors and Psychiatrists for the Army.

**The memories of the Nazi doctor's involvement in torture now hover over the American medical profession like a toxic black cloud.**

***“Research in sterilization techniques involved exposure to large doses of x-rays, straightforward castration, sterilization with drugs, and injection of inflammatory liquid into the uterus. Other experiments entailed drinking sea water, infection with gas, gangrenous wounds, bone transplants, exposure to phosgene and mustard gas, the artificial inducing of phlemon, and so forth.***

**Hitler's \$\$, Richard Grunberger**

On October 20, 2005, three California medical experts requested an investigation of any U.S. military doctor linked to the torture of detainees since Sept. 11, 2001. The probe was urged in a letter published Friday in the New England Journal of Medicine. The letter was in response to a disclosure of such mistreatment in Iraq and Cuba published in the journal and other publications in July.

***“There is now sufficient published evidence in professional and public journals that physicians, psychologists, and perhaps other healthcare professionals have abetted or directly participated in interrogation activities which are prohibited by accepted professional ethical codes,”***

**Dr. Philip Lee; a Professor at both Stanford University and the University of California, San Francisco.**

In any case, the efforts of the Republican Senators were too little, too late, and were partly intended to cut off an effort by Senate Democrats to attach more stringent demands to the defense bill regarding detainees. One group, led by Sen. Carl M. Levin (D-Michigan), has proposed an amendment calling for an

independent commission similar to the Sept. 11 commission, to look into administration policies on interrogation and detainee abuse.

### **The Unrestricted Commander-In-Chief State**

***"The Fuhrer must have all the rights demanded by him to achieve victory"***  
**Adolf Hitler, 1942**

### **The Torture Law does not apply to Emperor Bush as CINC!**

After doing everything possible to kill the Anti-Torture provisions of the Defense Bill, Bush signed the Bill containing the Anti-Torture prohibitions on December 30, 2005. He then quietly reserved the right to bypass the law under his exaggerated sense of his powers as commander in chief!

Bush issued a ***"signing statement"*** -- an official document in which a president lays out his interpretation of a new law -- declaring that he will view the interrogation limits in the context of his broader powers to protect national security. Bush wrote;

***"The executive branch shall construe [the law] in a manner consistent with the constitutional authority of the President . . . as Commander in Chief,"***

This means Bush believes he can waive the restrictions, the White House and legal specialists said. The president's signing statement, which was posted on the White House website, had gone unnoticed over the New Year's weekend, and raises serious questions about whether he intends to follow the law.

On August 1, 2005, Chris Floyd, reporting for the Moscow Times, had stronger words for the ***carte blanche*** authority demanded by the ***NFC*** Bush regime;

***"Last week, we wrote of the Bush Faction's increasingly successful drive to establish the principle of unlimited presidential authority -- beyond the reach of any law or constitutional restriction -- as the new foundation of a militarist American state. This relentless push toward autocracy gained even more strength in recent days, in two cases centering on what has emerged as the very core of Vice President Dick Cheney was dispatched to Congress last week to strong-arm three Republican senators***

**seeking to place the mildest limitations imaginable on Bush's power to do whatever he wants with his captives in "the war on terror," The Washington Post reports. The proposed amendments to the defense budget would simply require interrogators to follow whatever procedures the Pentagon establishes for questioning prisoners and to register all captives with the International Red Cross. A third provision would take the radical step of prohibiting "cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment" of anyone in custody -- behavior that is already expressly forbidden in U.S. law.**

**But Cheney brought hard words from on high for the tepid trio:**

**Bush will veto any attempt by Congress to place any fetters on his arbitrary power over the captives in his worldwide gulag. The grim-visaged veep put it plainly: Such legislation would "restrict the President's authority" to conduct the terror war as he sees fit, and thus cannot be tolerated"**

**The whole defense budget will be tossed into the toilet if the amendments are attached, Cheney thundered.**

**This would be the first veto of Bush's presidency: a mark of the supreme importance he places on his ability to seize people without charges, hold them indefinitely, break their bodies and their minds, then dispose of them as he pleases. This power is obviously more important to him than the defense of the nation itself. But what's most striking about this case is the fact that the amendments -- sponsored by ersatz maverick John McCain, among others:**

**is actually part of the process of establishing an open, "legal" structure for Bush's unrestricted "commander-in-chief state."**

**The measure is an attempt to lend congressional legitimacy to the Bush gulag, as co-sponsor Lindsey Graham made clear.**

**"We need congressional buy-in to Guantanamo"**

**Graham said bluntly. He also noted that the amendments would recognize and support Bush's power to establish his own private judicial system: the rigged "military tribunals" for anyone Bush**

***has arbitrarily designated an "Enemy Combatant." What's more, the measure exempts the CIA -- which runs the gulag's most secret quadrants -- from almost all of its provisions.***

***As for "cruel punishment," recent history shows that current U.S. laws against such practices have hardly deterred the Bush Faction's yen for torture. The White House simply redefines the meaning of "torture" to suit its needs of the moment. In 2002, a series of memos crafted by Bush's legal minions virtually defined torture out of existence. Only the deliberate attempt to murder a prisoner or maim him for life was considered beyond the pale, they said; everything else was fair game.***

***Later, when the Abu Ghraib atrocities drew some brief media heat in an election year, the Pentagon issued a few new restrictions on barbarity for public consumption -- although once again, the CIA was pointedly exempted from restraint. McCain's redundant and rather pathetic proposal, asking the Bushists to please obey laws that already exist, would doubtless be subjected to the same weasel-wording treatment.***

***So why put the kibosh on this gutless, toothless bill? It's simple.***

***The autocratic principle cannot accept any institutional infringement on the Leader's arbitrary power***

***not even a craven accommodation like McCain's measure. Yes, Congress may rubber-stamp the gulag ("a buy-in to Guantanamo"); that's allowed. And Congress may approve funding for the gulag.***

***But the people's representatives must have no say whatsoever in the gulag's operations.***

***To give way on this point would reintroduce the rule of law and genuine democracy to U.S. government. And the Bush militarists have gone too far, waded through too much blood, to return to such "quaint" notions now.***

***Likewise, the idea of judicial oversight of the executive must also be refuted. Even as Cheney was chastising Congress, the Bushists were blatantly defying a federal court order to release 87 photographs and four videos of last year's Abu Ghraib mayhem. These depict barbarities that even Pentagon warlord Don Rumsfeld once described as "blatantly sadistic, cruel and inhumane," Editor & Publisher reports. A Republican senator who saw the material spoke of "rape and murder.***

**“Bush simply refused to obey the federal court, saying he would provide an explanation for his actions -- in secret -- at some later date.**

**But there is more. Eyewitnesses have said the pictures show the rape and brutal abuse of young teenagers and children. The filmed evidence is corroborated by the Pentagon's own investigators. Yet in all this time -- and in all the show trials of low-ranking "bad apples" the Bushists have staged -- not a single person has been charged or even reprimanded for these abominations.**

**This is the power that Bush declares cannot be restricted by courts or Congress or any law on earth: the power to torture, to murder, to terrorize -- and to rape children. This is the dark, filthy heart of his militarist state.**

**With each new atrocity on every side in the hydra-headed "war on terror," you think that now, perhaps, we've reached the bottom. But never believe that comforting notion. The evil that has opened up beneath our feet is bottomless, and we are falling deeper, fathom by fathom, into the pit. The worst, far worse, is yet to come”**

***As a matter of U.S. policy, the United States' obligations under the CAT (Convention against Torture), which prohibits cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment -- those obligations extend to U.S. personnel wherever they are, whether they are in the United States or outside of the United States,"***

**Condoleezza Rice, December 7, 2005**

As the Torture story continued to plague the Bush regime, the American people became more aware of the facts; and Bush's approval rating dropped into the toilet, Condoleezza Rice was sent to Europe to reassure the Europeans with more Bushworld propaganda and disinformation; but by December 2005, the European public and their leaders were not buying it. Rice told the Europeans that the United States government does not authorize or condone torture of detainees, but they know **"it"** all depends on what she meant by **"authorize," "condone," "torture" and "detainees."**

The U.N. treaty prohibits treatment that doesn't meet the legal definition of torture, including many practices that human rights organizations say were used routinely in places such as Afghanistan and Guantanamo Bay in Cuba.

Human rights organizations and critics in Europe have said that the administration's prior statements that standards overseas were different; created a loophole for torture. Prisoners suspected of links to terrorism have been chained to the floors of their cells, denied sleep and led to believe they could be killed by methods such as waterboarding. These methods, called Coercive Persuasion or Interrogation are known to create the phenomenon of Regression which causes physical and psychological injuries and death. At least 108 deaths of prisoners in U.S. custody have been reported.

For example, the U.S. has been accused by released captives and some U.S. experts of using waterboarding; in which prisoners are strapped to a plank and submerged in water or have water continually poured on their face to approach drowning. These methods were recognized as torture as early as the Spanish Inquisition, and occasionally result in death from heart attacks or drowning. We will never know just how many were murdered or driven insane by these methods.

Rice faced sharp criticism despite the defense of U.S. policy she had outlined in Washington, Berlin and Bucharest. U.S. and European critics strongly suspect the CIA of running secret prisons in Eastern Europe and covertly transporting suspects around the continent. Dutch Foreign Minister Ben Bot of NATO said that Rice's answers to the allegations had so far been unsatisfactory.

On Wednesday, December 7, 2005, **Louise Arbour**, the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights had harsh words for the Bush regime;

***“The U.S.-led war on terror has undermined the global ban on torture, weakening American moral authority on human rights worldwide; The principle once believed to be unassailable -- the inherent right to physical integrity and dignity of the person -- is becoming a casualty of the so-called war on terror, There are a lot of human rights that can be set aside in cases of emergency, lots of them, but not the right to life and not the protection against torture; To the extent that there's a perception that there is a withdrawal from the high-water mark of commitment to civil and political liberties, I think it makes it a lot more difficult for the United States to exercise that kind of moral leadership on all human rights issues,”***

(Arbour is a former Canadian Supreme Court justice and a chief prosecutor for the U.N. War Crimes Court for the former Yugoslavia)

Britain's highest Court also thrust itself into the middle of the roiling U.S. debate in December 2005, declaring that evidence obtained through torture - no matter by whom - was not admissible in British courts. It also said Britain had a "**positive obligation**" to uphold anti-torture principles abroad as well as at home.

**The Democratic leadership has so far failed to take the moral high ground and condemn the Bush regime for these war crimes.**

**They have not introduced a bill to impeach Mr. Bush, and the high level slugs that are responsible for authorizing these crimes.**

**Conservative Christian Moral Leadership is Blessed:**

**"Providence withdrew its protection and our people fell, fell as scarcely any other people heretofore. In this deep misery we again learn to pray. . . . The mercy of the Lord slowly returns to us again. And in this hour we sink to our knees and beseech our almighty God that he may bless us; that He may give us the strength to carry on the struggle for the freedom, the future, the honor, and the peace of our people. So help us God."**

**Adolf Hitler, March 1936**

## The Law of Honor of the Religious SS-Man:

***“Question: What is your Oath?***

***Answer: We swear to you, Adolf Hitler, loyalty and bravery as the leader and Chancellor of the German Reich. We vow to you and to the principles laid down by you obedience to the death. So Help Us God.***

***Question: Thus you believe in God?***

***Answer: Yes, I believe in a Lord God***

***Question: What do you think of a person who does not believe in a God?”***

***Answer: I consider him arrogant, stupid, and a megalomaniac; he is not suited for us”***

**50 Questions and Answers for the SS—Man, by Heinrich Himmler, 1937**

During the rise of the Fascist dictatorships in Italy, Germany, Austria, Spain, and Portugal, the Christian clergy were largely silent and failed to criticize the brutality and criminality of the street thugs called the Blackshirts in Italy and the Brownshirts in Germany, when they were still a minority; and could have been defeated. By failing to provide moral leadership at the right time, the Conservative Protestant and Catholic Churches contributed to the subsequent horrors, perpetrated by the Gestapo and the SS.

American religious leaders, especially the holier than thou ***Christian-Nationalist Crusaders*** have been silent on the shame of official sanction of torture. Their deafening silence evokes memories of the unconscionable behavior of German church leaders in the 1930s and early 1940s. Despite the hate whipped up by administration propagandists against those it brands ***terrorists***, most Americans agree that torture should not be permitted.

Few seem to know that, although President George W. Bush says he is against torture, he has openly declared that our military and other interrogators may engage in torture "***consistent with military necessity***." Military necessity was rejected as an excuse for torture after WWII at the Nuremberg trials.

***It is specifically repudiated and outlawed by Army Field Manuals as a justification for torture.***

For far too long we have been acting like obedient Germans, averting our eyes, even as our mainstream media have finally begun to expose the routine torture conducted by US forces in Iraq, Afghanistan, Guantánamo, and throughout the theater of the War on Terror. By violating the Principles of Civilized nations

the U.S. has lost the moral high Ground and for the foreseeable future our power and influence will decline unless we rid ourselves of the War Criminals that have control of the country. This must be done at the very next electoral opportunity.

**The NFC Bush government's official sanction of barbaric mistreatment, abuse, torture, and murder of detainees in U.S. custody in the World War on Terror, is a shameful first in U.S. history, and the President and his accomplices must eventually be prosecuted for these U.S. Crimes and International War Crimes.**

**PUBLIUS**