

A VALUABLE REGULATORY INSTRUMENT: THE MILITARIZATION OF U.S. DOMESTIC AFFAIRS IN THE NAME OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ekin Oyan Altuntaş

Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi

• • •

Abstract

Compared to other accumulation models, the capitalist accumulation model has always been more susceptible to social uprisings because of its structural class conflicts, monopolistic and expansionist characteristics and its tendency toward systematic crises. In this context, the regulatory instruments of national security, namely, police and military forces, have functioned as “preventive” regulatory instruments to suppress social uprisings in the resilient process of hegemony (i.e., historic bloc) and the accumulation model. This paper examines how the authorization of the military and police force in American domestic affairs have been justified in the name of national security since the outset of the structural crisis of capitalism.

Keywords: Capitalism, social uprisings, regulatory instruments, United States, national security

*Yararlı Bir Düzenleme Aracı: Ulusal Güvenlik Adı Altında ABD
İşlerinin Askerileştirilmesi*

Özet

Diğer birikim modelleri ile karşılaştırıldığında, kapitalist birikim modeli gerek yapısal sınıfsal çelişkilere sahip olması ve sürekli eşitsizlik üretmesi, gerek tekelci ve yayılmacı karakterinin devamlı çatışmaya yol açması gerekse de doğası gereği sistematik krizlere girmeye eğilimli olması gibi sebeplerle, toplumsal ayaklanmalara karşı daha kırılgan bir tutum sergilemiştir. Bu nedenle, birikim modelinin yapısal bir krize girmesi ve hegemonyanın (tarihsel blok) restore edilmesi süreçlerinde toplumsal ayaklanmaları bastırmak amacıyla ulusal güvenliğe bağlı “önleyici” birer düzenleme araçları olarak polis ve askeri güçler sıkça kullanılmıştır. Bu çalışma, kapitalizmin yapısal krizinin ortaya çıktığı 1970’lerden itibaren Amerikan polis ve askeri güçlerinin ülke içi yetkilerinin ulusal güvenlik adı altında nasıl adım adım artırıldığını incelemektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kapitalizm, toplumsal ayaklanmalar, düzenleyici araçlar, ABD, ulusal güvenlik

A Valuable Regulatory Instrument: The Militarization of U.S. Domestic Affairs in the Name of National Security

The violent and repressive practices of the U.S. government following the terrorist attacks of September 11th have given rise to a wave of domestic restlessness across the globe. Both domestic and international publics assumed that “neocolonialist democratization” outside of the United States and institution of a “scaremongering democracy” within the continental of United States were part of the exclusive “empire-building” project of neoconservatives that would be phased out by the Obama administration. However, the economic, political and military policies of the Bush administration were maintained with only slight modifications during Obama’s first term as president.

Regardless of a president’s preferences, election pledges or personal backgrounds, American political history is characterized by continuity rather than change. Therefore, rather than being accredited to a specific presidential administration, issues of national security such as the “war against communism,” the “war on drugs,” the “promotion of democracy,” the “humanitarian intervention” or the “war on terror” have functioned as “regulatory instruments” (i.e., solutions of the one percent to capitalist crises) that aim to restore the accumulation model and reinstate the hegemony as to sustain proliferating the wealth and power of the one percent. The purpose of these regulatory instruments is hidden behind elaborate presentations (e.g., emancipation, liberation, democracy promotion) or scary illusions (e.g., nuclear attack, weapons of mass destruction in Iraq or the endless threat of Al Qaeda), and these instruments are designed to accommodate changing circumstances, concrete needs and legitimizing discourses.

The functioning of the military as a regulatory instrument of foreign policy to maintain national security has received wide attention from academics globally. However, the domestic function of the military and police have been

largely ignored. In an environment marked by the structural crisis of capitalism where the dictum of “state above classes” has lost its credibility and class contradictions are more visible, the regulatory instruments of national security, which rely on military force to suppress dissidents who asks for equality, justice and peace in the capitalist system, have proven to be successful.

This paper analyzes the authorization of military and police force in the U.S. domestic affairs in the name of national security since the outset of the structural crisis of capitalism. The first part of the paper will examine, why hegemony and capitalism need regulatory instruments and the functioning of “national security.” Second, the militarization process of U.S. domestic affairs, beginning in the 1970s, will be studied in detail. The final part will include an overall analysis.

Why does Hegemony Need Regulatory Instruments in the Capitalist Mode of Production?

The construction of hegemony takes place first and foremost in classes. In Gramsci’s words, to establish hegemony there must be an established “historic bloc” that corresponds to the dialectical unity of base and superstructure, an alliance between leading classes and subordinate groups (through economic compromises, normative, intellectual and ideological leadership), the willful consent by the masses and the coercive state power (Gramsci, 1971:57,161,181-182). In times of hegemonic crisis in which an economic crisis becomes a socio-political crisis and combined with the deterioration of economic and political compromises between classes (failure of willful consent) and moral-ideological leadership, the coercive power of the state loses its ability to control classes (Gramsci, 1971: 210, 276). A genuine solution to a hegemonic crisis requires the construction of a new consensus between classes and alternatives to the impaired mode of production. However, as history reveals, instead of a true resolution, leading classes rigidly insist on maintaining the outmoded accumulation regime and historic bloc by authorizing the use of military and police apparatuses in the name of national security.

National security notion resembles Machiavelli’s concept of “virtu” which means “common value in mobilizing the society as a unity” (Akgül and Yılmaz, 2012: 1). National security concept involves most of the common values of a society such as, peace, freedom and sovereignty. In addition to that, national security illusionary presents itself as neutral to all class contradictions and political-economic benefits and thus, legitimately mobilize masses for willingly (to some extent) give their consent to state and its apparatuses’ (i.e., police and military) practices. Because it was called national security, no one

seems to criticize the link between a presented enemy figure (threat to virtue) and hegemonic interests. In this context, national security paradigm serves as a useful purpose to renew hegemony and control working class by means of military and police forces.

As Morales put, “In reaction to a period of social upsurge flush with movements of liberation, justice and peace, and the mounting of powerful campaigns which threatened the status quo and elite control, the U.S. military’s stand-alone apparatus for conducting “civil disturbance suppression” operations, including detention” (Morales, 2012).

Why Capitalism Needs Regulatory Instruments?

Over the course of the history of capitalism, the inner contradictions of the accumulation system, namely, over-accumulation (the tendency of toward falling profit rates) and the conflict between capital and labor, led to recurrent crises that ended with structural crises in the accumulation model and hegemonic settlement. The weaknesses of capitalism and hegemonic settlement have necessitated the routine interventions by capitalist states to facilitate the expansion of capital, through the creation of new accumulation fields for surplus value (e.g., liquidity policies) and the suppression of class conflicts (consensus management) by means of economic, political, social, ideological and disciplinary instruments and suppressive apparatuses.

Under the conditions of structural crisis of capitalism, the primary objective of regulatory instruments is to sustain the existing accumulation model and keep enhancing the privileges of corporate elites who benefit from the extremely unequal redistribution of surplus. Just to remind the current situation, “Between 2009 and 2011, 88 percent of national income growth went to corporate profits, while just 1 percent went to wages. In terms of personal income, in 2010, 93 percent of all income gains went to the top 1 percent of Americans” (Tabb, 2012).

The primary objective of regulatory instruments requires strict rescue blueprints which include devastating and impoverishing retrenchment programs and repressive social-legal measures. Dialectically, these measures produce resentments and trigger social uprisings, massive protests and lead the emergence of new resistance collaborations and actors while raising class consciousness on a mass scale.¹

¹According to a survey of Pew Research Center (PRC) on 2,048 adults, “66 percent of the public believes there are “very strong” or “strong” conflicts between the rich and the poor, an increase of 19 percentage points since 2009” (Morin, 2012).

As revealed by Jacopo Ponticelli and Hans-Joachim Voth's well documented study fiscal retrenchment and instability are positively correlated (Ponticelli and Voth, 2011: 2). Ponticelli and Voth show that "as expenditure cuts reach one percent or more of GDP, this grows to nearly two events, a relative increase by almost a third compared to the periods of budget expansion. As cuts intensify the frequency of disturbances rises" (Ponticelli and Voth, 2011: 3). Thus, Ajay Kapur (analyst from Citigroup in 2005) listed "populist political pressure" as one of the most significant challenges to Plutonomy, which refers to a wealthy economy where the richest 20 percent are responsible for 60 percent of total spending (e.g. United States, United Kingdom and Canada) (Cited in Frank, 2007). In fact, findings of a recent survey of PRC, which includes 1,287 adults who define themselves as middle class, support the argument of Kapur. According to this survey, "85 percent of the participants expressed that compared to the last decade it is more difficult to maintain their standard of living" and 62 percent of them say "a lot" of the blame lies with Congress, while 54 percent say the same about banks and financial institutions and 47 percent about large corporations" (PRC, 2012). Apparently, the crisis of capitalism and austerity measures has dramatically raised class consciousness (e.g. "we are the 99 per cent" slogan).

The perception of social movements (based on class consciousness) as major challenges to capitalism is not today's subject. The report of the 1975 Trilateral Commission which was authored by Samuel Huntington, Michel Crozier and Joji Watanuki and named as "The Crisis of Democracy," emphasized that "some of the problems of governance in the United States today stem from an -excess of democracy- that could be cured by a "*greater* degree of moderation in democracy" (Huntington et al., 1975: 113). Democracy or even "procedural democracy" (Kolin, 2011: 2) would raise difficulties for corporate elites in the resilient process of hegemony. Instead, more authoritative political and repressive legal adjustments that function as "preventive interventions" to reduce "undesirable possibilities" are necessary at the juncture of revolution and counter-revolution, or the "clash of classes" which is referred to by Huntington as the "clash of civilizations".

Military and Police Authorization in U.S. Domestic Affairs in the 1970s

The authorization of police and the military in the suppression of dissidents in the U.S. did not begin in the 1970s. In fact, according to Andrew Kolin, "The American police state has historical roots in post-Revolutionary America" (Kolin, 2011: 15). Since its inception as an independent state, the U.S. government has deemed many types of mass-based political movements

and mobilizations to be a potential threat to the existing accumulation model and elite rule –from colonial elites to corporate elites- including organized labor, African-Americans, American Indians, Communist and Socialist organizations and individuals, civil right organizations and anti-war and anti-globalist groups. They have all been labeled “criminals” or “subversive.”² In this sense, national security institutions (i.e., the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), National Security Agency (NSA), Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), federal and local law enforcement forces and army) have steadily been authorized for action according to the requirements of the existing political-economic model. For instance, a far-reaching counter-dissident program called “Cointelpro” was secretly implemented by the FBI in 1956 until the program was exposed in 1971.³ The program aimed at investigating, wiretapping, spying, discrediting, distorting, disrupting and eliminating -or neutralizing- domestic political opposition including the Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party, Black Movement (particularly Martin Luther King and the Black Panther Party which represented mostly blue-collar black laborers), Puerto Rican groups, New Left (connected to 1968 upsurges), “White hate groups,”⁴ Cuban groups and organizations against war (Glick, 1999: 2).

²Many organized labor leaders, socialists and nonviolent political dissents in U.S. were charged and convicted under the Espionage Act of 1917, which prohibited any view challenging the government’s official view; NSA leaker Edward Snowden was also charged under this act, the Sedition Act of 1918 which outlawed criticism of any war in which the U.S. participated and the Alien Act of 1918 which allowed the deportation of anarchists (Kolin, 2011: 30). Thousands of individual and left-wing organizations had undergone close surveillance when the Wilson administration requested “loyal” American citizens to report any suspicious act (Kolin, 2011: 31). During the Palmer Raids in 1920, more than 10,000 people were rounded up and hundreds of them were deported for being members of labor unions or due to their political positions against the domestic and foreign policies of the U.S (Terkel, 2007). In 1950s under Senator Joe McCarthy’s pervasive surveillance and spying era, many people lost their jobs and freedom based on suspicion of their sympathy towards left-wing groups.

³Similar to its precedents, the Cointelpro program was disclosed after its secret files had been released to the media. Its exposure had caused a significant scandal because its targets were evidently not enemy spies but legal and non-violent domestic political movements. In addition FBI operations under this program consisted of all types of covert operation including “harassment, deception and violence” (Glick, 1999: 3).

⁴As Glick has noted, these so-called “White hate groups,” “functioned mainly as a cover for covert aid to rightwing vigilantes, who were given funds and information, so long as they confined their attacks to Cointelpro targets” (Glick, 1999:2). In fact,

However beginning in the 1970s, in the aftermath of the uprisings in 1968 and at the dawn of the neoliberal restructuring phase, the repressive capabilities of police, federal investigation agencies and the military have profoundly escalated into a new stage: a legalized, politicized, systematized, diversified and institutionalized phase. This change was the result of two factors.

First, the U.S. has been in the midst of a hegemony crisis since the end of the golden age of capitalism in the late 1960s, when the inner contradictions of the accumulation model surfaced and capitalism's long-term structural crisis began. The U.S. economy plunged into a severe slow-down. The growth rate of the American economy in the 1970s was 27 percent less than in the 1960s (Foster and McChesney, 2012). The profitability rates of U.S. manufacturing and the private sector had decreased by 40.9 percent and 29.3 percent, respectively from 1965 to 1973 (Brenner, 1998: 97). New accumulation fields were needed for capital because its profitability has tended to decrease.

The privileged status of the dollar (global reserve currency) and neoliberal resilience measures prevented a dramatic shift in the hegemony of U.S. corporate elites, but the collapse of the post-war capitalist accumulation model in the early 1970s (i.e., the end of the Bretton Woods model) marked the beginning of the long-term downfall. As a consequence, the Fordist industrialization model, based on the understanding of "mass production for mass consumption" (Yeldan, 2009: 4), and the Keynesian social welfare state model, which involved the steady increase of purchasing power, free public services, fight against unemployment and control of the capital circulation, were replaced with the neoliberal model that incorporated: immense mobility of capital (i.e., financialization), flexible labor markets (Yeldan, 2009: 2), stagnant wages, a steady generation of new debt devices (designed to fight under-consumption) and the privatization of public services.⁵

New consent and coercion mechanisms were apparently needed for the implementation of "preventive suppression"⁶ -or "neutralizing intervention"- for potential mass/class resistance and thought of this neoliberal transformation that would profoundly disrupt the post-war class conciliations-consensus in

similar measures were used in NATO's clandestine "stay behind" (better known as Gladio) operations during the Cold-War era.

⁵Statistics about the dramatic consequences of neoliberal transformation in the American working class are available at: <http://www.inequality.com>.

⁶According to Kolin, "The FBI understood all too well that if you control people's thoughts, essentially outlawing dissident thought, you can also control their activities" (Kolin, 2011: 6).

favor of capital, leading to significant economic disparities between classes. According to Edward Wolff, “In the 1970s, the level of wealth inequality in the U.S. was comparable to that of other developed industrialized countries. By the 1980s, the United States had become the most unequal society in terms of wealth among the advanced industrial nations” (Wolff, 1998: 131-132). In the 1970s and 1980s, U.S. labor had faced an unprecedented decline in wage income after an uninterrupted rise of real wages for 150 years, even during the Great Depression of the 1930s (Yeldan, 2009: 11).

Second, the decisive factor for a massive transformation of class balances and a restructuring of the capital accumulation regime in a given society is the totality of class relations. The class relations in the U.S. by the 1970s did not offer an easy transformation in class balances. The post-war economic boom and Keynesian welfare state model inflated workers’ expectations, self-assurance, willingness struggle, organizational capacity (i.e., powerful labor unions) and class consciousness from 1945 to 1970 (Cohn, 2013).⁷ From 1965 to 1975 in particular, U.S. had faced record severe strikes incomparable to any other period in the post-war history. Approximately 350 large-scale strikes and nearly 6000 medium-sized occurred (Cohn, 2013). Although the international economic recession (from 1973 to 1982) and the increase of “labor productivity,” -which allowed the manufacturing sector to fire workers more easily,-⁸ weakened their bargaining power (Cohn, 2013), the working American working class was still sufficiently organized to resist against counterattacks of the capitalist class. The capitalist class needed a strengthened executive power, “preventive” legal rules and repressive police practices to criminalize social protests, (from labor walkouts to anti-war marches) to crush organized resistance. Once a “factitious” but intimidating association between labor protest movements and anti-imperialist marches and national security (from communists to terrorists) was established, people began to keep clear of these movements to avoid being criminalized or treated as a “traitor.”⁹

⁷The percentage of wage and salary workers belonging to unions peaked in 1954 at 28.3 percent (In 1983, it was 20.1 percent). The total number of union members peaked in 1979 at an estimated 21 million (Mayer, 2004). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics Report, these numbers declined to 11 percent and 14.4 million, respectively, by 2012 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013).

⁸For instance, 25 percent of steel workers lost their jobs between 1962 and 1977 (Cohn, 2013).

⁹The Resolution of the National Convention of 2011 of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (UE) states: “Bosses try to instill fear in workers during union organizing campaigns that are the kind of fear that the government has

Consequently, starting in the 1970s, the federal government began authorizing the use of police and military forces to suppress dissidents and removed all distinctions between the police and military in the suppression of dissidents.¹⁰

Briefly, some examples of these regulations include the following:

- the “Federation Commission on Civil Disorder (1968).
- the “U.S. Military Civil Disturbance Plan 55-2” or “Directorate of Civil Disturbance and Planning” (known as Garden Plot) coordinated all “aspects of civil disturbance suppression” in America.¹¹
- the “Non-Detention Act” (1971), which placed the detention of suspected subversives under the authorization of Congress.
- the California Specialized Training Institute (1971), which initiated courses on “civil disorder management” for selected paramilitary police units; namely,

tried to spread across society as a whole. People may avoid anti-globalization rallies if they know they are under government surveillance. A union member will think twice about voicing their outrage on a picket line if they know they could face trumped-up terrorism charges. Fewer people attend organizing meetings if they suspect that someone in the room could be a police agent (Ueunion, 2011).

¹⁰In fact, the use of military resources for domestic law enforcement apparently violated the “Posse Comitatus Act of 1878.” The “Posse Comitatus Act of 1878” prohibits the use of federal military forces (including Reserve forces) to perform internal police functions. The basic purpose of the Act is to limit federal and Presidential power for the benefit of local state’s autonomy (Global Security, 1968). Posse Comitatus Act has been enforced with the “Insurrection Act of 1807” which allows the President to authorize federal forces to restore order in times of civil disturbances if the governor of that state officially requests help. Since the 1900s the federal government has constantly pushed to expand Insurrection Act and narrow down Posse Comitatus Act. The use of the “civil disturbances” phase helps both to deploy military forces for civil law enforcement regulations and to extend the legitimacy of the Insurrection Act. Additionally, the use of “civil disturbance suppression” in the meaning of “fighting against perturbations” debases civil protests, movements of peace, justice and liberation as well as labor walkouts.

¹¹In 1975 Ridenhour and Lubow stated: “The Directorate's headquarters was in the Pentagon's basement, known as “the domestic war room.” Surrounded by acetate map overlays, a fulltime staff of 180, including around-the-clock “watch teams,” used teletype machines, telephones and radios to keep in constant communication with every state National Guard headquarters and all major military installations in the continental United States. Seven Army infantry brigades totaling 21,000 troops were available for riot duty. And a huge, sophisticated computer center kept track of all public outbursts of political dissent, thereby furnishing the first of the Army task force's prescribed remedies: intelligence” (Ridenhour and Lubow, 1975: 21).

“Special Weapons and Tactics” (SWAT) and National Guard units in America” (Morales, 2012).

- the predecessor of the Department of Homeland Security (2002), “Federal Emergency Management Agency” (FEMA),¹² which was established by Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 3 in 1978, became responsible for the coordination of the federal response (also military support) to domestic civil defense and disturbances including national emergencies, terrorist and military attacks, natural disasters, riots, insurrections and all other disorders prejudicial to public law (Fas, 1979).

Consequently, National Guard Units were called in by state governors on ninety-two occasions in thirty-one states to manage civilian dissidents from July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970 (Global Security, 1968).

Military and Police Authorization in U.S. Domestic Affairs in the 1980s

The extensive reorganization process of neoliberalism, which focused on share of the surplus created by working classes, was hastened under the administration of Ronald Reagan and the American working class was the first target.¹³ Fundamental employee rights, real income rates, the organization of labor, and the investor role of the public sector were not only impaired; the entire social welfare state was nearly dismantled. The uncompromising position of the neoliberal state with regard to class conflicts was clearly illustrated in August 1981 by the firing of 11,000 air traffic controllers, who were on strike for safer working conditions and better pay. This event demonstrated that the army can be called in for any event civil disturbance. The army traffic controllers controlled the air towers during the walkout (then the layoff) of traffic controllers. Since then, large-scale military and police programs coordinating civil disturbances have been used for drug interdiction, counterterrorism and disaster recovery programs (including nuclear attack) as “covers for the war on dissent” (Morales, 2003).

¹²The directorship of FEMA would be elevated to a Cabinet position by the Clinton Administration in 1996 and be transferred to the Department of Homeland Defense by 2003. In that sense, the Department of Homeland Defense has been established on the legacy of FEMA.

¹³Just after the inauguration, Reagan administration proposed 144 billion dollar in cuts to social programs while increasing military spending by 180 billion dollar and activating 190 billion dollar tax cut for the benefit of wealthy (Kolin, 2011: 111).

Even before his election, Reagan established a counterinsurgency team at FEMA as the governor of California and appointed Colonel Louis Giuffrida (a strict advocate of forcible warrantless detention of millions of black Americans in concentration camps) as the head of the California National Guard (Scott, 2010). Reagan deployed Giuffrida “to design Operation Cable Splicer (a counterinsurgency program aimed to place all local and federal agencies under FEMA’s control in case of civil disturbances) to legitimize the arrest and detention of anti-Vietnam war activists and other political dissidents” (Scott, 2010).

Unsurprisingly, the Reagan administration adopted the “Military Cooperation with Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies Act of 1981,” which allowed the military and National Guard to cooperate with federal law enforcement agencies in operations such as drug interdiction, civil disturbances, terrorism, disaster recovery and special security issues (Fas, 2010). In 1986, Reagan issued a National Security Decision Directive on “Narcotics and National Security” and declared “drugs” a threat to American national security (Fas, 1986). The “war on drugs” functioned as a legal justification for the breach of the Posse Comitatus Act. In 1988, at the behest of President Reagan, the U.S. Congress expanded the drug-war exceptions to the Posse Comitatus Act (Kopel, 2000: 66). These new exceptions allowed the army to assist (e.g., sharing intelligence and help in surveillance), equip and train federal and local law enforcement agencies indefinitely (Kopel, 2000: 66).

In 1983, “Field Manual 3-19-15 Civil Disturbance Operations” was prepared (issued in 1985) by the U.S. Army. The stated purpose of the manual was to provide military assistance to civil authorities for civil disturbance operations in both foreign and domestic contexts, including massive protests (strikes), riots and violent crowds that were intent on disrupting the peacekeeping operations of the U.S. (Global Security, 1985). The manual was designed to equip soldiers with basic tactics, techniques and procedures required to suppress dissidents and disperse crowds in urban areas (Morales, 2003). In 1986, the Department of Defense Cooperation with Civilian Enforcement Officials Directive (5525.5) granted wide leeway for the domestic use of military force in “Operations Other than War” and “Military Operations in Urban Terrain” and provided “Military Support to Civil Authorities” (Morales, 2012).

In addition to the steady militarization of civilian law enforcement, Readiness Exercise (REX-84), an emergency response drill, was carried out in 1984 by FEMA and the Department of Defense to coordinate Federal departments and agencies for the internment of dissidents into prison camps,

which were controlled by FEMA (Morales, 2003).¹⁴ Reportedly, there were supposed to be 800 prison camps in the U.S. by 2004 (Roland, 2004).

In 1984, the Reagan administration proposed that Congress criminalize fundraising money including humanitarian aid to designated “terrorist groups.” In tandem with this proposal, the Reagan administration also requested authorization to expand the Presidential power to designate any group as “terrorist” without a juridical appeal (Kolin, 2011: 132).¹⁵ Congress at that time rejected Reagan’s “guilt by association” and “extrajudicial presidential power” proposals, but, the proposals were eventually accepted in the 1996 Anti-Terrorism Act, which bridged Reagan’s proposals and the Patriot Act.

These proposals were intended to criminalize and discredit the anti-war protests, particularly those against U.S. intervention in Central America, and organized labor by associating protestors with “terrorist groups.” Once the association with terrorism was applied to other protests or once the dispute moved to the neutralized zone of “national security,” the “imperialist” character of U.S. interventions would have been suppressed without discussion, and protestors would have been politically fragmented.¹⁶ In addition, once the “guilt by association” rule had been applied, the federal agencies could have easily conducted wiretapping, raided organizations and arrested group members, including donors, on the grounds that they had committed political crime.

Although the “guilt by association” failed to apply, federal surveillance and blacklisting of organizations and individuals continued. In 1988, it was exposed that FBI had been watching labor organizations such as, United Auto Workers and U.S. Steel Workers (Glick, 1989: 1) since 1981, conducting a “Library Awareness Program”¹⁷ and investigating 18,144 individuals or

¹⁴General Frank Salzedo, chief of FEMA’s Civil Security Division confirmed in a 1983 conference that one of the duties of FEMA is to “prevent dissident groups from gaining access to U.S. opinion, or a global audience in times of crisis” (Cited in APFN, 2012).

¹⁵The precursor of these proposals was the “Portfolio” program which the U.S. Justice Department secretly activated in 1948. Under this program the President had the right to label “dangerous persons,” including American citizens, during an emergency (Cole, 2003: 18). This right had been legalized by “Title II” of the “Internal Security Act” in 1950 but with greater restrictions.

¹⁶For instance, a march conducted in Texas on April 20, 1985 was called the “Texas April Mobilization for Peace, Justice and Jobs” (Cole and Dempsey, 2006: 42).

¹⁷Under the program, FBI agents asked librarians to report the identity of their members who read certain journals (Kolin, 2011: 131). In fact, this program originated in 1962, when then FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover started a secret program

groups, including 6,895 American citizens, from 1982 to 1988 on suspicion of their association with “terrorist activities” (Willson, 2011). In 1989, it was exposed that the FBI had targeted 1,600 civil organizations, including Veterans Fast for Life, World Peacemakers, the Washington Pledge of Resistance, the Plowshares Movement and the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (Willson, 2011).

In 1981, Reagan signed Executive Order 12333, which allowed warrantless searches for operations against a “foreign power or an agent of a foreign power” (National Archives, 1981).¹⁸ This authorization created a legal loophole in the U.S. Bill of Rights (open violation of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments) and rights of “habeas corpus”¹⁹ which together had formed the backbone of the American political and legal tradition for more than a century. This authorization generated debate during Clinton’s presidency about whether the President has the inherit authority to order physical searches (including homes of U.S. citizens) for foreign intelligence purposes without an order by the FISA Court (York, 2005). Although, the Clinton administration sought the permission of the court first, this expanded presidential authority became a presidential right under the Bush administration and was expanded to all civilians with the abolishment of the “foreign intelligence” condition under Section 218 of the Patriot Act (Doyle, 2001).

The authorization of paramilitary police force was also expanded under the Reagan administration. As R. Balko put it, “America’s war on drugs has spurred a significant rise in the number of ‘no-knock’ raids held by SWAT teams, to the point where in some jurisdictions drug warrants are only served by these teams or similar paramilitary units, and the overwhelming number of SWAT deployments are to execute drug warrants” (Balko, 2006: 4). The direct involvement of SWAT teams in low-risk drug raids (especially against university students), nonemergency matters, routine police patrolling and even in suicide cases was unthinkable before the declaration of war on drugs in the 1980’s (Balko, 2006: 6-13). According to a study by P. Kraska, “there were

to “solicit librarians as informants” (Willson, 2011). The post-9/11 surveillance programs extended the library programs, and contents of library records were legally opened investigation by national security agencies.

¹⁸In fact, surveillance, wiretapping and break-ins have been carried out through Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) since 1978 which made government surveillance legal.

¹⁹“Habeas Corpus” stands to be the fundamental principle of justice since the inquisition times and forbids the false imprisonment and detention without a writ taken from lawfully authorized custodian and gives the very right to the inmate to reach to legal authorities and the court (Lectric Law Library, 2012).

3,000 annual SWAT deployments by the early 1980s, by 1996 there were 30,000, and by 2001 there were 40,000” (Cited in Balko, 2006: 11). Because it was called a “war” (war on drugs) no one seemed to consider the unnecessary use of deadly force by SWAT teams, the use of military tactics and weapons on American citizens, unwarranted paramilitary raids, broaden police authorization or the abolition of fundamental civil liberties (Balko, 2006: 13).

Beyond SWAT operations, local police departments had conducted numerous drug raids on civil organizations, such as in African American, Mexican American and American Indian groups during the 1980s to criminalize, marginalize and discredit them with the public (Felker-Kantor, 2012). Although these organizations were known as racial-ethnic organizations rather than class associations, they were comprised of members at the lowest steps of the American economic ladder (i.e., the cheapest labor). For this reason, the Coalition against Police Abuse (CAPA) claimed in one of its pamphlets that, “As unemployment and inflation rises, the rulers of America find it necessary to employ more police in our communities” (Felker-Kantor, 2012).

Military and Police Authorization in U.S. Domestic Affairs in the 1990s

The use of military and police force continued in the U.S. during the presidential terms of both George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton under new and old justifications including the war on drugs, the threat of espionage and terrorism (this time within the framework of the clash of civilizations).

Joint Task Force-6 (JTF-6), headquartered at Fort Bliss was established in November 1989, under the direction of Defense Secretary Richard Cheney with the purpose of coordinating joint military and law enforcement anti-drug operations along the U.S.-Mexico border (Thevenot, 1997). The number of JTF’s law enforcement support missions reached 530 in just seven years and was assigned a new target as of 2004, counterterrorism (Thevenot, 1997) In 1993, the JTF-6 proved itself capable of carrying out joint paramilitary raids with civilian police departments. JTF-6 gave full military support to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in an operation that ended the siege at the Branch Davidian Compound (Waco Texas) which caused the death of 76 children, women and men (Kopel and Blackman, 1997). This direct involvement by the military (though it was explicitly precluded by the Posse Comitatus Act and the Constitution) was, in fact, not unique. In 1992, the U.S. Army’s 7th Infantry Division from California and the Marine forces from Camp Pendleton were called upon to suppress the Los Angeles riots.

In 1993, “Domestic Support Operations Field Manual 100-19” was published by the U.S. Army and Marine Corps which laid down the principles of “operations other than war” and the conceptual framework for assisting civil law enforcement authorities to maintain law and order (Headquarters Department of the Army U.S. Marine Corps, 1993).

Not long after, the Department of Defense issued Directive 3025.12 “Military Assistance for Civil Disturbances” (MACDIS) in 1994 and put forth the rules, procedures, resources, strategies and missions of military forces in times of civil insurgencies (DoD, 1994). In 1995, the transfer of heavy military weapons and technology to civilian police units was sustained by a cooperative program under the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense called “Technology Transfer from Defense: Concealed Weapons Detection” (Technology Transfer From Defense, 1995). As a result, the Pentagon delivered 1.2 million pieces of military equipment to local police forces only in 1997 (Balko, 2006: 8). Unsurprisingly, the use of deadly force by police dramatically increased by 34 percent between 1994 and 1998 (Balko, 2006: 28). The dramatic militarization of domestic law enforcement agencies apparently did not satisfy the Clinton administration. Thus, “Joint Task Force Civil Support” (JTF-CS) was created in 1999 at Fort Monroe in Hampton.

The proliferation of SWAT also steadily increased throughout the 1990s. According to Kraska’s study, “90 percent of cities with populations of 50,000 or more had at least one paramilitary police unit and 65 percent of towns within the 25,000-50,000 population range had a SWAT team as of 1997” (Cited in Balko, 2006: 9). Even federal agencies that, by definition, did not need any paramilitary raid teams (e.g., the Department of Energy and the National Park Service) had their own SWAT teams by the end of 1990s (Balko, 2006: 13). Moreover, by “introducing military culture, military equipment, and the military mindset even to parts of the civilian police force not involved in SWAT teams or like paramilitary units, militarization had an irreversible impact on domestic law enforcement” (Balko, 2006: 13).

In 1996, the Clinton administration pushed the Anti-Terrorism Act through Congress in the wake of the World Trade Center Bombing (1993) and federal building bombing in Oklahoma (1995) and eventually succeeded in legalizing “guilt by association” as a principle of criminal and immigration law (Cole and Dempsey, 2006: 2). Under this principle, anyone providing “material support,” including peaceful humanitarian-political aids, training, advice and donations, to politically selected “terrorist” groups, as freely labeled by the President, would be penalized under the criminal and immigration law (Cole, 2003:2). The Antiterrorism Act granted excessive powers to the FBI and other national security agencies to conduct “emergency wiretapping” without court orders; access personnel records, including financial, hotel, library, rental and

medical records, and engage in “electronic eavesdropping” (Merritt, 1996).²⁰ The FBI only established the “Digital Collection System Network” program in 1997, and NSA began the “Trailblazer” program in 1999.

Finally, in February 2001 a report named “Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change, The Phase III Report of the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century” was prepared under the co-chair of Senator Gary Hart (Democrat Party) and Senator Warren B. Rudman (Republican Party) and under the umbrella of the “Council on Foreign Relations.” This report recommended to the creation of a new “National Homeland Security Agency” (The United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, 2001). By October 2001, the Office of Homeland Defense was founded and given department status (extraordinarily authorized by the Patriot Act and numerous Presidential Executive Orders) in November 2002. Therefore, the “Homeland Security Department” was not created because of the September 11th terrorist attacks or by President Bush, but by the previous administration(s) and corporate elites.

Military and Police Authorization in U.S. Domestic Affairs in the 2000s and 2010s

The authorization of military and police force in U.S. domestic affairs has passed the point of no return with a war waged on perpetual target: terrorism. First, the Patriot Act, followed by several Presidential Executive Orders and countless surveillance programs with unending “state of emergency” statuses, have infiltrated America’s legal, political, social and institutional systems in the span of a few years (while superseding the system of checks and balances). In this sense, and contrary to popular belief, the frontline of the war on terrorism is not overseas, but in the very heart of the U.S.

In fact, the militarization of domestic politics in the U.S. was anticipated given the economic and social conditions of the 2000s, which were built to stall the crisis of capitalism (which nearly collapsed in 2001 after the stock market crashed) through a moribund casino economy. The onslaught of the “housing-market bubble” crisis, severe budget cuts and class-coded austerity measures (shaking the historic bloc) was apparent by the middle of the 2000s. However,

²⁰Immediately following these authorizations, the FBI’s court-order wiretapping had risen up 30 to 40 percent in 1996. The number of the cases exempt from court order was unknown (McGee, 1996).

the effects of September 11th attacks should not be underestimated because they brought about the extreme militarization of U.S. domestic politics in the 2000s.

In 2002, Northern Command (NORTHCOM) was established (at the Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs) and tasked with “counter-terror,” “homeland defense,” “counter-drug,” and “military assistance to civil authorities” (including “civil disturbances”). NORTHCOM was entitled to operate in the continental United States (Arctic was also included with the “2011 Unified Command Plan”), Alaska, Canada, Mexico and the surrounding water out to approximately 500 nautical miles (U.S. House of Representatives, 2012). The foundation of NORTHCOM eradicated the letter and spirit of the Posse Comitatus Act.²¹

The Insurrection Act specifies that “in case of the explicit demand of the local governments” the Posse Comitatus Act is suspended. However, this exception became moot with the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act of 2007, which defined “terrorist attacks” and “emergency situations” as exceptions without defining the criteria for these exceptions (Global Security, 2006). Furthermore, to expand the right of the federal government to use military personnel as law enforcement forces in cases of insurgencies, the term “insurrectionist” was replaced by “the ones who disobey the enforcement of laws” (Global Security, 2006).

As a result, the Third Infantry Regiment was called back from Iraq in 2008 and assigned to serve as law enforcement during emergency (civil disorders) situations (e.g., at the G-20 summit in Pittsburgh in September 2009 under the command of NORTHCOM) (Chossudovsky, 2008). In December 2008, the Marine Corps Air and Ground Combat Support Group provided assistance to police checkpoints in California (Corbett, 2010). In September 2009, 379,000 troops were deployed inside the U.S. (Corbett, 2010). Unfortunately, these examples are not isolated cases. No one currently knows where and how military forces are deployed within the U.S.

Concurrent with these physical deployments, the Pentagon established “Counterintelligence Field Activity” (CIFA) in 2002 for domestic surveillance. Each military service also started its own domestic intelligence programs in addition to programs initiated under NORTHCOM’s massive intelligence center in Colorado and Texas (Pincus, 2005). These military-based surveillance

²¹Soon thereafter, the establishment of NORTHCOM, U.S. Coastal Guard (one of the five armed forces of the U.S.) which had been under the command of Department of Transportation since 1967 came under the command of the Department of Homeland Defense in 2003.

agencies have also gained access to data from the FBI, NSA, CIA and other intelligence agencies. Unsurprisingly, their attention has focused not on the so-called “terrorists” but on “peaceful anti-war and counter-military recruitment groups” (Grey, 2005).²²

Meanwhile, ordinary police authority expanded in the 2000s to include warrantless searches and surveillance; use of SWAT forces and paramilitary techniques against peaceful protest movements including, “Occupy Wall Street,” the “Wisconsin demonstrations,” the “Wal-Mart Workers Strike” and the “Fast-food Employees Strike;” detention of suspicious persons based on hearsay evidence by anonymous witnesses; abolition of the right of “habeas corpus” and the removal of the legal distinction between civilian and military police forces. The FBI has extraordinary authority under the extended clauses of the Patriot Act, including Lonely Wolf, Business Records and Roving Wiretaps and “National Security Letters” (NSLs)²³ for surveillance, warrantless searches and detentions without probable cause (Yeh and Doyle, 2006).²⁴ Most targets of counterterrorism investigations and raids are anti-war activists, labor leaders, university students, members of civil liberties unions and organizers of anti-globalization marches (Mullen and Bannow, 2010; Moynihan, 2009; Wolf, 2007).

²²Beyond the military surveillance programs, an unknown number of pervasive surveillance programs have unprecedentedly been activated inside the U.S. since 9/11. According to a two-years investigation by the Washington Post in 2010, a “top Secret America hidden from public view” exists and: “Some 1,271 government organizations and 1,931 private companies work on programs related to counterterrorism, homeland security and intelligence in approximately 10,000 locations across the United States with an estimated 854,000 people” (Priest and Arkin, 2010).

²³NLSs are important because they are exempted from Fourth Amendment restrictions that prohibit unreasonable searches because their use is directly linked to national security. In fact, the idea of NLSs began in the post-war era. Under the secret “Portfolio” program, the Attorney General had been authorized to issue a “master warrant” for extensive surveillance and seizures (Cole, 2003: 18). The “Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978” authorized the FBI to use search warrants similar to NLSs, but they had to be signed by high-ranking FBI officials instead of the Attorney General. Since 9/11 and the passage of the “Patriot Act,” nearly all low-ranking federal intelligence officials have gained access to sign these letters.

²⁴According to the Electronic Frontier Foundation’s analysis of records from the “Intelligence Oversight Board,” more than 40,000 infringements of law cases occurred due to the use of NSLs by the FBI between 2001 and 2008 (EFF, 2011).

According to internal FBI documents that were acquired and released by the Partnership for Civil Justice Fund (PCJF) through a “Freedom of Information Act” request, FBI treated the non-violent Occupy movement as a “potential criminal and terrorist threat” to national security (PCJF, 2012). The documents also exposed a strong coordination (described as a “strategic partnership” by the federal government) and information network between the FBI, Department of Homeland Security and the conglomerate elites (defined as the “private sector”) about the Occupy movement (PCJF, 2012). For instance, the FBI warned the Wall Street conglomerates and the New York Stock Exchange one month before the Occupy protests occurred (PCJF, 2012). The main concern of the members of this strategic partnership was the spread of the Occupy movement ideas (i.e., “we are among the 99 percent”) to the working class and the development of an association between them (PCJF, 2012).²⁵ This concern was apparent in a Naval Criminal Investigative Services (NCIS) report warning the Domestic Security Alliance Council (DSAC) about the relationship between the “Occupy movement and organized labor for port actions” (PCJF, 2012).²⁶

The close association between federal agencies and corporate elites is not actually new. A nationwide multi-threat military exercise program focused particularly on counterterrorism training and tactical exercises called TOPOFF which stands for Top Officials and incorporate top officials from the private sector, non-governmental organizations, local units and federal agencies has taken place since 2000 (Global security, 2000). TOPOFF4 (2007), the last occurrence, included more than 15,000 participants. Militarized cooperation between conglomerate elites and the state has not been only limited to exercises but also extend to various types of intelligence sharing and surveillance activity. According to Adler-Bell and Segal, “Surveillance itself is a tool of suppressing workplace dissent” (Adler-Bell and Segal, 2013).

Beyond the nationwide surveillance and spying programs, in partnership with agencies such as the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense,

²⁵Another concern was the spread of the Occupy movement to universities. The documents revealed how the local Joint Terrorism Task Forces, FBI and campus police officials have worked together under the Campus Liaison Program to acquire information about the Occupy movement among students and professors (PCJF, 2012).

²⁶In the fall of 2011, the Occupy movement protestors tried to blockade West Coast ports that they defined as places of “corporate greed and economic inequality” and “economic engines for the elite” (PCJF, 2012). Occupiers claimed that they were “standing up for workers against the port companies, which have had recent high-profile clashes with union workers” (Politico, 2011).

the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the National Sheriffs Association, dozens of self-surveillance programs have initiated the transformation of citizenship into militarized civil corps. These programs are officially named, Citizen Informants, U.S. Freedom Corps and Citizen Corps, and they have developed a national surveillance network under a number of different guises, including the Terrorism Information and Prevention System, Terrorism Liaison Officers, If You See Something Say Something, Neighborhood Watch Groups and the Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting Initiative (Finley, 2008; Goldstein, 2002). The projects aim to obtain reports of suspicious behaviors from people whose work provides access to homes, businesses or transport systems, such as letter carriers, repairmen, truck drivers, firemen, housewives and neighbors, to raise a new generation of civilian police. Department of Defense Directive 1404.10 (January, 23, 2009) declared the establishment of the Civilian Expeditionary Workforce, which would be “equipped, and ready to deploy in support of combat operations by the military; contingencies; emergency operations; humanitarian missions; disaster relief; restoration of order; drug interdiction; and stability operations of the Department of Defense” (DoD, 2009).

The “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (NDAA)” which was signed into law by Obama on December, 31, 2011 is the most recent authorization of military and police force inside the U.S. Section 1021 entitled “Affirmation of Authority of the Armed Forces of the United States to Detain Covered Persons Pursuant to the Authorization for the Use of Military Force” confirmed that anyone, including American citizens (without temporal, geographic or citizenship restrictions; including Guantanamo), can be defined by the President as an “enemy combatant” detained by the military and held at a military facility under the law of war without being charged with any crime and without any trial except supervision by a military commission once a year “until the end of hostilities” (i.e., indefinitely) (Morales, 2012; U.S. Government Printing Office, 2011).²⁷ Furthermore, as U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder asserted in March 2012, the President of the U.S. has the right to order the assassination of American citizens (Becker and Shane, 2012).

²⁷In fact, the President has been authorized by the “Authorization for Use of Military Force” (AUMF), signed into law by President Bush on 18 September 2001, to use “necessary and appropriate” military force against those who “planned, authorized, committed or aided” the September 11th attacks (U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001). However, since the recognition of NDAA, American citizens had been exempted from being designated as “enemy combatants” (or “unprivileged enemy belligerents”) and thus being excluded from any militarily use of force and detainment.

Finally, the “Civil Liberties Program” issued by the Department of Defense on May, 17, 2012, put the last nail in the coffin for the U.S. Bill of Rights. The program acknowledged basic rights such as freedom of speech, assembly, press and religion which are protected by the First Amendment to the American Constitution but listed exceptions to the use of these rights under “operational requirements of an authorized law enforcement, intelligence collection, or counterintelligence activity” (Morales, 2012; DoD, 2012).

Concluding Remarks

The September 11 terrorist attacks did not commence the complete militarization of U.S. domestic affairs, and none of the alleged U.S. enemies throughout history, from American Indians to Communists, drug traffickers and terrorists have caused a genuine security threat to the U.S. However, most of these identified enemies have offered a convenient source of justification for repressing mass-based political movements and organized labor, which have been deemed real threats to the existing capitalist accumulation model, including imperialist policies, and its hegemonic settlement (historic bloc).

The national security paradigm, which represents itself as neutral to all class contradictions, has functioned perfectly in the U.S. as a preventive regulatory instrument by obstructing labor unification and suppressing social uprisings and at the same time gaining the consent of the people during both the routine interventions of the capitalist state (i.e., due to the inner contradictions of capitalism) and the implementation of full-scale restructuring models in times of systematic crises. Once the national security paradigm was applied, the U.S. state has succeeded in removing all distinctions between police and military forces; deploying militarized police forces to repressively suppress mass/class-based social uprisings, even before the protests took place; authorizing federal agencies to engage in pervasive surveillance, operate counter-dissident programs and conduct covert operations; discrediting and criminalizing the organizational capacity of the working class; marginalizing and outlawing class-based political movements that could lead to the emergence of new resistance collaborations and raise class consciousness and establishing self-disciplining programs that create a new generation of civilian corps. The national security paradigm has served as a spearhead in the U.S. for creating a loophole in the legal system that could be expanded to the entire political, social, economic and judicial system.

The authorization of police and military in the name of national security commenced with the foundation of the U.S. as an independent state. In the beginning of the last century alone, thousands of nonviolent dissidents and labor leaders were convicted in U.S. under various legislations, such as the

Espionage Act of 1917, Alien Act of 1918 and Sedition Act of 1918. In 1920, during the Palmer Raids, more than 10,000 people were rounded up and hundreds of them deported for being members of labor unions or political dissidents. In addition to McCarthy's era of extensive surveillance and witch-hunting, dozens of surveillance, spying and disrupting programs, such as "Cointelpro," were initiated in the 1950s and 1960s against non-violent and legal domestic political organizations, including the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the black movement, the New Left and anti-war groups.

The militarization of police and federal agencies and amplification of their repressive capabilities accelerated by the early 1970s with the end of the golden age of the post-war capitalist accumulation regime incorporating, the Fordist industrialization model, Keynesian social welfare model and Bretton Woods model. Therefore, the 1970s marked the beginning of the long-term structural crisis of capitalism and the emergence of a full-scale restructuring model called neoliberalism.

The neoliberal transformation necessitated the implementation of new consent and coercive measures because it profoundly upset the post-war class balances in favor of capital, worsened the position of wage labor and raising mass scale impoverishment. Because the organizational capacity and class consciousness of the American working class were relatively high in the 1970s, the repressive capacities of federal agencies, the military and police forces had legally, politically and institutionally increased. This process was hastened under the Reagan administration, when an undeclared war was directed at the working class, beginning with air traffic controllers, and to all types of social protests. Meanwhile, an unprecedented shift in references to national security threat occurred, including discussion of enemies such as, Communists, drug traffickers, terrorists, immigrants and agents of foreign powers. Most legal, institutional and operational achievements that laid the ground for the Patriot Act had occurred in these years.

The authorization of military and police force in U.S. domestic affairs in the name of national security has continued throughout the 1990s and passed the point of no return with the war on terrorism declared in 2001. The U.S. economy also plunged into a harsh slow-down in 2001 after the collapse of stock market bubble, but it was saved through the massive financial expansion initiated by the low interest rate and liquidity policies of the Federal Reserve (FED). However, by the mid-2000s it was clear that the "housing-market bubble" would burst eventually and result in severe budget cuts and class-coded austerity measures.

Under the pretense of the war on terrorism and the authorization of Patriot Act, U.S. federal agencies, military services and local police have obtained the rights to conduct warrantless searches and pervasive surveillance, use paramilitary techniques against peaceful protest movements, take “suspicious people” into custody based on hearsay evidences, violate the right of “habeas corpus,” blacklist of people and even to assassinate American citizens. Unsurprisingly, most targets of counterterrorism operations are labor leaders, anti-war protestors, university students, and members of Occupy movements and other civil liberties unions.

In sum, a totalitarian political system has been built through a loophole created by the national security paradigm. That which is left of the U.S. Bill of Rights, including the freedom of speech, the freedom to peacefully assemble, the freedom of association, protection from unreasonable search and seizure, the right to a speedy civil trial by an impartial jury and protection from cruel and unusual punishment, is only waiting to be demolished.

Bibliography

- Adler-Bell and Segal (2013), “Why NSA Surveillance Should Alarm Labor,” July 24, http://inthesetimes.com/article/15346/why_nsa_surveillance_should_alarm_labor (10.09.2013).
- Akgül, Çiğdem and Zehra Yılmaz (2012), “Virtu’dan Demokrasiye ‘Meşru’ Şiddetin Evrimi: Güvenlik-Ortadoğu ve ABD Sarmalı, *Ankara University SBF Journal*, 67(3): 1-32.
- Antifascist Calling (2011), “As Whistleblower Prosecutions Rise, Government Withholds Spy Doc, Fears Lawsuits against Telecom Partners,” May 15, <http://antifascist-calling.blogspot.com> (20.04.2011).
- APFN (2012), “FEMA Concentration Camps: Locations and Executive Orders,” <http://www.apfn.org/apfn/camps1.htm> (30.07.2012).
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2013), “Union Members_2012,” U.S. Department of Labor, January 23, <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/union2.pdf> (30.07.2013).
- Balko, Radley (2006), “Overkill: The Rise of Paramilitary Police Raids in America,” Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/pubs/wtpapers/balko_whitepaper_2006.pdf (22.06.2012).
- Becker, Jo and Scott Shane (2012), “Secret ‘Kill List’ Proves a Test of Obama’s Principles and Will,” *New York Times*, June 20, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/29/world/obamas-leadership-in-war-on-al-qaeda.html> (13.08.2012).
- Brenner, Robert (1998), “The Onset of Crises,” *New Left Review*, May-June (229): 95–140.
- Chossudovsky, Michel (2008), “Pre-election Militarization of the North American Homeland. US Combat Troops in Iraq Repatriated to Help with Civil Unrest,” Center for Research on Globalization, September 26, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/pre-election-militarization-of->

the-north-american-homeland-us-combat-troops-in-iraq-repatriated-to-help-with-civil-unrest/1034 (22.08.2011).

Cole, David and Dempsey, James X. (2006), *Terrorism and the Constitution*, (New York: The New Press).

Cole, David (2003), "The New McCarthyism: Repeating History in the War in Terrorism," *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, (38): 1-30.

Corbett, James (2010), "Towards Martial Law in America: Authority to Deploy Troops Domestically during 'National Emergencies,'" Center for Research on Globalization, October 27, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/towards-martial-law-in-america-authority-to-deploy-troops-domestically-during-national-emergencies> (10.01.2011).

Cohn, Candace (2013), "Working-class women's liberation and rank-and-file rebellion in steel," *International Socialist Review*, June 1, <http://isreview.org/issue/90/working-class-womens-liberation-and-rank-and-file-rebellion-steel> (01.08.2013).

DoD (2012), "Civil Liberties Program," May 17, http://dpclo.defense.gov/civil/docs/DoDI_100029_CL_instruction.pdf (20.05.2012).

DoD (2009), "Directive 1404.10: DoD Civilian Expeditionary Workforce," January 23, <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/140410p.pdf> (10.04.2012).

DoD (1994), "Military Assistance for Civil Disturbances-Directive 3025.12," February 4, <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/302512p.pdf> (30.04.2012).

Doyle, Charles (2001), "Terrorism: Section by Section Analysis of the USA PATRIOT Act," CRS Report for Congress, December 10, <http://epic.org/privacy/terrorism/usapatriot/RL31200.pdf> (20.06.2012).

EFF (2011), "Patterns of Misconduct: FBI Intelligence Violations from 2001-2008," January 30, <http://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2011/01/eff-releases-report-detailing-fbi-intelligence> (30.12.2011).

Fas (1979), "Executive Order 12127- Federal Emergency Management Agency," March 31, <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/eo/eo-12127.htm> (15.08.2012).

Fas (2010), "Military Cooperation with Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies ACT," http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm100-19/fm100-19_1.html (20.06.2012).

Fas (1986), "NSDD-221- Reagan Administration," April 8, <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/nsdd-221.htm> (21.07.2012).

Felker-Kantor, Max (2012), "Race, Control, and Resistance: Community Empowerment and the Struggle against Police Repression in late-Twentieth Century Los Angeles," http://www.hhh.umn.edu/centers/rwc/conferences/fourth/pdf/MaxFelker_Kantor_Paper.pdf (05.08.2013).

Finley, Bruce (2008), "Terror Watch Uses Local Eyes 181 Trained in Colo," *Denver Post*, June 29, http://www.denverpost.com/news/ci_9725077 (14.03.2012).

Foster, J.B. and McChesney R.W. (2012), "The Endless Crisis," *Monthly Review*, 64(1), <http://monthlyreview.org/2012/05/01/the-endless-crisis> (10.08.2012).

Frank, Robert (2007), "Plutonomics," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 8, <http://blogs.wsj.com/wealth/2007/01/08/plutonomics> (07.03.2011).

Glick, Brian (1999), "COINTELPRO Revisited: FBI Domestic Intelligence Activities," http://www.itsabouttimebpp.com/BPP_Books/pdf/Necessary_Reading.pdf (06.08.2013): 1-23.

- Glick, Brian (1989), *War at Home: Covert Action Against U.S. Activists and What We Can Do About It*, (Cambridge: South End Press).
- Global Security (2006), "National Defense Authorization Act for Year 2007," May 9, http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/congress/2006_rpt/s-109-254.htm (18.05.2012).
- Global security (1985), "FM-19-15 Civil Disturbances," November 25, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/19-15/toc.htm> (19.06.2012).
- Global security (1968), "Garden Plot/Conplan 2502 (Civil Disturbance Operations)," November 11, http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/garden_plot.htm (21.08.2011).
- Global security (2000), "TOPOFF 1," http://www.globalsecurity.org/security/ops/index_topoff1.htm (10.08.2011).
- Goldstein, Ritt (2002), "US Planning to Recruit One in 24 Americans as Citizen Spies," Sydney Morning Herald, July 15, <http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2002/07/14/1026185141232.html> (14.03.2012).
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971), *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (New York: International Publishers, 1971).
- Grey, Barry (2005), "Pentagon's domestic spying operations target opponents of Iraq war," December 15, <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2005/12/pent-d15.html> (20.08.2012).
- Headquarters Department of the Army U.S. Marine Corps (1993), "Manuel 100-19 Domestic Support Operations," July 1, http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/service_pubs/fm100_19.pdf (11.05.2012).
- Huntington, P.Samuel, Michel Crozier and Joji Watanuki (1975), "The Crisis of Democracy," *Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*, (New York: New York University Press): 1-213.
- Kolin, Andrew (2011), *State Power and Democracy: Before and During the Presidency of George W. Bush*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Kopel, David B. (2000), "Militarized Law Enforcement: The Drug War's Deadly Fruit," Timothy Lynch (eds.), *After Prohibition: An Adult Approach to Drug Policy*, (Washington: Cato Institute, 2000): 61-88.
- Kopel David B. and Paul M. Blackman (1997), "Can Soldiers Be Peace Officers: The Waco Disaster and The Militarization of American Law Enforcement," <http://www.davekopel.com/waco/lawrev/cansoldiersbepeaceofficers.htm> (10.06.2012).
- Lectric Law Library, "Habeas Corpus," <http://www.lectlaw.com/def/h001.htm> (10.04.2012).
- Mayer, Gerald (2004), "Union Membership Trends in the United States," August 21, http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace/174 (05.07.2013).
- McGee, Jim (1996), "Federal Use of Wiretaps Sharply Rises Under Clinton Administration," *Los Angeles Times*, July 07, http://articles.latimes.com/1996-07-07/news/mn-22018_1_clinton-administration (05.11.2012).
- Merritt, Jeralyn E. (1996), "Partisan Politics v. Bill of Rights," *The Champion*, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, <http://crimelynx.com/partpol.html> (02.10.2012).
- Morales, Frank (2012) "The Coup of 2012: Encroachment upon Basic Freedoms, Militarized Police State in America," Centre for Research on Globalization, June 14, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php> (20.08.2012).

- Morales, Frank (2003), "Homeland Defense and the Militarization of America," Centre for Research on Globalization, September 13, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/MOR309A.html> (10.06.2012).
- Moynihan, Colin (2009), "Arrests Put Focus on Protesters' Texting," *New York Times*, October 5, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/05/nyregion/05txt.html> (13.02.2012).
- Mullen, Mike and Tara Bannow (2010), "FBI Raids Homes of U Staff," September 27, <http://www.mndaily.com/2010/09/24/fbi-raids-student> (30.04.2011).
- National Archives (1981), "Executive Order 12333-United States Intelligence Activities," National Archives, December 4, <http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/codification/executive-order/12333.html> (30.07.2012).
- PCJF (2012), "FBI Documents Reveal Secret Nationwide Occupy Monitoring," December 22, <http://www.justiceonline.org/commentary/fbi-files-ows.html#documents> (05.06.2013).
- Pincus, Walter (2005), "Pentagon Expanding Its Domestic Surveillance Activity," *Washington Post*, November 27, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/26/AR2005112600857.html> (27.10.2012).
- PRC (2012), "The Lost Decade of the Middle Class: Fewer, Poorer, Gloomier," August 22, <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org> (09.10.2012).
- Priest, Dana and Arkin, William M (2010) "Top Secret America: A Hidden World, Growing Beyond Control," *Washington Post*, July 19, <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/article> (23.06.2011).
- Ponticelli, Jacapo, and Hans-Joachim Voth (2011), "Austerity and Anarchy: Budget Cuts and Social Unrest in Europe, 1919–2009," Centre for Economic Policy Research, 1-28 www.cepr.org/pubs/dps/DP851 (05.07.2011).
- Politico (2011), "Occupy Wall Street: Ports disrupted on West Coast," December 13, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1211/70350.html#ixzz2fHpXmEV4> (07.10.2012).
- Ridenhour, Ron, and Lubow, Arthur (1975), "Bringing the War Home," *New Times*, 5(11): 20-24.
- Rich, Morin (2012), "Rising Share of Americans See Conflict between Rich and Poor," Pew Research Center, <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org> (11.10.2012).
- Roland, Allen L. (2004), "REX 84 and FEMA," September 3, <http://www.mindfully.org/Reform/2004/FEMA-Concentration-Camps3sep04.htm> (12.05.2012).
- Scott, Peter D. (2010), "Continuity of Government: Is the State of Emergency Superseding our Constitution," Center for Research on Globalization, November 24, <http://globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=22089> (22.07.2012).
- "Technology Transfer From Defense: Concealed Weapon Detection" (1995), *National Institute of Justice Journal*, 229: 35-38.
- Terkel, Studs (2007), "The Wiretap This Time," *The New York Times*, October 29, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/29/opinion/29terkel.html> (12.10.2012).
- The United States Commission on National Security/21st Century (2001), "Roadmap for National Security: Imperative for Change, The Phase III Report," February 15, <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/nssg/PhaseIIIFR.pdf> (10.06.2012).
- Thevenot, Chad (1997), "The "Militarization" of the Anti-Drug Effort," <http://www.ndsn.org/july97/military.html> (22.06.2012).
- Ueunion (2011), "Defend Our Civil Liberties," <http://www.ueunion.org/ue-policy/defend-our-civil-liberties> (20.08.2012).

- U.S. House of Representatives (2012), "USCODE Title 10-Chapter 15: Insurrection," March 1, <http://uscode.house.gov/download/pls/10C15.txt> (15.07.2012).
- U.S. Government Printing Office (2001), "Public Law-107-40," September 18, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ40/pdf/PLAW-107publ40.pdf> (20.05.2012).
- U.S. Government Printing Office (2011), "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (H.R. 1540)," December 31, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-112hr1540enr/pdf/BILLS-112hr1540enr.pdf> (20.02.2012).
- William, K. Tabb (2012), "The Crisis: A View from Occupied America," *Monthly Review* 64(4), <http://monthlyreview.org/2012/09/01/the-crisis> (05.10.2012).
- Willson, Brian S. (2011), "Counter-terrorism under Reagan-Bush," August 23, <http://www.brianwillson.com/counter-terrorism-under-reagan-bush-i/> (05.08.2013).
- Wolf, Naomi (2007), "Fascist America, in 10 Easy Steps," *The Guardian*, April 24, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2007/apr/24/usa.comment> (17.02.2012).
- Wolff, Edward N., (1998), "Recent Trends in the Size Distribution of Household Wealth," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(3): 131-150.
- Yeh, Brian T. and Charles Doyle (2006), "USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005: A Legal Analysis," CRS Report for Congress, December 21, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL33332.pdf> (06.06.2011).
- Yeldan, Erinc (2009), "On the Nature and the Causes of the Wealth of Nations, 2007/2008," BagimsizSosyalBilimciler website, <http://www.bagimsizsosyalbilimciler.org.tr> (10.01.2010): 1-16.
- York, Byron (2005), "Clinton Claimed Authority to Order No-Warrant Searches (Does anyone remember that?)," *National Review*, December 20, <http://old.nationalreview.com/york/york200512200946.asp> (30.03.2012).