

...And Justice for All?

☒ There's a lot about the Department of Justice that I just don't get. The main thing I don't get, though, is Eric Holder, the Attorney General. In the last two years, he's done a lot of very strange things.

Most recently, the DOJ decided to try terrorist Ahmed Ghailani in a civil trial, rather than a military tribunal, which turned out to be a disaster. Just this week, he was acquitted of 279 counts and found guilty of only one count of conspiracy to destroy government property. Nice going, Mr. Holder.

Last year, the DOJ announced it intended to try the self-proclaimed mastermind of the 9/11 attacks, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, in NYC as well, despite overwhelming opposition from both political parties. Although Holder's had a change of heart regarding Mohammed's trial, I'm hoping that this latest fiasco in the Ghailani trial was a wake-up call and showed Holder and the Obama administration that it would be a very big mistake to pursue civil trials for Mohammed and other terrorists.

Mr. Holder ordered the FBI to give the Christmas Day underwear bomber Miranda warnings without even consulting intelligence officials.

In May of this year, before the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Holder wouldn't allow himself to concede that terrorists are motivated by "radical Islam." No matter how many times he was asked, he just couldn't say it.

In the same month, Holder went to Oakland, California's Youth Uprising and criticized the Arizona Immigration Law as being "divisive" with the potential for racial profiling being increased. Yet, on May 13, before the House Judiciary Committee, he admitted he hadn't even read the law.

How does the Attorney General of the United States stand up and criticize a state for trying to protect its citizens by passing a law, which mirrors the federal law by the way, when he hasn't even read the law?

Now, the federal government will end up spending God knows how many taxpayers' dollars, in its lawsuit against the state of Arizona despite the fact that 50% of Americans oppose the lawsuit and only 33% approve it. Sixty-one percent of Americans favor passage of a similar law in their own states. Does Holder plan to sue every state which enacts a similar law?

What I don't get is if the DOJ is so concerned about Arizona's law conflicting with federal law, why isn't it pursuing lawsuits against sanctuary cities which go out of their way to protect illegal aliens, contrary to existing federal law?

Now, the DOJ is reporting on New Jersey Republican Gov. Chris Christie spending \$2,176 more than the budgeted hotel rate allows. Wow.

But it's the DOJ's handling of the New Black Panther Party that worries me the most.

On Election Day in 2008, two New Black Panther Party members in paramilitary gear stood outside a polling place with batons harassing whites claiming to be "security." When I saw it, I thought, ok, you've got a couple of thugs trying to intimidate people. Their guy won so that's the end of the story. Well, think again.

The Bush Justice Department brought a civil complaint against three members of the group alleging violations of the Voting Rights Act. While the Obama administration won a default judgment in federal court, it inexplicably moved to dismiss the charges after getting one of the Party members to agree not to carry a "deadly weapon" near a polling place until 2012. Such a deal but, I said, what the hey, that was the end

of the story. Well, think yet again.

Since that time, an ex-official at the DOJ, J. Christian Adams, has testified before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that the DOJ has repeatedly showed "hostility" toward those cases which involved black defendants. While he believed the lawsuit was an "open and shut case," he said the DOJ's hostility towards cases involving black defendants was "pervasive." The DOJ, of course, has denied those statements.

Another prosecutor at the DOJ, Christopher Coates, testified at the same Commission and said the "downgrading of the case against the New Black Panther Party was evidence of a Justice Department culture which discouraged 'race neutral' enforcement of civil rights laws." He said that, after President Obama and Eric Holder took office, the "culture" intensified leading to his departure as chief of the voting rights section early this year. The whole thing, as my mother used to say, "stinks on ice."

What makes it even more disturbing is that one of those vile thugs at the polling place, King Samir Shabazz, the New Black Panther Party's Philadelphia leader who professes to hate all white people, is heard saying if the black man wants freedom, he's going to have to kill some crackers and their babies. If you don't believe me, see for yourself.

On the one hand, there's Mr. Holder saying that we're to engage one another in talking about race, and, on the other hand, according to Messrs. Adams and Coates, the DOJ systematically ignores cases which involve black defendants and white victims.

So what happened to blind justice? What's the reasoning behind these decisions? The DOJ had won the civil lawsuit against the three defendants and then, after Eric Holder took over, moved to dismiss the case which raises serious concerns about his leadership.

If we're supposed to have an honest discussion about all this, then I think Mr. Holder owes the American people an explanation as to why he dismissed the Election Day lawsuit. I'd like to know why Shabazz wasn't charged with hate speech or, at the very least, with disturbing the peace as a result of his statements shown in the video.

I can only imagine what would happen to me if I stood on the streets of Seattle and said that I hated every black person and we should kill some black people and their babies. There is no question in my mind that I would be arrested and prosecuted. So, why not Shabazz? The failure to prosecute him certainly supports the statements of Messrs. Adams and Coates.

I don't get it, but, if you do, God bless you.