

# The Sword and the Shield: A Comprehensive Analysis of Domestic Military Deployment on American Soil (1792–2026)

## I. Executive Summary: The Minnesota Crisis in Historical Relief

In January 2026, the United States stands at a precipice of civil-military relations not witnessed since the turbulent spring of 1992, or perhaps even the constitutional crises of the mid-19th century. The standoff in Minneapolis, Minnesota—precipitated by the fatal shooting of Renee Nicole Good by an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agent and the subsequent "Metro Surge" of federal law enforcement—has transcended a local policing issue to become a fundamental test of American federalism.<sup>1</sup> President Donald Trump's threat to invoke the Insurrection Act of 1807, coupled with the staging of 1,500 active-duty paratroopers from the 11th Airborne Division in Alaska, represents a collision between the executive's plenary power to enforce federal law and the state's traditional police powers.<sup>3</sup>

To understand the gravity of the 2026 Minnesota crisis, one cannot view it in isolation. It is the latest chapter in a 234-year narrative of the American military's role in domestic governance. From the whiskey-soaked hills of western Pennsylvania in 1794 to the burning rail yards of 1877, from the shanties of the Bonus Army in 1932 to the smoke-filled streets of Los Angeles in 1992, the deployment of federal troops to American soil has always marked a failure of civil society. It is the moment when the "shield" of national defense turns inward to become the "sword" of domestic order.

This report provides an exhaustive analysis of the legal standing, historical precedents, and political ramifications of such deployments. It argues that while the President possesses robust statutory authority to deploy troops under the Insurrection Act, the *legitimacy* of such action rests on a fragile consensus that has eroded significantly in the 21st century. The Supreme Court's 2025 ruling in *Trump v. Illinois*, which limited the use of the military for "protective" missions without a full insurrection declaration, has paradoxically raised the stakes, forcing the executive to use the "nuclear option" of the Insurrection Act rather than lesser statutory measures.<sup>5</sup>

## II. The Constitutional and Legal Architecture of

# Domestic Force

The legal framework governing the use of the military within the United States is defined by a tension between two fears held by the Founding Fathers: the fear of mob rule (anarchy) and the fear of a standing army (tyranny). This section dissects the statutes that navigate this "Zone of Ambiguity".<sup>7</sup>

## A. The Constitutional Basis

The U.S. Constitution does not explicitly forbid the use of the military domestically; in fact, it obligates the federal government to intervene under specific conditions.

- **Article I, Section 8, Clause 15** (The Militia Clause) grants Congress the power "To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions."
- **Article IV, Section 4** (The Guarantee Clause) mandates that the United States shall guarantee to every state a republican form of government and protect them against invasion and, upon request, "domestic Violence."

However, the Founders were deeply wary of military enforcement. The Third Amendment (quartering troops) and the general tenor of the Bill of Rights suggest a preference for civilian law enforcement. The legal reconciliation of these opposing forces is found in two primary statutes: The Insurrection Act and the Posse Comitatus Act.

## B. The Insurrection Act of 1807

Often misunderstood as a form of martial law (which it is not), the Insurrection Act is the primary statutory exception to the prohibition on domestic military law enforcement.<sup>8</sup> Codified in **10 U.S.C. §§ 251–255**, it provides three distinct triggers for deployment, detailed in the table below:

Statutory Section	Triggering Condition	Consent Required?	Historical Context
<b>10 U.S.C. § 251</b>	At the request of a State Legislature or Governor to suppress an insurrection.	<b>Yes</b> (State Request)	Used in 1992 LA Riots (Gov. Wilson requested). <sup>8</sup>
<b>10 U.S.C. § 252</b>	To enforce federal laws or suppress	<b>No</b> (Unilateral)	Used in the Whiskey Rebellion

	rebellion that makes judicial proceedings "impracticable."		and Pullman Strike. <sup>8</sup>
<b>10 U.S.C. § 253</b>	To protect civil rights or when domestic violence prevents the execution of state/federal laws (state is unwilling/unable).	<b>No</b> (Unilateral)	Used during Civil Rights Era (Little Rock, Alabama). <sup>8</sup>

**Legal Insight:** The critical distinction in the 2026 Minnesota scenario is between Section 251 and Section 253. Governor Tim Walz has *not* requested federal troops; in fact, he has mobilized the Minnesota National Guard specifically to maintain local control and preempt federal intervention.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, President Trump's threat relies on Section 253—arguing that the "patriots of ICE" are being impeded and that the state is failing to protect the execution of federal law.<sup>4</sup> This sets up a direct confrontation between the Governor's assessment of public safety and the President's assessment of federal supremacy.

### C. The Posse Comitatus Act of 1878

Enacted following the end of Reconstruction, the Posse Comitatus Act (18 U.S.C. § 1385) generally prohibits the Army and Air Force from executing civilian laws (e.g., search, seizure, arrest).<sup>11</sup>

- **Purpose:** To prevent the military from becoming a national police force.
- **Exceptions:** The Act is not absolute. It applies "except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or Act of Congress." The Insurrection Act is the *primary* exception.<sup>13</sup>
- **Erosion:** Over decades, Congress has created other exceptions, such as for drug interdiction and counter-terrorism, but the core prohibition against using troops for crowd control remains intact *unless* the Insurrection Act is invoked.

### D. The Matrix of Military Status

Understanding the current crisis requires distinguishing between the types of troops involved. The "soldiers" visible on American streets usually fall into one of three categories, each with different legal authorities.<sup>14</sup>

Status	Authority	Funding	Posse Comitatus Applies?	Role in Jan 2026 Crisis
<b>State Active Duty (SAD)</b>	Governor	State	<b>No</b>	MN National Guard deployed by Gov. Walz to support local police. <sup>10</sup>
<b>Title 32</b>	Governor (with Fed. approval)	Federal	<b>No</b>	Often used for disaster relief (COVID, Katrina). Not currently the primary status in MN.
<b>Title 10 (Active Duty)</b>	President	Federal	<b>Yes</b> (unless Insurrection Act invoked)	The 1,500 paratroopers from Alaska staged by Trump. <sup>3</sup>

**Crucial Insight:** Troops under State Active Duty (SAD) can perform law enforcement duties because they are not federal troops; they are the state militia. This is why Governor Walz’s deployment of the Guard does not violate Posse Comitatus. President Trump’s threatened deployment of *Title 10* active-duty forces would violate Posse Comitatus unless he invokes the Insurrection Act.<sup>7</sup>

### III. The Early Republic: Establishing the Precedent (1792–1860)

The early history of domestic deployment established the doctrine that military force was a tool of last resort, subordinate to civilian judicial process.

#### A. The Whiskey Rebellion (1794)

The first use of the Calling Forth Act (precursor to the Insurrection Act) occurred when farmers in western Pennsylvania revolted against a federal excise tax on distilled spirits.

- **The Procedure:** President Washington did not simply march in. He first sent peace

commissioners. Crucially, he waited for a federal judge to certify that the courts could not function—a "certificate of failure" that lent judicial legitimacy to the military operation.<sup>8</sup>

- **The Force:** Washington led a militia force of 12,950 men—larger than the Continental Army during the Revolution.
- **The Precedent:** The massive show of force dissolved the rebellion without significant combat. It established federal supremacy but emphasized procedural caution.

## B. The Antebellum Era and Slave Revolts

In the decades leading to the Civil War, the Insurrection Act was used to uphold the institution of slavery.

- **Nat Turner's Rebellion (1831):** Federal artillery and marines were deployed to Virginia to suppress the slave revolt. While the procedural requirements were not strictly followed (President Jackson validated it retroactively), it demonstrated the federal government's commitment to maintaining the internal order of slave states.<sup>8</sup>
- **Bleeding Kansas (1850s):** Federal troops were used to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act and maintain uneasy order between pro-slavery and free-soil factions, illustrating the military's growing entanglement in political disputes.

## IV. Civil War and Reconstruction: The Military as Government (1861–1877)

The Civil War era fundamentally altered the relationship between the army and the citizenry. The conflict was not merely a rebellion; it was a total breakdown of the legal order, necessitating a military substitute.

### A. Lincoln and the Suspension of Habeas Corpus

Abraham Lincoln invoked the Insurrection Act in 1861 (Proclamation 80) to call forth the militia against the seceding states.<sup>8</sup> However, the legal controversy centered on the treatment of civilians in non-rebellious states.

- **Ex parte Milligan (1866):** In a landmark ruling, the Supreme Court held that military tribunals could not try civilians in areas where civil courts were open and functioning.<sup>18</sup>
- **Relevance to 2026:** This ruling remains the bulwark against using the military to bypass the justice system. Even if Trump deploys troops to Minnesota, *Milligan* prohibits them from trying protestors in military courts; they must be handed over to civilian authorities.<sup>20</sup>

### B. Grant and the KKK Acts

During Reconstruction, President Ulysses S. Grant used the Insurrection Act more

aggressively than any other president to combat the Ku Klux Klan.

- **The Enforcement Acts (1870-1871):** Congress expanded the President's power to use the military to protect constitutional rights (Section 253 origin).
- **South Carolina (1871):** Grant suspended habeas corpus in nine counties and used the 7th Cavalry to arrest hundreds of Klan members.<sup>8</sup>
- **The Inversion of Roles:** Unlike previous uses (protecting the state), Grant used the military *against* the dominant social order of the state to protect a minority group. This stands as the historical counter-narrative to the 2026 crisis: Grant used troops to *protect* civil rights; critics argue the 2026 threat is to *suppress* protest against rights violations.<sup>12</sup>

## V. Industrial Warfare: Labor, Capital, and the Army (1877–1932)

Following the withdrawal of troops from the South in 1877, the US military found a new domestic mission: strikebreaking. This era defined the "class character" of domestic deployment, where the Insurrection Act was often invoked to protect the flow of commerce rather than public safety.

### A. The Great Railroad Strike of 1877

When the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad cut wages, a strike spread across 14 states.

- **The Chaos:** Riots in Pittsburgh destroyed 39 buildings and 104 engines.
- **The Response:** President Rutherford B. Hayes invoked the Insurrection Act, deploying federal troops to Maryland, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.<sup>22</sup>
- **The Shift:** This was the first time troops were used to quell labor unrest on a national scale. The military effectively functioned as a police force for railroad corporations, acting under the guise of "protecting interstate commerce".<sup>22</sup>

### B. The Pullman Strike of 1894

In 1894, the American Railway Union led by Eugene Debs struck against the Pullman Palace Car Company.

- **The Pretext:** President Grover Cleveland bypassed the Governor of Illinois, John Peter Altgeld, who refused to request troops. Cleveland used the innovative legal theory that the strike obstructed the U.S. Mail (a federal function).<sup>24</sup>
- **The Deployment:** Thousands of troops entered Chicago. The result was violence, the death of 30 strikers, and the imprisonment of Debs.
- **The Legal Legacy:** The Supreme Court upheld Cleveland's action, affirming that the federal government could use force to remove obstructions to its functions (the mail) without state consent. This is the direct legal ancestor of the "obstruction of federal law" argument used by the Trump administration in 2026 regarding ICE operations.<sup>4</sup>

## C. The Bonus Army (1932): The Nadir of Relations

The most infamous domestic deployment occurred during the Great Depression. 43,000 WWI veterans and their families camped in Washington D.C., demanding early payment of service bonuses.<sup>26</sup>

- **The Eviction:** President Herbert Hoover ordered the Army to clear the camps. General Douglas MacArthur, exceeding his orders, used tanks, tear gas, and cavalry with drawn sabers to drive veterans out of the capital and burn their shanties.<sup>27</sup>
- **Posse Comitatus Violation?** While technically authorized by the President, the use of such overwhelming military force against destitute veterans shocked the national conscience and contributed significantly to Hoover's electoral defeat.<sup>26</sup>
- **Lesson for 2026:** The Bonus Army incident demonstrates the extreme political risk of using the military against sympathetic American citizens. It destroyed the reputation of the administration and the military leadership for a generation.

## VI. The Civil Rights Era: Enforcing the Constitution (1957–1968)

The mid-20th century saw the Insurrection Act return to its Reconstruction-era roots: enforcing federal court orders against recalcitrant states.

### A. Little Rock (1957)

When Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus used the National Guard to block the integration of Central High School, President Eisenhower faced a constitutional crisis.

- **Federalization:** Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10730, federalizing the entire Arkansas National Guard—taking them out of Faubus's control—and deploying the 101st Airborne Division.<sup>30</sup>
- **Section 253:** This was the first modern use of Section 253 (enforcing federal law/protecting rights) without a state request. Eisenhower justified it as upholding the Supreme Court's *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling.

### B. Ole Miss and Alabama (1962–1963)

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson continued this pattern.

- **Ole Miss (1962):** JFK deployed 30,000 troops to Oxford, Mississippi, to ensure James Meredith could register for classes amidst a riot that left two dead.<sup>30</sup>
- **Selma (1965):** LBJ federalized the Alabama National Guard to protect the Selma-to-Montgomery marchers from state troopers and vigilantes.<sup>31</sup>

### C. The 1968 Riots

Following the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr., riots erupted in over 100 cities. LBJ invoked the Insurrection Act to deploy troops to Washington D.C., Baltimore, and Chicago. This was a "restoration of order" mission, requested by mayors and governors overwhelmed by the scale of the unrest.<sup>32</sup>

## VII. The Late 20th Century: From Postal Strikes to LA (1970–1992)

### A. The Postal Strike of 1970

In March 1970, 200,000 postal workers struck illegally. President Nixon declared a national emergency (Proclamation 3972) and deployed 23,000 military personnel to New York City to sort and deliver mail.<sup>33</sup>

- **Operation Graphic Hand:** Unlike 1894, there was no violence. Troops were used as replacement labor ("scabs") rather than for enforcement. It remains a unique instance of the military performing a purely civil function to break a strike.<sup>35</sup>

### B. The 1992 Los Angeles Riots

The last uncontested invocation of the Insurrection Act occurred in 1992. Following the acquittal of officers in the Rodney King beating, Los Angeles dissolved into chaos.

- **The Request:** California Governor Pete Wilson specifically requested federal assistance after the National Guard proved slow to mobilize and insufficient in number.<sup>36</sup>
- **The Deployment:** President George H.W. Bush issued the necessary proclamation and deployed 4,000 Army and Marine troops. They worked alongside the federalized National Guard to restore order.
- **Significance:** This is cited by modern proponents of deployment as the "model" for intervention—a necessary restoration of order when civil authority collapses.<sup>13</sup>

## VIII. The Current Crisis: January 2026

The events of January 2026 in Minnesota represent a dramatic departure from the 1992 model and a return to the adversarial federalism of the 1960s, albeit with inverted political alignments.

### A. The Trigger: The Killing of Renee Good

On January 7, 2026, Renee Nicole Good, a 37-year-old community observer, was shot and killed by an ICE agent during a raid in South Minneapolis. The shooting sparked massive, sustained protests targeting the Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building.<sup>2</sup>

- **The Escalation:** The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) responded with a "Metro Surge," deploying thousands of additional federal agents. This exacerbated tensions,

leading to violent clashes and a subsequent shooting of a protestor on January 14.<sup>1</sup>

## B. The Legal Standoff: *Trump v. Illinois* (2025)

Crucial to understanding President Trump's actions in 2026 is the Supreme Court decision from the previous year, *Trump v. Illinois* (December 2025).

- **The Ruling:** The Court ruled 6-3 that the President could *not* federalize the National Guard under **10 U.S.C. § 12406** solely to "protect federal property" if active-duty forces were available, nor could he use Title 10 forces for broad policing under "inherent authority" without invoking the Insurrection Act.<sup>5</sup>
- **The Consequence:** This ruling removed the "middle ground." Previously, presidents might use "protection of federal functions" as a loophole to deploy troops without the stigma of the Insurrection Act. By closing this door, the Court forced Trump to either withdraw or invoke the full powers of the Insurrection Act.<sup>5</sup>

## C. The Deployment Mechanics

As of January 18, 2026:

- **The State Response:** Governor Tim Walz has mobilized the Minnesota National Guard under State Active Duty (SAD). Their mission is to support local police and protect rights, explicitly commanded by the Governor to "turn the temperature down".<sup>10</sup>
- **The Federal Threat:** President Trump has placed 1,500 paratroopers from the 11th Airborne Division (Alaska) on "prepare-to-deploy" orders.<sup>3</sup> He has cited the "failure" of the state to protect "Patriots of ICE" as the justification for a potential Section 253 invocation.<sup>4</sup>

# IX. Detailed Analysis: Legal Standing and Ramifications

## A. Does Trump Have Legal Standing?

Under the text of the Insurrection Act, specifically **Section 253**, the President has broad discretion. The statute allows the President to use force if he considers it necessary to suppress "any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy" that hinders the execution of federal law.

- **The "Obstruction" Argument:** The Trump administration argues that the protests are obstructing the enforcement of federal immigration laws (ICE operations). Historical precedent (Pullman Strike 1894) supports the use of troops to remove obstructions to federal functions.<sup>4</sup>
- **The "Civil Rights" Counter-Argument:** The ACLU and Minnesota officials argue that the protests are lawful First Amendment assemblies and that the "insurrection" is a fabrication to justify crushing dissent. They contend that Section 253 was designed to *protect* rights (like in 1871 or 1965), not to suppress them.<sup>17</sup>

- **Judicial Review:** Historically, courts have been extremely reluctant to second-guess a President's determination that an insurrection exists (see *Luther v. Borden*, 1849). However, the recent *Trump v. Illinois* ruling suggests a more skepticism-prone Supreme Court regarding executive overreach in domestic policing.<sup>6</sup>

## B. Implications and Ramifications

### 1. The Breakdown of Cooperative Federalism

The deployment of active-duty troops against the wishes of a Governor (who has already deployed the Guard) creates a dangerous "dual military" situation.

- **Scenario:** If Title 10 troops (Trump) and State Active Duty Guard troops (Walz) operate in the same space with conflicting orders—one to "dominate" and one to "de-escalate"—the risk of blue-on-green accidental conflict is non-zero. This undermines the tradition of the National Guard as the primary bridge between state and federal power.<sup>7</sup>

### 2. The Politicization of the Military

The military leadership is placed in an impossible position.

- **The Soldier's Dilemma:** Officers swear an oath to the Constitution, not the President. If the order to deploy is technically legal (under the Insurrection Act) but morally questionable or based on false pretenses of "insurrection," morale and cohesion will suffer.
- **Recruitment and Trust:** The use of combat troops to police American cities historically correlates with a drop in public trust in the military. The "enemy within" rhetoric used by the administration risks reframing the military as a partisan praetorian guard rather than a neutral defender.<sup>42</sup>

### 3. Civil Liberties and the First Amendment

Invoking the Insurrection Act does not suspend the Constitution.<sup>44</sup> Troops are still bound by the Fourth Amendment (unreasonable search/seizure) and First Amendment. However, combat troops are trained for warfare, not nuanced crowd control.

- **Escalation Risk:** As seen in Kent State (1970) and the Bonus Army (1932), the introduction of lethal weaponry into civil disturbances increases the likelihood of civilian casualties.
- **Chilling Effect:** The mere presence of paratroopers is a powerful deterrent to lawful protest, effectively curbing free speech through intimidation.<sup>17</sup>

## X. Conclusion

The timeline of American troops on American soil is a timeline of the nation's most severe growing pains. From the Whiskey Rebellion's test of federal authority to the Civil War's test of

union, to the labor wars of the Gilded Age and the civil rights struggles of the 1960s, the Insurrection Act has been the break-glass-in-case-of-emergency tool of the presidency.

The crisis of January 2026, however, presents a novel danger. Unlike 1861 (secession) or 1992 (total anarchy), the Minnesota situation involves a functional state government actively managing a crisis, pitted against a federal executive seeking to enforce discretionary policies via military might. The invocation of the Insurrection Act in this context would not be a restoration of order, but an assertion of dominance.

While legally plausible under the broad powers of the 1807 Act, such a deployment risks shattering the Posse Comitatus norms that have held for 150 years. It transforms the "zone of ambiguity" into a zone of conflict, where the ultimate arbiter of the law is not the judge's gavel, but the paratrooper's rifle. As the 11th Airborne waits on the tarmac in Alaska, the United States faces a historical echo of 1932 and 1894—a moment where the definition of "domestic tranquility" is being rewritten by the force of arms.

---

## Appendix A: Timeline of Notable Insurrection Act Invocations & Domestic Deployments

Year	Event	President	Legal Justification / Context
1794	Whiskey Rebellion	Washington	Enforce federal tax law; judicial certification of failure. <sup>8</sup>
1831	Nat Turner's Rebellion	Jackson	Suppress slave revolt (retroactive validation). <sup>8</sup>
1861	Civil War	Lincoln	Suppression of rebellion; suspension of Habeas Corpus. <sup>8</sup>
1871	KKK Uprising (SC)	Grant	Protect civil rights; suspend Habeas Corpus. <sup>8</sup>

<b>1877</b>	<b>Great Railroad Strike</b>	Hayes	Protect interstate commerce; suppress labor insurrection. <sup>23</sup>
<b>1894</b>	<b>Pullman Strike</b>	Cleveland	Enforce federal mail service; <i>against</i> Governor's will. <sup>45</sup>
<b>1932</b>	<b>Bonus Army</b>	Hoover	Clear federal property (alleged insurrection). Note: Technically police support, escalated by MacArthur. <sup>27</sup>
<b>1957</b>	<b>Little Rock Nine</b>	Eisenhower	Enforce Federal Court Orders (Desegregation). <sup>30</sup>
<b>1962</b>	<b>Ole Miss Riots</b>	Kennedy	Enforce Federal Court Orders. <sup>30</sup>
<b>1965</b>	<b>Selma March</b>	Johnson	Protect Civil Rights marchers. <sup>30</sup>
<b>1968</b>	<b>MLK Assassination Riots</b>	Johnson	Restore order (DC, Chicago, Baltimore). <sup>32</sup>
<b>1970</b>	<b>Postal Strike</b>	Nixon	National Emergency; Maintain federal function (Mail). <sup>34</sup>
<b>1992</b>	<b>Los Angeles Riots</b>	G.H.W. Bush	State Request (Gov. Wilson); Restore order. <sup>13</sup>
<b>2026</b>	<b>Minnesota ICE Protests</b>	Trump	(Threatened/Stage d) Protect federal

			law enforcement; suppress "insurrection". <sup>3</sup>
--	--	--	--

## Appendix B: Comparative Analysis of 1992 vs. 2026

Feature	1992 Los Angeles Riots	2026 Minnesota Crisis
<b>Trigger</b>	State court verdict (Rodney King)	Federal agent shooting (Renee Good)
<b>Violence Level</b>	Massive (60+ dead, \$1B damage)	Localized unrest, clashes with ICE
<b>State Stance</b>	Governor <b>Requested</b> Troops	Governor <b>Opposes</b> Troops <sup>10</sup>
<b>Legal Basis</b>	Section 251 (State Request)	Section 253 (Unilateral/Rights Protection)
<b>Troop Type</b>	National Guard (Federalized) + Marines	Active Duty Paratroopers (Staged)
<b>Political Context</b>	Bipartisan consensus on restoring order	Highly partisan conflict over immigration policy

### Works cited

1. Trump threatens to use the Insurrection Act to stop anti-ICE protests in Minneapolis, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.wunc.org/2026-01-16/trump-threatens-to-use-the-insurrection-act-to-stop-anti-ice-protests-in-minneapolis>
2. Could Trump Invoke the Insurrection Act? What to Know and How to Prepare | Indivisible, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://indivisible.org/resource/could-trump-invoke-insurrection-act-what-know-and-how-prepare>
3. U.S Military Puts 1,500 Alaska-Based Paratroopers on Standby as Minneapolis Protests Escalate, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://thekenyatimes.com/latest-kenya-times-news/world-news/u-s-military-put>

- [s-1500-alaska-based-paratroopers-on-standby-as-minneapolis-protests-escalate/](#)
4. Trump threatens to use Insurrection Act to put down protests in Minneapolis | PBS News, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/trump-threatens-to-use-insurrection-act-to-put-down-protests-in-minneapolis>
  5. Trump v. Illinois: A Narrow Supreme Court Decision with Broad Implications - Just Security, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.justsecurity.org/128371/trump-v-illinois-supreme-court/>
  6. Trump Just Faced the Biggest Supreme Court Defeat of His Second Term So Far, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2025/12/trump-v-illinois-supreme-court-national-guard-chicago.html>
  7. Understanding the Guard's Duty Status - GiveAnHour.org, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://giveanhour.org/wp-content/uploads/Guard-Status-9.27.18.pdf>
  8. The Insurrection Act, Explained | Brennan Center for Justice, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/insurrection-act-explained>
  9. The Posse Comitatus Act, Explained | Brennan Center for Justice, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/posse-comitatus-act-explained>
  10. Minnesota Governor Deploys National Guard After Trump Threatens Insurrection Act as Protests Continue, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://themedialine.org/headlines/minnesota-governor-deploys-national-guard-after-president-trump-threatens-insurrection-act-as-protests-continue/>
  11. 'Insurrection Act': Trump warns of military use as Minnesota unrest continues against ICE - What is it, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/insurrection-act-trump-warns-of-military-use-as-minnesota-unrest-continues-against-ice-what-is-it/articleshow/126547732.cms>
  12. What is Insurrection Act? The law Trump may use to deploy troops in Minneapolis, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.indiatoday.in/world/us-news/story/donald-trump-threatens-insurrection-act-troop-deployment-minneapolis-protests-glbs-2852704-2026-01-16>
  13. What is the Insurrection Act, and why is Trump threatening to invoke it in Minnesota?, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-insurrection-act-minnesota/>
  14. Military 101: Orders - The Council of State Governments, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.csg.org/2024/09/25/military-101-orders/>
  15. NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU FACT SHEET National Guard Duty Statuses, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.nationalguard.mil/Portals/31/Resources/Fact%20Sheets/NGB-Fact-Sheet-Duty-Status-Reference-FINAL.pdf>

16. What's the Difference Between Title 10 and Title 32 Mobilization Orders? | Military.com, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.military.com/benefits/reserve-and-guard-benefits/whats-difference-between-title-10-and-title-32-mobilization-orders.html>
17. Trump's Threat to Invoke the Insurrection Act, Explained | American Civil Liberties Union, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.aclu.org/news/civil-liberties/trumps-threat-to-invoke-the-insurrection-act-explained>
18. Ex parte Milligan - Oyez, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.oyez.org/cases/1850-1900/71us2>
19. The Supreme Court . The First Hundred Years . Landmark Cases . Ex parte Milligan (1866) | PBS - THIRTEEN, accessed January 18, 2026, [https://www.thirteen.org/wnet/supremecourt/antebellum/landmark\\_exparte.html](https://www.thirteen.org/wnet/supremecourt/antebellum/landmark_exparte.html)
20. Analysis: Ex Parte Milligan | Research Starters - EBSCO, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/military-history-and-science/analysis-ex-parte-milligan>
21. Ex parte Milligan | 71 U.S. 2 (1866) - Justia U.S. Supreme Court Center, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/71/2/>
22. A Second American Revolution? The Great Railroad Strike of 1877 - Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.appalachianforestnha.org/america250-in-the-appalachian-forest-stories/a-second-american-revolution-the-great-railroad-strike-of-1877>
23. Great Railroad Strike of 1877 - Wikipedia, accessed January 18, 2026, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great\\_Railroad\\_Strike\\_of\\_1877](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Railroad_Strike_of_1877)
24. Chapter 18: Urban Growth: The Pullman Strike | Teaching American History, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/chapter-18-urban-growth-the-pullman-strike/>
25. The Strike of 1894 - Pullman National Historical Park (U.S. National Park Service), accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.nps.gov/pull/learn/historyculture/the-strike-of-1894.htm>
26. Bonus Army - Wikipedia, accessed January 18, 2026, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonus\\_Army](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonus_Army)
27. Statement on the Dispersal of the Bonus Army - Teaching American History, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/statement-on-the-dispersal-of-the-bonus-army/>
28. Senate Stories | The Senate and the Bonus Expeditionary Force of 1932, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/senate-stories/senate-and-the-bonus-expeditionary-force-of-1932.htm>
29. THE LAND WARFARE PAPERS - AUSA, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.ausa.org/sites/default/files/LWP-63-Confrontation-at-Anacostia-Flats-The-Bonus-Army-of-1932.pdf>

30. List of invocations of the Insurrection Act - Wikipedia, accessed January 18, 2026, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_invocations\\_of\\_the\\_Insurrection\\_Act](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_invocations_of_the_Insurrection_Act)
31. Insurrection Act of 1807 | Research Starters - EBSCO, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/law/insurrection-act-1807>
32. When Has the Insurrection Act Been Invoked? | Definition, History, Trump, & Facts, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/When-Has-the-Insurrection-Act-Been-Invoked>
33. 1970 United States postal strike - Wikipedia, accessed January 18, 2026, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1970\\_United\\_States\\_postal\\_strike](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1970_United_States_postal_strike)
34. Proclamation 3972—Work Stoppages in the Postal Service | The American Presidency Project, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/proclamation-3972-work-stoppages-in-the-postal-service>
35. The Great Postal Strike of 1970 - AFL-CIO, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://aflcio.org/about-us/history/labor-history-events/great-postal-strike>
36. Why Trump Sending the National Guard to L.A. Is Different From Its Deployment There in 1992 - Time Magazine, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://time.com/7292493/trump-national-guard-la-1992-riots/>
37. mout: a domestic case study— the 1992 los angeles riots - Army University Press, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Portals/7/Hot-Spots/docs/Civil-Unrest/Rand-Domestic-Riots-Case-Study.pdf>
38. Department of Justice investigating Gov. Walz, Minneapolis Mayor Frey, U.S. officials say, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.cbsnews.com/minnesota/live-updates/minnesota-ice-shooting-protests-trump-insurrection-act/>
39. 25A443 Trump v. Illinois (12/23/2025) - Supreme Court, accessed January 18, 2026, [https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25a443\\_new\\_b07d.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25a443_new_b07d.pdf)
40. 1,500 soldiers on standby for possible Minnesota deployment, reports say, as state mobilizes National Guard, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://kioncentralcoast.com/news/national-world/cnn-national/2026/01/18/minnesota-national-guard-staged-and-ready-as-minneapolis-protests-continue-state-officials-say/>
41. 'Insurrection Act': Donald Trump dismisses 'need' for military use in Minnesota amid protests; claims 'no reason right now', accessed January 18, 2026, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/insurrection-act-trump-dismisses-need-for-military-use-in-minnesota-amid-protests-claims-no-reason-right-now/articleshow/126590494.cms>
42. Domestic Deployment of the Military: The Past, Present, and Potential Future, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/domestic-deployment-of-the-military-the-past-present-and-potential-future/>
43. 2025–2026 domestic military deployments in the United States - Wikipedia, accessed January 18, 2026, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2025%E2%80%932026\\_domestic\\_military\\_deployments](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2025%E2%80%932026_domestic_military_deployments)

[nts\\_in\\_the\\_United\\_States](#)

44. The Insurrection Act, explained - Protect Democracy, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://protectdemocracy.org/work/insurrection-act-explained/>
45. Guide to Invocations of the Insurrection Act | Brennan Center for Justice, accessed January 18, 2026, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/guide-invocations-insurrection-act>