



It is not power, wealth, or numbers that will determine our fate, but rather our allegiance to truth, virtue, and the discipline of reason.

The great philosopher Plato addresses the US Congress:

T **Honored leaders,** esteemed thinkers, and guardians of the American Republic, I stand before you—not as a citizen of your time but as a voice from an age long past, where the seeds of civilization were sown and where the specter of its ruin was studied with due gravity. You are the stewards of a great republic, one that stands on the precipice of either flourishing through wisdom or decaying through folly. It is not power, wealth, or numbers that will determine your fate, but rather your allegiance to truth, virtue, and the discipline of reason.

The Struggle Between Truth and Illusion

In my time, I wrote of a cave where prisoners sat in darkness, mistaking shadows on a wall for reality. They knew only what was projected before them by unseen hands. And I ask you: Are your citizens not also captive to shadows? Do they not mistake rhetoric for reality, passion for principle, and volume for veracity?

The citizenry looks to you for governance, but what they receive instead is often spectacle. You craft words as artisans craft metal, shaping them not always to reflect truth, but to wield influence. When policies are made not in service to what is right but to what is expedient, you do not govern—you merely entertain. Yet no republic can endure when the governed cease to believe that truth exists at all.

Let us be plain: If truth is merely a subjective construct, bent to whims and feelings, then all communication, all discourse, and all governance become absurd. A republic that denies objective truth unravels into incoherence, where power, not wisdom, dictates reality.

The Perils of Unchecked Democracy

I warned my own city against the seductions of unbridled democracy, for I knew its tendency to exalt momentary passions over enduring wisdom. In time, the crowd demands to be led not by those who are just, but by those who can best mirror their grievances and flatter their desires. The noble statesman is cast aside, and in his place rises the demagogue—a man who trades in half-truths and is loved not for his virtue but for his ability to inflame the multitude. Such a republic does not grow strong; it grows restless, resentful, and ripe for ruin.

You, leaders of this Republic, are entrusted not merely to echo the will of the people but to educate and elevate it. If you shape policy by counting voices rather than by weighing truths, you will create a state that is not ruled, but that is manipulated. If you submit wisdom to whim, you will find that whims are merciless masters, shifting as the wind and eroding all that is firm and lasting.

On Justice and the Common Good

I have said before that justice is not the advantage of the stronger, nor is it the mere balancing of grievances. Justice is that which orders a society toward its highest good. But today, justice has been reduced to a currency of endless transactions—one grievance exchanged for another, one injury repaid with another. You divide citizens into factions, setting them against one another like combatants in the arena, as if the republic were a prize to be seized rather than a trust to be safeguarded.

What is the purpose of your station if not to unite rather than divide, to strengthen rather than enfeeble? A nation that devours itself from within does not need an enemy from without. The walls of a city are not its stone ramparts, but the character of its people, and the first responsibility of a statesman is to cultivate that character. You must ask yourselves: Do we govern to heal, or do we govern to conquer?

The Incoherence of Open Borders and Lawlessness

JCMC PACKET FEBRUARY 17, 2025

2) **Shall I feign astonishment** at your notion of an open border? To dissolve the very definition of a nation, allowing chaos in the name of charity while forsaking the duty of protection? The first obligation of any government is to its own people. To allow the vulnerable to be preyed upon by traffickers, criminals, and cartels under the guise of compassion is not nobility—it is abdication. If the rule of law is optional, then why have law at all? A republic that disregards its own boundaries will soon cease to be a republic at all.

And who suffers? The weak. Women and girls subjected to unspeakable atrocities in transit, children abandoned, lives treated as mere currency in a lawless trade. A government that fails to ensure the safety of those it is charged to protect is not a government but an accomplice in disorder.

The DEI Malaise: Mob Rule in Intellectual Disguise

You speak of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and yet, the fruits of this movement are neither diverse, nor equitable, nor inclusive. It is but a fresh coat of paint upon the same old tyranny—the mob enforcing compliance, demanding obeisance, and rewarding mediocrity. It claims to eradicate racism by institutionalizing new forms of it. It claims to elevate merit, yet discards it in favor of quotas and identity metrics.

Do not deceive yourselves: a nation that abandons excellence for appeasement does not uplift the marginalized; it ensures the continued descent into mediocrity and resentment. The republic you were entrusted to govern does not flourish through division and favoritism, but through the cultivation of virtue, ability, and justice.

The Immutable Reality of Sex and the Family

The most basic truths—those written into the very nature of our being—are now under siege. There are two sexes. Not many. Not an ever-expanding spectrum of self-invention. Two. To deny this is not progress but the deliberate unmooring of civilization from reality.

The family, the sacred bond upon which all ordered societies are built, is derided as an artifact of oppression. Marriage, once upheld as a pillar of civilization, is now treated as optional, disposable, or wholly redefined. Yet without family, what is a nation but a collection of individuals bound by nothing but taxation and governance? A republic that does not honor the sanctity of family will find itself replaced by something far more chilling: the cold, impersonal hand of the state, governing a populace fragmented and directionless.

The Higher Law: Philosophy Meets Theology

Even philosophy, though noble, finds its completion in something higher. If there is no objective, universal good, then every man becomes his own god, and civil order is reduced to scaffolding, bending to the whims of those in power. Your own Constitution presupposes a moral order beyond human decree—a reality not constructed but discovered.

C.S. Lewis, once a formidable atheist turned Christian, warned that without a higher good to which all are accountable, power becomes the only measure of right. It is no accident that oaths are sworn upon a Bible, for in the end, each of us will be accountable—not merely to history, but to the Supreme Judge beyond this world.

A Final Plea: Choose Greatness, Not Decay

If you wish to preserve your republic, you must first preserve what makes it worth preserving. May you have the courage to fulfill this duty.

The choice is yours. The future will answer.

Author

Greg Schlueter

CRISIS
MAGAZINE

A 64-year-old woman with deep family roots in Alabama recently said to me that she was taught in Alabama public school that Abraham Lincoln was "the best president ever." That would be a good example of the consequences of what the New England Yankee conquerors labeled "reconstruction." The truth is that Lincoln was by far the *worst* president in American history. He was certainly the most "reviled" (by the people of the North *during his lifetime*), as Larry Tagg documented in his book, *The Unpopular Mr. Lincoln: America's Most Reviled President*. Thanks to the Republican party propaganda machine, which essentially monopolized American politics for the half century after the war, Lincoln was transformed from the most hated and reviled of all American politicians during his lifetime to a saint. (See *The Deification of Lincoln* by Ira D. Cardiff).

Here is what the state tells you to celebrate today, Lincoln's birthday: Lincoln *destroyed* the voluntary union of the Founding Fathers and replaced it with a union held together by war and the mass murder of Southern civilians (at least fifty thousand according to Princeton historian James McPherson), turning it into something resembling the old Soviet Union more than the original American union.

The uniquely American system of federalism was destroyed along with the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution and the states' rights of nullification and secession, and Americans became the servants rather than the masters of their own government. Government's "just powers" no longer came from the consent of the governed, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, but from the barrel of a gun. Are you beginning to get why the state celebrates Lincoln's birthday?

Lincoln waged war on Southern civilians for four long years, ordering the bombing and burning of American cities to the ground and rewarding the commanding generals who committed these war crimes of plundering, raping, murder, and arson with promotions and glory. The population of the South was about 9 million at the beginning of the war. Scaling the death toll for today's U.S. population, McPherson's estimate of 50,000 civilian deaths would be the equivalent of 1.9 million civilians being killed by the U.S. government in just four years. Coming from Lincoln cultist James McPherson, the 50,000 figure is bound to be an underestimate.

Reading books like *War Crimes against Southern Civilians* by Walter Brian Cisco, which is based on the U.S. government's publication *The War of the Rebellion: Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, one learns how more than twenty-two thousand artillery shells exploded in a six-month period in *civilian-occupied* Charleston, and that unexploded shells are still being discovered today. Then there is Sherman's four-day bombardment of civilian-occupied Atlanta after the Confederate Army had left the city with as many as five thousand artillery shells exploding in a single day. Thousands of survivors were rendered homeless at the onset of winter. Lincoln's favorite general called the site of corpses of women and children in the streets of Atlanta "a beautiful sight" because he thought it would cause the war to end sooner.

Lincoln's first inaugural address should be known as his "Slavery Forever" speech. He started out announcing that he had no intention of disturbing Southern slavery (at a time when there were also slaves in Union states); that he *never* had any intention of doing so; that this was clearly stated in the Republican Party platform of 1860; and that it would be unconstitutional to do so. He then expressed his strongest support for the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, which compelled Northerners to capture runaway slaves (and which was enforced in Washington, D.C. during the Lincoln presidency).

Near the end of his first inaugural address Lincoln declared his support for the Corwin Amendment to the Constitution which would prohibit the government from *ever* interfering with Southern slavery and which had just passed the Republican-controlled House and Senate. He said he considered slavery to be constitutional and had no objection to it being made "express and irrevocable" in the text of the Constitution. *Irrevocable*.

4) The amendment was named after Ohio Congressman Thomas Corwin but in fact came from Lincoln himself. Doris Kearns-Goodwin showed in her book, *Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln*, that before the inauguration Lincoln had instructed William Seward to get the amendment through the senate, which he did. In his inaugural address he lied about never actually having seen the amendment. This was a constitutional amendment to enshrine slavery in the Constitution, passed by his own party of which he was the leader, and ratified by his home state of Illinois along with Rhode Island, Ohio, and the "border states" of Kentucky and Maryland which were under U. S. Army occupation at the time. How dumb and gullible did Lincoln think the American public was to tell them such a blatant lie?

In the same speech Lincoln used the words "invasion" and "bloodshed" as promises of what would occur in any state that refused to collect the tariff tax on imports which had just been more than doubled two days earlier. At the time more than 90 percent of federal tax revenue came from tariff taxes and there was no central bank to legally counterfeit money. The South did not intend to send tariff tax revenues to D.C. any more than it would send them to London or Paris, so Lincoln followed through with his threat and commenced the waging of total war on his own country over tax collection.

For over a hundred years the death toll of the "Civil War" was said to be 620,000 but recent forensic research has revised the number to as much as 850,000 with more than double that number wounded. In terms of today's population that is almost 9 million deaths in less than four years, all over tax collection according to Lincoln himself. Are you still wondering why the state celebrates Lincoln's birthday?

In April of 1861 Lincoln illegally suspended the writ of Habeas Corpus and ordered the military to arrest and imprison without due process tens of thousands of Northern civilians for merely criticizing him and his war policies. Treason is defined in Article 3, Section 3 of the Constitution as "only . . . levying war upon the United States" or "Giving Aid and Comfort to *their* enemies" (emphasis added). The word "their" is all important here, as it refers to "United States" in the plural, as in all the founding documents. It means the individual states, not something called "the United States government in Washington, D.C."

Lincoln levied war upon the Southern states and he and his entire high command were therefore guilty of treason. He took it upon himself to redefine treason as any criticism of himself. He also ordered the shutting down of more than 300 opposition newspapers, imprisoned many of the editors and owners of the papers, and deported his chief congressional critic, Congressman Clement Vallandigham of Ohio.

The slaves were used as political pawns (as their descendants still are today) in a war that had nothing to do with them according to Lincoln himself. The War Aims Resolution of the Republican-controlled U.S. Congress (the Crittendon-Johnson Resolution) also declared to the world that the purpose of the war was not to disturb "the domestic institutions of the states," by which they meant slavery, but to supposedly save the union (geographically but not philosophically).

Lincoln and the Republican party ignored the fact that all other nations that ended slavery in the nineteenth century did so peacefully, as did New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and all the other Northern states (See *Greatest Emancipations* by Jim Powell). The last slave state to enter the union was West Virginia whose secession during the war was orchestrated by the Lincoln administration which gave the Republican party two more senators.

Lincoln was a lifelong advocate of "colonization," a euphemism for deporting all the black people out of the country. Whenever he talked about emancipation it was always coupled with "colonization." As Phil Magness and Sebastian Page document in their book, *Colonization after Emancipation*, Lincoln, Seward, and others were hard at work literally until Lincoln's dying day trying to make land purchase deals with other governments and counting how many ships it would take to deport all the black people out of America.

Lincoln's emancipation proclamation was phony. It specifically exempted the Republican party-controlled slave state of West Virginia along with all the parishes of Louisiana that were under control of the Union Army at the time, and stated that it would become null and void if the slave states re-entered the union and continued with payment of the federal tariff tax. It emancipated no one, nor could it have constitutionally.

Lincoln was a corrupt crony capitalist mercantilist on economic policy, advocating protectionist tariffs, corporate welfare for railroad corporations, and a government-run central bank to pay for it all. He signed ten tariff-increasing bills, commenced the massively corrupt subsidization of the transcontinental railroads, monopolized the money supply with his Legal Tender and National Currency Acts, and created a gigantic military-industrial complex during the war.

The "great emancipator" enslaved Americans with the first federal conscription law after hundreds of thousands had deserted the Union Army, even on the eve of great historic battles. Lincoln ordered the execution by firing squad of deserters and when there were draft riots in New York City in 1863 he sent 15,000 troops from the recently-concluded Battle of Gettysburg who fired into the crowds, killing hundreds in the streets of New York City.

To advance his political career Lincoln broke up with Joshua Speed, with whom he had shared a bed for four years, and married Mary Todd, the daughter of a wealthy Kentucky slave plantation owning family that had close ties to Henry Clay, the leader of the Whig Party. Lincoln was a Whig for more than twenty years before becoming a Republican when the Whig party dissolved.

When Lincoln's wife inherited the slaves from her family's slave plantation they became her husband's property by law. Lincoln *sold* the slaves instead of emancipating them as proven by the bill of sale published in Kevin Orlin Johnson's book, *The Lincolns in the White House*.

Robert E. Lee's wife, a descendant of Martha Washington, also inherited slaves. General Lee *freed* them during the war in accordance with his father-in-law's will. How many government school students from Alabama – and everywhere else in the South – have been taught this – or anything else mentioned in this article for that matter?

Mike Huckabee Condemns "The Massacre of Women and Children" on Fox News on Sunday

Thomas DiLorenzo

LEWRockwell.com

He of course was NOT referring to the Israeli mass murder of tens or hundreds of thousands of Palestinian women, children, and babies in Gaza. Trump's nominee as ambassador to Israel is only concerned to bad things that happen to Israelis. He has also said that there is no such thing as a Palestinian, thereby defining out of existence the thousands of civilian victims of the American/Israeli Middle East War Crime Machine.

Here you have a Christian minister literally sanctifying the massacre of many *Christian* Palestinian women and children. His real "god" is Netanyahu.

12:11 pm on February 10, 2025

The Best of Thomas DiLorenzo

What Does National Security Have To Do With Soaring Defense Spending?

by Casey Carlisle · February 03, 2025

Paraphrasing Thomas Jefferson, the natural progress of things is for prices to yield and for quality to gain ground. Technology is what enables this natural progress. Do televisions cost more now than they did in the early '90s? What about mobile phones? Same answer for both questions: both are better and less expensive today than they were in the early '90s, which is why one will conclude that something is awry when reading headlines like "Global Military Spending Has Almost Doubled Since the Early '90s."

Why has military spending almost doubled since the early '90s? Arguably for the same reason hospital services have: government intervention. Those who 'serve' in government endlessly tax the present because they arrogantly claim to know what the future *should* be rather than allow the future to unfold via voluntary exchange between producers and consumers. Against all reason and historical precedent, they claim that, in order to stay safe, 'defense' spending must increase. But that's like claiming that, in order for eggs to contain yolks, the cost of raising chickens must necessarily outpace the rate of inflation.

"But but but" the unthinking screech, "the world is much more dangerous today!" Perhaps, but is warfare immune from technological advance? No, as Jefferson's actual quote helps explain: "The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." The world's danger stems from governments' interventions. Wars aren't cheap; governments don't engage in them for fun. The people would rather not fight, but instead of consulting with the people, governments conscript them. Increased military spending is inversely proportional to market forces – the will of the people.

Military spending has almost doubled because the government that allegedly serves us trades our present liberty for its imagined, grotesque future. Weapons manufacturing is one of the most regulated – if not *the* most regulated – industries in the "land of the free," and that regulation paves the way for the most perverse incentive imaginable: though the maiming, killing, and destruction of "them" and their cities equates to the decimation of their economy, "our" business relies on it.

But work divided – not obliterated – is what enables the natural progress of things. And when the number and duration of wars are unknown, and when that uncertainty is combined with the fact that war – at least its initial phase – is entirely devoid of market forces, weapons manufacturers can charge whatever they like, considering the governments that purchase their products spend their citizens' money and not their own. Governments have only what they've taken from the people they claim to serve, and they spend that money in the same way they obtained it: without consent.

There's nothing natural about military spending nearly doubling; it's a choice, just like inflation. But these are not choices freely made by citizens; they're choices imposed on citizens by those who claim to serve citizens. Where citizens do have a choice, however, is whether to enlist, but increasingly more patriots have decided to abstain from military enlistment. Why, then, would military spending increase while the number of those 'serving' decreases? Because, again, military spending is not the product of billions of freely transacting individuals but of a handful who claim with a straight face that they know better than the billions engaging in voluntary exchange (the global economy).

"That's just the way things are" is what the parasites hope you'll keep chanting, but that song is better ascribed to things subjected to market forces. "This is the way things will be" is why global military spending has doubled and will continue to increase. As long as the government – not the people – decides which weapons will be purchased and which wars will be funded, the people will continue to fund the increasingly expensive suffering of others worldwide for the benefit of their governments.

This first appeared on RealClearMarkets.

Casey Carlisle writes in the Pacific Northwest.

6

Your best source for antiwar news, viewpoints, and activities

ANTIWAR.COM

What would Pope Francis have done with an Ambrose standing in the emperor's path?

7

The Church celebrates the Memorial of St. Ambrose, Bishop and Doctor, on December 7. By liturgical standards, he's important. Not only is his an obligatory memorial (i.e., you *have* to celebrate it), but it's an obligatory memorial in Advent.

Saints—especially saints of the early Church—were often the subjects of classical art. Great painters often depicted them, and especially signature moments from their lives, in their paintings.

One of those great painters depicting a great saint was the master of Flemish Baroque, Peter Paul Rubens. His subject was St. Ambrose. The specific painting I have in mind is "St. Ambrose and Emperor Theodosius," which Rubens painted around 1615 and which today is held by the famous Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. (Rubens' student Anthony van Dyck produced a similar painting which hangs in London's National Gallery.)

The painting depicts St. Ambrose barring the way to Emperor Theodosius as the latter sought to enter the Cathedral of Milan. We need something of the backstory.

St. Ambrose was the great fourth-century bishop of Milan. A major reason he was chosen for that See was his opposition to the Arian heresy, which he intended to eliminate. His influence as a churchman is unquestionable: he was responsible for the conversion of St. Augustine, who himself held Ambrose up as the model bishop. His preaching and teaching were so powerful that he was regarded as one of four (along with Ss. Athanasius, Augustine, and John Chrysostom) great ancient doctors of the Church. Anyone who visits St. Peter's Basilica sees the Throne of St. Peter, encased as a relic by Bernini, and borne up by those four great doctors.

Theodosius was Roman Emperor in the late fourth century. Around 390, there was a massacre of citizens in Thessalonica. According to the traditional account, up to 7,000 people were killed in collective punishment for the lynching of a Roman soldier who had a popular charioteer arrested for pederasty. In that traditional account, blame for the punishment was laid on Theodosius and his "choleric" temper. The tradition says that while Theodosius' anger subsided, he supposedly tried sending messages to revoke the punishment, but it was too late.

Today's historians, of course, dispute most of the facts surrounding the tradition, inferring it was framed the way it was to make the Church look good. In any case, Theodosius made his way to Milan in the hope of repentance (and to redeem himself both politically as well as spiritually by ecclesiastical pardon). St. Ambrose did not want to be seen as sanctioning or whitewashing Theodosius' deed, so he conveniently made himself absent from the city, corresponding with the errant Emperor and demanding extended public penance on his part prior to his restoration to full Communion. This Theodosius did.

The tradition (and artists) turned that call for repentance and conversion into a confrontation at the cathedral door, where Ambrose bars Theodosius—dressed as an emperor—from entering the church until he first dons penitential habit and performs public penance for his bloodletting. This apocryphal scene of Ambrose actually standing in the way of Theodosius' entry to the church prior to his public penance was the stuff of such tradition as to be regularly depicted in the life of St. Ambrose. Excluding Theodosius from Communion until he does public penance, yes; standing in the doorway, no.

My focus, however, is on how this depiction stuck—and stuck positively—in the Catholic imagination. For centuries, nobody suggested that Ambrose was the "bad guy" or Theodosius the "abused victim."

I allude to this episode in light of Pope Francis' November 25 Address to the "Academic Community" of his refashioned John Paul II Institute for "Marriage and Family Sciences." This "beginning of the academic year" talk functions as a kind of trendsetter for the Institute's works. It gained international attention because the pope supposedly was calling for welcoming those living in fornication as well as the "divorced and remarried."

8

While the actual text is not as straightforward as the press played it, in some sense they were not wrong: this is the usual Francis *modus operandi* of what's-said-by-not-being-said. On the one hand, the pope is correct: the Church needs to open its doors to "everyone." But for that connection, a sinner may find himself in an even worse place. Proximity to grace might work its effects.

But the papal text shows no follow-through. While the pope insists the Church is "Mother of all," "everyone, everyone, everyone," he leaves out that mothers do not just affirm their children. They also have to correct, sometimes even chastise them. And that's the part that, if we hear it from Francis, we hear *sotto voce*, with nowhere near the intensity of his "welcome" message.

Nowhere in his address, for example, does Francis explicitly reaffirm constant ecclesiastical teaching that premarital cohabitation—understood as living sexually together—is a mortal sin. The question of divorced and remarried persons is referred back to Francis' arguable novelties in *Amoris Laetitia*.

Francis' approach is not new to me because I was exposed to this jesuitical approach to moral theology in my graduate studies, where I learned that what *wasn't said* was often more important than what was.

Which makes me wonder: What would Francis have done with an Ambrose standing in the emperor's path? Would he invite his early resignation? Tell us he's been wrongly criticized before taking that resignation? Give him a coadjutor with right-of-succession? Name some suffragan a cardinal?

Or—in Francis' fashion of criticizing those "who sit in the chair of Moses"—would he criticize the Milanese doctor for holding up the chair of Peter? Or send him a note on what *proper* "theology" is and how to apply it "pastorally?" Would we be told Ambrose was "weaponizing" the Eucharist and being "unaccompanying"?

History tells us that Ambrose did not hesitate to exclude a politician from the Bread of Life for his crimes against life. History tells us Ambrose welcomed Theodosius first to show real repentance, which he did.

One might ask: Who should be taking lessons from whom?

Author

John M. Grondelski

John M. Grondelski (Ph.D., Fordham) is a former associate dean of the School of Theology, Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey. All views expressed herein are his own.

We ask of the State and Society only one thing -- a fair field and no favors ... a strict cutting out of all paternalistic activities, and the unfaltering insistence that government shall really perform its basic and fundamental duty, the protection of the individual citizen from violence and interference.

– Hanford Henderso, *The Freeman* [July 1956]

Five Foundational Truths from James Otis, Jr.

9

James Otis Jr. was one of the most important leaders of the American Revolution – yet today, he is almost completely forgotten. Years before the Declaration of Independence, he laid the intellectual foundation for the revolution by championing natural rights, property rights, and the necessity of resisting tyranny. To commemorate his birthday – February 5, 1725 – this article explores five fundamental truths that Otis taught, truths we ignore at our own peril.

1. Natural Rights: The Foundation of Liberty

James Otis rooted his philosophy in the belief that natural rights are inherent to all individuals, preceding and superseding any government authority. He argued that these rights are not granted by rulers but are an unalienable gift from nature and God.

“There can be no prescription old enough to supersede the law of nature, and the grant of God almighty; who has given to all men a natural right to be free, and they have it ordinarily in their power to make themselves so, if they please.”

This principle echoed John Locke, who described natural liberty as freedom from any superior power on earth, bound only by the law of nature. Otis explained that this principle is the basis of free and independent states:

“This is the liberty of independent states; this is the liberty of every man out of society, and who has a mind to live so; which liberty is only abridged in certain instances, not lost to those who are born in or voluntarily enter into society; this gift of God cannot be annihilated.”

Today, many assume that when the founders and old revolutionaries spoke of “the natural liberty of man,” they deliberately excluded women. But James Otis rejected such a notion outright.

“Are not women born as free as men? Would it not be infamous to assert that the ladies are all slaves by nature?”

Likewise, many today assume they all supported slavery – but, again, that was not the case with Otis.

“The Colonists are by the law of nature free born, as indeed all men are, white or black.”

Citing Montesquieu, he warned that slavery could drive both Europe and America into darkness:

“No better reasons can be given, for enslaving those of any color than such as baron Montesquieu has humorously given, as the foundation of that cruel slavery exercised over the poor Ethiopians; which threatens one day to reduce both Europe and America to the ignorance and barbarity of the darkest age.”

Otis left no room for doubt – he saw slavery as one of the gravest violations of the law of nature.

“Nothing better can be said in favor of a trade, that is the most shocking violation of the law of nature.”

2. No Liberty Without Property Rights. And Consent

For Otis, liberty and property rights were inseparable. He argued that personal security depended on protection from government intrusion:

(10)

"Now one of the most essential branches of English liberty is the freedom of one's house. A man's house is his castle; and whilst he is quiet, he is as well guarded as a prince in his castle."

Property rights were not just about possessions – they were about consent:

"Now can there be any liberty, where property is taken away without consent?"

Without property rights secured by consent, freedom cannot exist. If property can be taken at will, liberty is reduced to nothing more than an illusion, and the people are left in a state of political slavery.

"No man can take my property from me, without my consent: If he does, he deprives me of my liberty, and makes me a slave."

Once property can be seized without consent, no other rights remain secure:

*"For what one civil right is worth a rush, after a man's property is subject to be taken from him at pleasure, without his consent? If a man is not his **own assessor** in person, or by deputy, his liberty is gone, or lays intirely at the mercy of others."*

3. Government Must Have Strict Limits

If government has no strict limits, if those in power can change the law at will, no rights – natural or otherwise – are safe. Otis believed that a constitution must be fixed, not subject to the whims of rulers:

"In all free states, the constitution is fixed."

Because government derives its authority from the constitution, it has no power beyond what is explicitly delegated to it. Even the smallest step beyond constitutional limits sets a dangerous precedent.

"And as the supreme legislative derives its power and authority from the constitution, it cannot overleap the bounds of it without destroying its own foundation."

Any exercise of power beyond the limits of the constitution was, to Otis, nothing but arbitrary rule – one of the grievances included in the Declaration of Independence.

"Arbitrary; which in plain English means no more than do as one pleases."

The preservation of liberty depended on strict adherence to the constitution, which must uphold these key principles:

- To govern by stated laws.
- Those laws should have no other end ultimately, but the good of the people.
- Taxes are not to be laid on the people, but by their consent in person, or by deputation.
- Their whole power is not transferable.

For Otis – anything outside the limits of the constitution was NO LAW AT ALL.

"An act against the constitution is void."

4. Submission and Compliance Guarantees Tyranny

To Otis, a free people were defined by one principle: they obeyed **only** those laws that stayed within the bounds of the constitution – nothing more, nothing less.

"To obey such laws, and submit to such taxations only as we consent to, is the peculiar happiness of British subjects, and the invaluable privilege of Englishmen. This is our felicity, and this is what characterizes us a free people."

He had no patience for those who promoted the opposite – passive obedience:

"He that would palm the doctrine of unlimited passive obedience and non-resistance upon mankind, is not only a fool and a knave, but a rebel against common sense, as well as the laws of God, of Nature, and his Country."

Once people stop resisting tyranny, they are already enslaved:

"It is always safer to oppose any the least infraction of our happy constitution, than prudently to acquiesce for the preservation of peace."

5. To Remain Free, Resistance Must Come Early and Often

Otis' final warning was clear: resistance must be swift and unyielding against even the smallest violation of the constitution or liberty.

"It is my countrymen of the utmost consequence that we boldly oppose the least infraction of our charter, and rights as men."

He invoked a Latin phrase meaning "nip it in the bud":

"Obsta Principiis is a maxim never to be forgot: If we do not resist at the first attack, it may soon be too late."

The Enduring Legacy of James Otis

The principles James Otis Jr. championed were not mere theories – they were essential pillars of liberty that required constant resolve and action:

- Natural rights are the foundation of liberty.
- There is no liberty without property rights and consent.
- Government must have strict limits or it becomes tyranny.
- Submission and compliance guarantee tyranny.
- To remain free, resistance must come early and often.

These truths, once the driving force of the American Revolution, are just as vital today. Disregarding these principles invites the very tyranny James Otis, Jr. warned against.

"So long as people submit to arbitrary measures, so long will they find masters."

Tags: American Revolution, Founding Principles, James Otis, James Otis Jr, Natural Rights, Today in History



Michael Boldin
Michael Boldin [send him email] is the founder of the Tenth Amendment Center. He was raised in Milwaukee, WI, and currently resides in Los Angeles, CA. Follow him on twitter - @michaelboldin and Facebook.

The US Should Not Take Over Gaza

RON PAUL • FEBRUARY 10, 2025 • 500 WORDS • 1 COMMENT Q&A

(12)

This week, President Trump upended US Middle East policy by announcing that the United States would “take over” war-ravaged Gaza and turn it into “the Riviera of the Middle East.” President Trump also said the Palestinians living in Gaza would be (temporarily?) relocated to Jordan or Egypt.

Kentucky Senator Rand Paul came out strongly against the proposal. Senator Paul pointed out that the plan contradicted the American people’s vote for “America First.” What was more surprising was that South Carolina Senator Lindsey Graham expressed skepticism about sending Americans to take over Gaza. This may be the first time in Senator Graham’s political career that he has opposed sending US troops abroad.

Senator Graham is correct that most South Carolinians are not excited about sending Americans or US tax dollars to take over Gaza. Neither are most other Americans. In fact, polls show that the majority of Americans oppose providing military aid to Israel or other countries.

One of the best comments was made by libertarian scholar and podcaster Tom Woods. He suggested that Trump’s Gaza proposal is the type of wasteful overseas spending that DOGE should be working to eliminate.

Trump’s plan has also been criticized by the government of Saudi Arabia. This could mean that if President Trump follows through with this proposal it will further push Saudi Arabia away from the United States and toward the BRICS alliance.

Some of the BRICS nations want to challenge the dollar’s world reserve currency status. One of the foundations of the dollar’s world reserve currency status is the “petrodollar.” This arose from the deal Henry Kissinger negotiated with Saudi Arabia where the Saudis agreed to use dollars for oil trade in exchange for US support for the Saudi regime. Recently, Saudi Arabia has given signs that it will be willing to use other currencies, such as the Chinese renminbi, for its oil trade.

The loss of the dollar’s world reserve currency status would cause a major US economic crisis. It would force the government to make massive cuts in warfare and welfare spending and could lead to violence and a government crackdown on our liberty.

US “ownership” of Gaza, accompanied by forcible relocation of Palestinians, would cause increased resentment of the US. This could result in increased terror attacks against the US.

Even if a long-term US occupation of Gaza went 100 percent according to plan, the US government, which has an over 36 trillion dollars and growing debt, cannot afford another open-ended overseas military commitment. Instead, President Trump should follow through on his campaign rhetoric about withdrawing from unnecessary military commitments. This, not tariffs, will help make America more competitive on the international economy.

The best thing the United States can do to rebuild Gaza and promote peace in the Middle East is to stop funding Israel’s occupation and blockade of Gaza. Instead, the US should work toward peaceful relations backed by free trade with Israel and its neighbors.

We do not take possession of our ideas but are possessed by them. They master us and force us into the arena where like gladiators, we must fight for them.

– Henrich Heine

February 10, 2025

“Hail Caesar! We Who Are About To Die Salute You”

13

One might need to go back to the administration of Grover Cleveland to find a U.S. president who understood, revered and sincerely attempted to honor his oath to the U.S. Constitution. For sure and for certain, America has been under an imperial presidency for the entirety of the 21st century—and that includes 2025 under the presidency of Donald J. Trump.

It's really hard to fathom the utter ignorance of the Constitution, the utter bankruptcy of honesty and fidelity, the depth of moral depravity, the profound indifference to international law, the extreme callousness to the heritage, homes and hearts of people in other lands and the complete abdication of America's sovereignty and national interests to an alien power—namely, Israel—that we saw demonstrated in the presidential administration of Joe Biden and are now seeing in the presidential administration of Donald Trump.

The very first foreign head of state that Trump invited to the White House was Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. And what came out of that meeting is something out of *The Twilight Zone*.

Netanyahu is without a doubt the world's most notorious war criminal and mass murderer—bar none! Instead of putting him in a limousine and driving him to the White House, he should have been met by law enforcement personnel, put in shackles and immediately put on a plane to The Hague to stand trial for International War Crimes, Crimes Against Humanity and Genocide.

Many of us had hoped that perhaps Trump brought *The Monster of the Middle East* to Washington to set him down and tell him in no uncertain terms that the White House was no longer Israel's puppet. Our hopes were dashed. It is business as usual at the Oval Office.

The announcement Trump made in a sit-down next to Netanyahu with reporters is beyond indescribable in its iniquity. I am on record as saying, it is my belief that Benjamin Netanyahu is a demon-possessed madman. I also believe that there are many politicians in D.C.—from both parties—who are demon possessed. And after Tuesday's announcement by Trump, I question who owns the soul of this man.

There is no doubt that Herod the Great was a much greater tool in the hands of Satan than the maniac of Gadara. People in positions of power are the Evil One's greatest assets, as their positions magnify their maliciousness.

From *Zero Hedge*:

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was all smiles as he visited the White House and met with President Trump in the Oval Office Tuesday afternoon, especially given Trump said many things in terms of the future of Gaza that the Israeli leader would welcome.

Trump in an exchange with reporters while sitting next to 'Bibi' continued pressing the idea that Palestinians should be relocated out of Gaza. "There's hardly a building standing, and the ones that are are going to collapse. You can't live in Gaza right now. And I think we need another location," Trump said, echoing prior comments.

Trump stoked further controversy by claiming Palestinians **would "love to leave" Gaza** – comments which have already been condemned by many pundits as tantamount to an ethnic cleansing campaign. Arab leaders too have blasted any plan which would see a mass exodus or removal of Palestinians to neighboring countries.

"Who would want to go back?" Trump posited during the sit-down with Netanyahu. Indeed the place has been leveled, but as the ceasefire has held there's been evidence of a mass return of tens of thousands of Palestinians to their largely destroyed communities in the northern Gaza Strip.

14
"It would be my hope that we could do something really nice where they would not want to return," Trump reasoned, despite the current Israel-Hamas truce calling for future reconstruction of the Strip.

"It doesn't have to be one area, but you take certain areas and **you build really good quality housing, like a beautiful town**, like someplace where they can live and not die," Trump said.

"The U.S. will take over the Gaza Strip, and we will do a job with it, too," Mr. Trump said.

"We'll own it and be responsible for dismantling all of the dangerous unexploded bombs and other weapons on the site, level the site and get rid of the destroyed buildings — level it out. Create an economic development that will supply unlimited numbers of jobs and housing for the people of the area. Do a real job. Do something different."

"Just can't go back," he continued. "If you go back, it's gonna end up the same way it has for a hundred years." —CBS [Emphases in the original]

From Al Jazeera:

United States President Donald Trump has said the US will "take over" and "own" Gaza after resettling Palestinians elsewhere under an extraordinary redevelopment plan that he claimed could turn the enclave into "the Riviera of the Middle East".

"The US will take over the Gaza Strip and we will do a job with it, too. We'll own it," Trump said at the White House after talks with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

In his announcement, Trump suggested the US would take a "long-term ownership position" over the enclave.

"This was not a decision made lightly. Everybody I've spoken to loves the idea of the United States owning that piece of land, developing and creating thousands of jobs with something that will be magnificent," he said.

Asked if US soldiers could be sent to Gaza to maintain security, Trump said it was a possibility.

"As far as Gaza is concerned, we'll do what is necessary. If it's necessary, we'll do that," he said.

Trump is now providing more evidence for what I wrote in this column last week:

Trump is saying it out loud: He intends to displace the remaining Palestinian people in Gaza to the U.S. puppet states of Egypt and Jordan and depopulate Gaza of the Palestinians.

"We just clean out that whole thing [Gaza]."

Trump has now revealed to the whole world—including the Palestinians he lied to in Michigan to obtain their vote—that he is a racist and supports Israel's ethnic cleansing.

This is also part of Trump's deal with the Israeli government and Mossad asset, billionaire Miriam Adelson, for the hundred million dollars they put into Trump's election campaign.

Can we expect to see a new Trump Tower in Gaza? If Trump has his way, Yes.

The Zionists put Biden in office to do the dirty work of helping Israel commit genocide against the Gazan people and completely destroying the infrastructure, making Gaza unlivable.

Now the Zionists have put Trump in office to do the work of moving the remaining Palestinians to U.S. puppet countries (Jordan and Egypt) in order to allow the U.S. and Israel to develop the beachfront property of Gaza on the Mediterranean Sea and seize the oil, natural gas and minerals that exist there—and to also help Israel seize the land in the West Bank.

USMC General Smedley Butler was right: "War is a racket."

By what constitutional, lawful, moral or ethical authority does Trump declare to the world that he is going to *take over*, subjugate and *own* the people and land of a foreign territory? You know the answer: There is no such authority.

Trump is as lawless as Biden.

This is raw imperialism and naked Empire. This is the crime of using power for profit. It reeks of rot and corruption.

The only way Trump can accomplish his pernicious plans is to use the brute force of the U.S. military. So, will America's generals and admirals allow themselves to be used as the slavish instruments of Trump's and Netanyahu's power-lust and greed and issue orders to commit such crimes?

I ask that question, because the **only** way you will displace the Palestinians from their ancestral homeland is with bombs and bullets, which Trump said he is prepared to do.

No! Palestine is NOT the ancestral homeland of Ashkenazi Jews Netanyahu, Ben-Gvir, Smotrich, et al. Their ancestral homeland is Eastern Europe—Ukraine to be specific (which is why they are identified as *Ashkenazi* Jews). The Palestinians can trace their ancestry in Palestine for over one thousand years. Israeli sycophant ex-preacher/politician and now U.S. Ambassador to Israel (actually, he's Israel's pitchman in Washington), Mike Huckabee, is dead wrong when he absurdly spouts that Israel's homeland goes back 3,500 years. No, it doesn't!

The Assyrians destroyed Israel in 722 BC; the Babylonians destroyed Judah in 587 BC; and the Romans destroyed the Jewish remnant in 70 AD. And God has NOT given the land of Palestine to the Jews in perpetuity. I urge readers to watch my message **God's Chosen People**, in which I delve deeply into this subject.

Truly, the emperor Donald Trump *has no clothes*. Tell me how Trump's proclamation differs from those of the Caesars.

Trump's invasion of Gaza would produce revolt, violence, war and bloodshed across Palestine and the Arab world—and perhaps across the whole world.

And while Trump is busy committing ethnic cleansing in Palestine to build his *Riviera of the Middle East*, he wants to take over Greenland (which is the sovereign territory of Denmark)—by force if necessary; and he wants to annex Canada, making it America's 51st state.

It appears that Trump is too stupid to realize that if such a thing happened with Canada, the Republican Party would never again have a majority in either chamber of the U.S. Congress, as Canada's politics are mostly dominated by socialist liberals. Does anyone inside the GOP have the political acumen and internal courage to tell Trump just how idiotic his notions are? Probably not.

So, the American servicemen who are about to be ordered to fight and die invading Gaza to ethnically cleanse the Palestinian people and the opposition forces who will fight and die resisting such tyranny can all chant in unison to Emperor Trump:

"Hail Caesar! We who are about to die salute you."

By Chuck Baldwin
Chuck Baldwin Live

16

Trump: Military Spending Could Be Cut in Half and There's No Reason To Build New Nuclear Weapons

The president said he wants to have a global conference with Russia and China to discuss cutting military spending

by Dave DeCamp / February 13, 2025 at 4:11 pm ET / News / China, Russia

President Trump told reporters on Thursday that he believes US military spending could eventually be cut in half and that he wants to pursue the idea as part of an agreement with Russia and China. He also said there was no reason to build new nuclear weapons.

“At some point, when things settle down, I’m going to meet with China and I’m going to meet with Russia, in particular those two, and I’m going to say there’s no reason for us to be spending almost \$1 trillion on the military ... and I’m going to say we can spend this on other things,” Trump said.

“When we straighten it all out, then one of the first meetings I want to have is with President Xi of China and President Putin of Russia, and I want to say let’s cut our military budget in half. And we can do that, and I think we’ll be able to do that,” he added.

The US spends significantly more on its military than Russia and China combined. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), in 2023, the US accounted for 37% of global military spending. China came in second but was still far behind, accounting for 12% of military spending, and Russia was in third at 4.5%.

Discussing nuclear weapons, Trump said, “There’s no reason for us to be building brand new nuclear weapons. We already have so many you could destroy the world 50 times over or 100 times over. And here we are building new nuclear weapons, and [Russia] is building new nuclear weapons, and China is building new nuclear weapons.”

The US has been working to modernize its nuclear triad, a project that’s expected to cost \$1.5 trillion. Trump also repeated his call to seek “denuclearization” with Russia and said Russian President Vladimir Putin had agreed to do so “in a very big way.”

Trump has previously claimed that he was pursuing denuclearization with Russia and China in his first term in office, but the US also withdrew from key arms control treaties during that time.

Russia recently said the outlook was not good for the state of US arms control as the last nuclear arms control treaty between the two powers is due to expire in February 2026, and there’s currently no replacement. But Trump’s talks with Russian President Vladimir Putin on the Ukraine war could lead to arms control negotiations.

On the other hand, Trump also recently signed an executive order to build a major new missile defense system to cover the US and its military bases abroad, which could lead to a new arms race and will come with a huge price tag. Republicans in Congress are also looking to increase military spending by at least \$100 billion.