

Preparing for War Is an American Institution

By Paul Craig Roberts

PaulCraigRoberts.org

March 29, 2025

JCRMC PACKET

MARCH 31, 2025

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists, and will persist." — President Dwight D. Eisenhower

In the 1960s and 1970s when the US actually had an enemy, though possibly one of our own making, there was a peace movement. It might well have come from left-wing professors in the universities who did not think racist America was worth defending.

In the first quarter of the 21st century, a period of many American wars of choice, there is no peace movement. In her book Joan Roelofs asks:

"Why is there so much acceptance of and so little protest against our government's illegal and immoral wars and other military operations? Why is there mostly silence about the death and destruction that wars and even the preparation for war inflict on people, including the troops, and on the environment? Why is there so little concern about the potential for the extinction of human and other life posed by nuclear war, now seen as an 'option' by the US and other militaries?"

Her answer is in her title: *The Trillion Dollar Silencer*. You might think that the money goes for weapons, but much of it is used to purchase universities and faculties, think tanks, nonprofit organizations, state and local governments, media, contractors, and foreign governments.

The Department of Defense tentacles reach everywhere. With so many so dependent on DOD handouts, there is no one left to protest.

Roelofs' research is exhaustive. She packs an amazing amount of detail including names and monetary amounts in 200 pages. For example, Roelofs explains how the CIA salts money around. The CIA creates dummy foundations and makes grants to them. The dummy foundations then make grants to legitimate foundations, and the foundations pass the money on to the CIA-designated groups.



President Eisenhower warned about the growing power of the military/security complex. Nothing was done about it. The power has grown so great that the Department of Defense cannot pass an audit, and several trillion dollars are unaccounted for. You might remember that whatever it was that hit the Pentagon on 9/11 managed to hit and destroy the offices housing the documents and experts who were searching for where the money had gone, thus bringing the investigation to an end.

In the final chapter Roelofs asks "what can be done?" Her suggestions lack effectiveness. Her book was written prior to the creation of the Department of Government Efficiency. My suggestion is for someone who can get the book into DOGE hands. *The Trillion Dollar Silencer* traces the money flows through so many hands and places that it will save the DOGE staff much work and leave them astonished by the many non-defense uses of defense funds.

It takes character and determination to correct a bad situation. America's predicament is that corruption is so pervasive that challenging it results in career destruction. People have mortgages, car payments, kids in school. Taking exception to corruption is a road to poverty. Perhaps Trump and Musk will be able to do something, or perhaps the Democrat judges will save the day for institutionalized grift.

US Intelligence Says Iran Is 'Not Building a Nuclear Weapon'

Author: Dave DeCamp

The annual Threat Assessment said there's no evidence Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has reversed his ban on producing nuclear weapons

by Dave DeCamp / March 25, 2025 at 2:44 pm ET / News / Iran

US intelligence agencies have reaffirmed that there's no evidence Iran is developing nuclear weapons or that Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei has reversed his 2003 fatwah that banned the production of weapons of mass destruction.

"The IC continues to assess that Iran is not building a nuclear weapon and Supreme Leader Khamenei has not authorized the nuclear weapons program he suspended in 2003," Director of National Intelligence Tulsi Gabbard told a Senate Intelligence Committee hearing.

Gabbard's comments were based on the annual threat assessment, which is released by the ODNI with input from all US intelligence agencies. The report did note that there have been more calls inside Iran to reverse the ban on nuclear weapons, which have grown in response to Israeli aggression in the region.

"In the past year, there has been an erosion of a decades-long taboo on discussing nuclear weapons in public that has emboldened nuclear weapons advocates within Iran's decisionmaking apparatus," the report reads.

"Khamenei remains the final decision maker over Iran's nuclear program, to include any decision to develop nuclear weapons."

The threat assessment comes amid increasing US sanctions and threats of military action over Iran's nuclear program. Iranian officials have rejected the idea of talks with the US in the face of President Trump's "maximum pressure campaign," but have said the door is open for indirect negotiations.

The hype over Iran's nuclear program revolves around the enrichment of some uranium at 60%, the highest level Iran has achieved but still lower than the 90% needed for weapons-grade. Iran first took the step to enrich at 60% in response to a 2021 Israeli sabotage attack against its Natanz nuclear facility, which was meant to sabotage talks between the Biden administration and Tehran.

Iran is still a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and has told the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) that it won't enrich uranium beyond the 60% level.

Amid increasing US and Israeli threats about its nuclear program, Iran has recently pointed out that Israel has a secret nuclear weapons stockpile, and its nuclear program is not subject to IAEA inspections since Israel is not a signatory to the NPT.

Where there is a multitude of specific laws, it is a sign that the state is badly governed.

– Isocrates

A look at the history of Iran's efforts for the nationalization of its oil

March 17, 2025 - 22:21

TEHRAN – Soon after oil was discovered in Iran in 1908 as the first country in the region, colonial powers, particularly Britain and later the United States sought to bring the Iranian national wealth under their control, depriving the impoverished nation of its revenues.

In the absence of a powerful Iranian government during both Qajar and the successor Pahlavi dynasties, the British colonial power used force and abused the weakness of the Iranian state to coerce it into making concessions which allowed foreign companies to control oil extraction and sale. The nationalization of the oil industry was the response to such colonialism. Different weak Iranian monarchs made concessions to colonial powers.

D'Arcy Concession

In 1901, William Knox D'Arcy, a British investor backed by the British government, reached a sixty-year agreement with Mozzafar al-Din Shah of Iran to exploit Iran's potential oil resources. Six years later, in 1907, his exploration efforts paid off and oil was discovered in Masjedsoleyman in the southwestern province of Khuzestan for the first time in the West Asia and southern Persian Gulf regions. Within two years, the Anglo-Persian Oil Company was established to produce and bring Iranian oil to world markets.

After the first Pahlavi king, Reza Shah rose to power with the full support of the British Empire, who helped him to stabilize the country in line with its colonial goals, he began to undo what his Qajar predecessors did. One of Reza Shah's actions was to cancel the 1907 D'Arcy Concession. But his 1933 oil concession was not much in Iran's favor.

Iran's 1933 Oil Concession

The Iranians at the time of Reza Shah were opposed to the D'Arcy Concession as they looked for their inalienable rights and the increasing Iran's share of oil revenues. By contrast, Britain sought to maximize their gains and extend its full control over the natural Iranian resources. The Brits also intended to get a stronger agreement, which had to be ratified in the Iranian parliament in order not to have the weaknesses of the previous concession.

The new 1933 agreement extended the concession for another sixty years, sparking outrage among Iranians who eventually moved towards the 1951 nationalization.

After the ratification of the 1933 agreement, an amount of pound sterling was deposited into Reza Shah's account at Lloyd's Bank in London, while the small amount of money as Iran's share in the agreement was spent by Reza Shah and his inner circle as they wished.

In the meantime, the British were engaged in a rivalry with the Russians over gaining control over the Iranians' wealth.

Formation of the nationalization of the Iranian oil industry movement

The movement to nationalize the oil industry was a reaction by the Iranians to concessions made by both Qajar and Pahlavi Shahs to foreign powers. The movement was originated in the parliament.

The movement was led by lawmaker Mohammad Mosaddegh, who later became prime minister.

The British and Soviet troops invaded Iran in 1941, toppled Reza Shah, and occupied the country. The British removed Reza Shah and sent him into exile while Iran remained under Allied occupation until 1946. When the young Mohammad Reza replaced his father as the new Pahlavi king, the anti-colonial oil nationalization movement had become too strong to suppress. In the meantime, the senior cleric Ayatollah Abol-Ghasem Kashani was leading a powerful popular movement outside the parliament against foreign interference in the country's affairs.

Anyway, the weakness of Mohammad Reza Shah's regime benefitted the movement in the period after World War II. Different political groups emerged and the oil movement gradually got more and more powerful.

As time passed, the United States joined the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union to gain control of the Iranian oil industry. The religious movement led by Ayatollah Kashani and the National Front headed by Mosaddegh, who were both MPs from the capital Tehran constituency at the 16th parliament, were strongly in favor of nationalizing the oil industry in the parliament. Ayatollah Kashani's house had already become a center for popular gatherings and opponents of the Shah-appointed prime ministers Abdolhossein Hazhir (1948), Ali Mansour (1950), and Haj Ali Razmara (1951) governments.

After Prime Minister Razmara was assassinated by a member of the religious movement Fada'iyān-e Islam, the 16th parliament led the process of approving the legislation to nationalize the oil industry and the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AIOC). Finally, on March 15, 1951, the legislation was approved and it was verified by the parliament two days later on March 17.

Mohammad Reza Shah reverses course on nationalization of oil industry

After the piece of legislation to nationalize the oil industry was passed, the next month in April, Mosaddegh was introduced as prime minister by Shah Pahlavi under immense pressure from the parliament. Consequently, he served as the 35th Iranian prime minister from 1951 to 1953.

The young Shah along with the UK and the U.S. could not stand the nationalization of the oil industry and the democratically-elected Mosaddegh. For that, they overthrew his government in the 1953 coup d'état which was orchestrated by the intelligence agencies of the United Kingdom (MI6) and the United States (CIA).

In the aftermath of the coup, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi could reassert his autocratic control and negotiated the 1954 Consortium Agreement with the British, which returned the ownership of Iranian oil to a consortium of Western companies until 1979, the year the Islamic Revolution became victorious.

THE WANDERER An Unhappy Anniversary

3/6/2025

Eighty-two years ago, Sophie Scholl and her brother Hans, both students at the University of Munich, were found guilty of sedition by a Nazi court and sent to the guillotine the same afternoon.

The Scholls were members of the White Rose, a peace movement that anonymously distributed flyers in universities throughout the country.

Nazi prosecutors reportedly offered her a reduced sentence if she would testify against her brother. She refused.

"Sie werden stehen wo ich stehe," the 23-year-old Sophie told Judge Roland Freisler, when he announced the death sentence.

"You will be standing where I'm standing."

That prediction was fulfilled in every detail.

After the Reichstag fire in 1933, Adolf Hitler had formed "The People's Court" and put Freisler, state secretary of the Reich Ministry of Justice at the time, in charge. By 1943, Freisler had sent some 5,000 "enemies of the Reich" to their deaths.

Most notorious of his victims were the conspirators in the July 1944 plot against Hitler. Hitler had insisted that Freisler conduct the trial.

"You will be standing where I'm standing," Sophie Scholl told Fre-

By CHRISTOPHER MANION

isler at her trial.

Well, he didn't have to — he was killed on Feb. 3, 1945 by American bombers. He had reportedly run back to his office to retrieve the files on trial of Fabian von Schlabrendorff, the last of the July conspirators, whom he was hoping to send to his death that very afternoon.

Freisler was found crushed to death by a fallen column while clutching the case files in the anteroom of the judicial chamber in which he had convicted the Scholls.

"It is God's verdict," one hospital worker reportedly said when Freisler's body was brought in.

Fabian von Schlabrendorff was later sent to a concentration camp; after liberation, he served on the prosecution staff at the Nuremberg trials and eventually became a member of Germany's highest constitutional court.

While Sophie and Hans Scholl were gone, their message lived on. Word of the pamphlets made its way back to Britain, and the Royal Air Force began reproducing them and dropped White Rose flyers all over Germany.

Even in death, Hans Scholl and Sophie Scholl could not be silenced.

"How can we expect righteousness to prevail when there is hardly anyone willing to give himself up individually to a righteous cause," Sophie Scholl asked just before her sentence was carried out. "Such a fine, sunny day, and I have to go, but what does my death matter, if through us, thousands of people are awakened and stirred to action?"

And a curious historical footnote: In 2005, a documentary appeared in Germany describing the life of Traudl Junge, whose typing skills had qualified her for the job of Adolf Hitler's stenographer in 1943. She stayed on the job until Hitler's April 1945 death in "The Bunker." In the movie, Junge recalls how, after the war, she passed a statue near her home in Munich erected to the memory of a young student.

That student was Sophie Scholl. Traudl realized that she and Sophie were the same age in 1943 when she began working for Hitler, and Freisler was conducting Sophie's trial. The film depicted Junge as completely clueless for her entire life until that moment. "I really sensed it was no excuse to be young and that it might have been possible to find out what was going on," she said.

Would It be Okay for Hamas to Strike a Hospital Treating Benjamin Netanyahu?

JONATHAN COOK • MARCH 24, 2025 •

Israel has justified bombing a Gaza hospital, killing civilians, because an injured Hamas politician was there. The laws of war only ever seem to be forgotten when it is Israel violating them

Israel and its genocide cheerleaders are claiming Israel's **air strike** on the Nasser Hospital in Gaza last night – which killed several patients and staff – was justified because a Hamas politician was being treated there for injuries from an earlier Israeli strike.

Israel has also seized on the fact that a Hamas official was in the hospital to **retroactively rationalise** its destruction of Gaza's entire health sector, leaving more than 2 million Palestinians with barely functioning medical care in the midst of Israel's genocidal bombing campaign.

At the weekend, the Israeli army blew up the entire Turkish Hospital in Gaza and did so without any possible military justification. Its soldiers had been occupying the hospital, using it as a military post, for much of the past year.

The hospital had served its purpose for Israel – and Israel sees no purpose for Palestinian hospitals actually serving the Palestinian population. After all, Israel's goal is to drive Palestinians out of Gaza, and that is made easier if Palestinians have no surviving medical facilities in the enclave.

Once again, Israel's "justification" for the latest attack on Nasser Hospital doesn't even bother to suggest it accords with any known principle of international law.

Here are a few reminders about the long-established laws of war that only ever seem to be forgotten when it is Israel violating them.

Even fighters are considered non-combatants – that is, not legitimate targets for military attack – when they are injured and no longer engaged in combat. That rule applies even more obviously to politicians.

All Israel's hospitals, such as Rambam in Haifa, regularly treat **Israeli soldiers injured in combat**. Israeli hospitals are doing so right now – Israel makes no secret of this.

No one, least of all the people defending last night's attack on Nasser Hospital in Gaza, would for one moment consider it legitimate for Hamas to bomb Rambam Hospital, killing patients and staff there, to hit an injured soldier being treated at the facility.

But what Israel did is even more clearly a violation of the laws of war because it bombed the hospital to hit an injured Hamas politician, not a fighter.

That is the equivalent of Hamas striking a hospital in Israel, killing Israeli staff and patients, to assassinate an Israeli politician.

Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu recently **spent several days** in the Hadassah Ein Kerem Hospital in Jerusalem for a prostate operation.

Had Hamas hit the hospital, can one imagine Israel and its supporters – or western politicians and media – accepting that as legitimate grounds for a military attack? The question doesn't even need asking.

The only reason it is okay for Israel to attack a Palestinian hospital, killing Palestinian civilians, to assassinate a Palestinian politician is because the western political and media class are out-and-out anti-Palestinian racists.

Palestinian life is meaningless to them. Israel calls Palestinians ‘human animals’ – and western leaders secretly concur.

Once Jews were seen that way – as human animals. Their lives were worthless. They were killed on an industrial scale across Europe.

Today’s Europe is no different, nor is the US. It’s just that Jews are no longer the objects of the West’s institutional racism and its structural violence. Palestinians are.

The West’s racism that led to the Holocaust is still with us. We have not learnt from history. Our politics has not evolved beyond that of our great-grandparents’ generation. The Gaza genocide is our generation’s Holocaust. And we are equally complicit.

White House: Trump ‘Fully Supports’ Israel’s Gaza Slaughter

The State Department said the US 'stands with Israel in every circumstance'

by Dave DeCamp / March 20, 2025 at 1:01 pm ET / News / Gaza, Israel

White House Press Secretary Karoline Leavitt said Thursday that President Trump “fully supports” Israel’s renewed massive bombing campaign in Gaza, which has killed at least 200 children since Tuesday.

“The president made it very clear to Hamas that if they did not release all of the hostages, there would be all hell to pay. Unfortunately, Hamas chose to play games in the media with lives,” Leavitt told reporters.

The US and Israel are blaming Hamas for the lack of a continued ceasefire and hostage releases. But it was Israel that repeatedly violated the deal signed in January, which would have led to the release of all Israeli captives, a permanent truce, and Israeli withdrawal from Gaza.

Leavitt said that President Trump “fully supports Israel and the IDF and the actions that they’ve taken in recent days.”

On Wednesday, the State Department also affirmed the administration’s unconditional support for Israel. State Department spokeswoman Tammy Bruce said the US will “stand with Israel in every circumstance.”

When asked about the massive child casualties in the Israeli bombing, Bruce pinned the blame on Hamas. “So it’s a shame that Hamas has allowed this to occur, but look nowhere else other than the people who have facilitated this suffering from the beginning,” she said.

Bruce claimed that the administration wants peace, but President Trump has emboldened Netanyahu and his government by supplying huge amounts of military aid and repeatedly calling for the permanent expulsion of Palestinians from Gaza instead of pressuring Israel to implement the deal it signed in January.

Author: Dave DeCamp

HOLY PLACES

How Beautiful upon the Mountains

— Anthony Esolen —

“OF WHAT ARE CALLED THE *rights of man*,” wrote the aged Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Tametsi*, late in the year 1900, just at the turn of a new century, “the many have heard enough. Let them hear once in a while about the rights of God.” He wrote those words *because* he loved mankind, *because* he longed for man to prosper in true peace. So great are the benefits that Christ has brought to man, he says, that “to have known him and then to repudiate or to forget him is a crime so foul and mad, it hardly seems possible that a man could be guilty of it.”

Yet how often do we wish to keep Christ *out* of special portions of our lives, as if we, as our own creators, should place a boundary upon him, and say, “Thus far, and no farther”?

■ CHRISTIAN NATIONS AT WAR ■

These were the days when an appeal in the name of Christ might move political mountains. And for the nations of Chile and Argentina, it was urgent that it should be so. They were young and vigorous, but edging to the precipice of war. That was because rich lands in the mountain passes between the two had been discovered, and nobody quite knew to whom they should belong. Some of them included rivers that flowed *west* into Chile and the Pacific Ocean, rather than east into Argentina and the Atlantic. So each nation was busy building warships. The total territory at issue was by no means insignificant: some 80,000 square miles, about the size of the entire island of Great Britain.

It wasn't as if the countries could afford to do it. The coastline of Chile would extend from the Arctic Ocean to the Rio Grande, but in all that long strip there are only three or four good harbors. Friendship between the two and communication by rail would help alleviate the need for their ships to round the ever-dangerous Cape Horn. Central Chile has some of the richest farmland in the world. The Pampas of Argentina is a rancher's paradise. Self-interest alone, you would think, would bring them to trade in peace, but it was as the pope had said: When you *forget* Christ, you may as well toss even your earthly good to the winds.

And the hatred had been long building up. Here is an excerpt from an article in the *New York Sun*, on March 22, 1896:

“Not only is a war impending here, but it is certain to be a war of sufficient magnitude to command the attention of the civilized world. Troops to the numbers of tens of thousands armed with the most modern weapons and appliances will meet in the open field, while cruisers of the very best English make will go hunting each other on the high seas.... The men on each side will be actuated by a hatred that has long been cultivated, and they will fight as the panther and the jaguar of La Plata's prairies do for the possession of a steer's carcass. No one need doubt...that the war, if there be a war, will be the bloodiest known to the history of South America.”

But the people of Chile and Argentina had not forgotten Christ after all.

■ A GOOD WOMAN, GOOD BISHOPS, AND HONEST MEN ■

“War may dazzle men with its lightning flashes of military glory,” wrote Ángela de Oliveira César de Costa, in *The Independent*, a Congregationalist journal published in what she called “the great, opulent, and philanthropic Republic of the United States of the North.” But, she went on, “for us women it represents only tears and pain.” So she, an Argentinian, had for some years been working to bring peace between her country and Chile, and it was her idea, more

than anyone else's, to erect a statue of Christ the Redeemer, and to place it atop the highest pass along the border of the two nations, in the Andes Mountains.

Señora de Costa was not just a woman with a daydream. She was the leader of the Christian Mothers' Association of Buenos Aires, perhaps the largest such association in the world. You may ask, “How could these women exert any influence, when they did not have the vote?” And indeed, Señora de Costa was active on that front too, as was *The Independent*. But we should not underestimate the moral power of those women who had no personal political ambitions and who therefore could not be bought or sold. When they made alliance with the bishop Marcelino Benevento, of Cuyo—an Argentinian diocese bordering on the mountains from the east—they gained also the attention of the Chilean bishops, and that got things going. It helped, too, that Señora de Costa was a personal friend of the president of Argentina, and that the leaders of both nations were Catholics, and they too understood that Christ was the true and only Prince of Peace.

So Chile and Argentina did something that had never been done in the history of the world. They submitted their conflict to arbitration by a *third nation*: the British government, under Edward VII. Let's think about this. Imagine that the Roman republic and the Carthaginian empire appeal to Ptolemy IV in Egypt to settle their differences. Not in a thousand years! He would try to gobble them up himself if he could. But then, Britain too was a Christian nation, and the British negotiators went over the claims, one by one, mile by mile, awarding this to Chile and that to Argentina, roughly half of the disputed regions to each. What appeared to be a terrible war that might have drawn in other South American nations never occurred.

■ CHRIST OF THE ANDES ■

We are atop the Uspallata Pass in the Andes, almost 13,000 feet above sea level. The date is March 13, 1904. Several hundred dignitaries are present, including soldiers from Argentina, stationed on the Chilean side of the border, and soldiers from Chile, stationed on the Argentinian side. Shots *are* fired: shots of salute, of celebration.

A bronze statue of Christ, holding the cross in his left hand and extending a blessing of peace with his right hand, stands tall on the summit, facing Argentina. The Chileans didn't at first cotton to that, till someone suggested that it was just right, because Argentina needed more watching. The statue, with its massive granite pedestal, is more than sixty feet tall. There are two plaques upon the base. One of them reads: “He is our peace who has made us one.” The other, added later, reads: “Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentinians and Chileans break the peace sworn at the feet of Christ the Redeemer.” They have come close to breaking that peace, most notably in the late 1970s. But they have not broken it.

You can thread your slow, white-knuckled way up to the monument by a gravel road with dozens of hairpin turns and no guardrails. The road is closed during the winter months, and in fact the highest recorded temperature there has been but 20° C (68° F), and snow can fall at any time. Señora de Costa tried to raise money internationally to build a hospice on one of the slopes nearby, to house pilgrims and travelers, such as the monks of Saint Bernard used to build high in the Alps, but that noble dream was never realized.

If we suppose that the statue is well placed high in the mountains because that happened to be the border between the quarreling nations, Señora de Costa was of another opinion. Maybe she knew of Dante, who situated his Purgatory as an island mountain in the sea, in the southern hemisphere, exactly opposite the globe from Calvary, the mountain that makes purgatory a possibility for us. For she

was thinking of that other mount, which is in its eternal significance far higher than Everest, far higher than any peak in the mighty Andes. "Who could more rightfully occupy the highest summit on earth," she wrote, "than He who for twenty centuries has occupied in the history of humanity that topmost summit which touches the sky and is called 'Golgotha'?"

May we too never forget the true and only Prince of

Peace, and may we confess, with the good Pope Leo who worked so hard for peace among nations, that there is not one moment of our lives and not one inch of our being that does not belong to Christ.

(Anthony Esolen is translator of Augustine's Confessions (TAN), translator and editor of Dante's Divine Comedy (Random House), and author of four volumes of essays, How the Church Has Changed the World (MAGNIFICAT).

President Trump: Stop Bombing Yemen and Exit the Middle East!

by Ron Paul / March 18, 2025

Over the weekend President Trump ordered a massive military operation against the small country of Yemen. Was Yemen in the process of attacking the United States? No. Did the President in that case go to Congress and seek a declaration of war against the country? No. The fact is, Yemen hadn't even threatened the United States before the bombs started falling.

Last year, candidate Trump strongly criticized the Biden Administration's obsession with foreign interventionism to the detriment of our problems at home. In an interview at the Libertarian National Convention, he criticized Biden's warmongering to podcaster Tim Pool, saying, "You can solve problems over a telephone. Instead they start dropping bombs. Recently, they're dropping bombs all over Yemen. You don't have to do that."

Yet once in office, Trump turned to military force as his first option. Since the Israel/Hamas ceasefire plan negotiated by President Trump's special envoy Steve Witkoff, Yemen has left Red Sea shipping alone. However, after Israel implemented a total blockade of humanitarian relief to citizens of Gaza last week, Houthi leaders threatened to again begin blocking Israel's Red Sea shipping activities.

That was enough for President Trump to drop bombs and launch missiles for hours, killing several dozen Yemeni civilians – including women and children – in the process.

After the attack, Trump not only threatened much more force to be used against Yemen, but he also threatened Iran. His National Security Advisor Mike Waltz added that the US may start bombing Iranian ships in the area, a move that would certainly lead to a major Middle East war.

Like recent Presidents Bush and Obama, candidate Trump promised peace after four years of Joe Biden's warmongering and World War III brinkmanship. There is little doubt that with our war-weary population this proved the margin of his victory. Unfortunately, as with Bush and Obama, now that he is President, he appears to be heading down a different path.

The Republican Party is gradually becoming a pro-peace, America first party, but the warmongers and neocons of the old line in the Party are not going to let go so easily. Unfortunately many of these dead-enders have found their way to senior positions in Trump's Administration, with voices of restraint and non-intervention nearly nowhere in sight among his top tier of advisors.

To solve the Yemen problem we must understand it: Russian and Chinese ships, for example, are not being threatened because they are not enabling the Israeli demolition of Gaza. The slaughter there has been facilitated with US money and US weapons. It is the US doing Israel's bidding both in Gaza and in the Red Sea that is painting a target on us and unnecessarily putting our troops at risk of retaliation.

The US government, starting with Biden and continuing now with Trump, seems eager to make this our war even though, as Rep. Thomas Massie pointed out over the weekend, Red Sea shipping is of minor importance to the US economy.

In a real "America first" foreign policy we would be following the Russian and Chinese lead and staying out of the conflict. It's not our war. End US military involvement in the Middle East and our troubles disappear. It really is that simple.

Norway's Nonviolent Resistance in WWII: The Power of a Paperclip, Part 3

by Wendy McElroy



Vidkun Quisling had good reason to be angry, but cracking down could backfire badly, as an earlier encounter should have taught him. On May 22, 1942, Quisling arrived at the Stabekk gymnasium (high school) in the company of the Minister of Education and the head of the national police. Twenty members of the Hird surrounded the school and forced the teachers to attend a meeting. Quisling raged at the assembly, ending his rant with the words, "You teachers have destroyed everything for me!" These words become a badge of honor for resisters, and they were repeated throughout Norway. Meanwhile, teachers at the school meeting were arrested. The next day, a handful of teachers who had been absent entered the town's prison, stating, "We should be arrested, too."

Perhaps realizing the futility of his iron hand policies and not wishing to increase resistance, Quisling allowed some teachers to be released. Although disease was not widespread at Kirkenes, many prisoners were so starved and depleted they were unable to do hard labor. In the wake of a doctor's report, the Germans announced that 150 teachers would be sent home. (Richard Bartlett Gregg places the number at 50, but 150 derives from a first-hand account.)

The strategy of resistance

There was a catch. They were required to sign a statement declaring they would resume their teaching as members of the new Nazi union. In last-minute discussions, the teachers who would be left behind debated. Some argued that signing was a personal decision for which no one should be criticized. Most believed that, as in actual war, it is sometimes prudent for the wounded or ill to leave the front lines and work for the cause as noncombatants. The 150 signed. In a bitter irony, however, their declarations never left Kirkenes and were never

used for propaganda by Quisling or the Germans. By the end of August, the teachers were welcomed home as national heroes.

On September 16, another group of about 100 teachers went home without signing statements.

Approximately 400 prisoners remained. As winter drew near and temperatures plunged below freezing, they worried about surviving an Arctic winter. Happily, on November 4, the remaining teachers were loaded onto a steamer to make the 16-day trip south. They signed no statements.

The teachers' protest was a near total victory against Quisling's dream of corporatism.

As with the teachers released earlier, people flocked to the stations to sing songs and applaud the national heroes. People brought flowers and scarce food to their homes, where notes of congratulation filled mailboxes. Eight months to the day of his arrest, on November 20, Haakon Holmboe arrived home to a proud wife. She admitted that when he had been called up years ago to defend against the German invasion, "I felt my knees were cut off. Later, when the war came, and he was arrested twice, I felt more and more quiet." Over and over, teachers and their families credited the solidarity of Norwegians and the strength of nonviolent resistance with allowing them to persist.

Sweet victory

The teachers' protest was a near total victory against Quisling's dream of corporatism. His new teachers' organization never came into being, and Norwegian schools never taught fascist propaganda. After Quisling's pilot program for the corporative state failed so miserably, Hitler personally intervened to order the complete abandonment of the plan. Equally importantly, the teachers had weathered the occupation in such a manner as to retain their self-respect; this meant their postwar lives could truly go back to normal. Largely because of the teachers' protest, historians have described the occupation of Norway as "an unconditional ideological defeat upon Nazism."

The teachers did not use nonviolent resistance because they rejected violence. "We also had military organisations during the occupation," Holmboe said. In fact, "many of the teachers, including myself, were active in organising illegal military groups when we got

the opportunity. We were willing to use weapons when we had them."

Years later, Gene Sharp interviewed Holmboe and asked what he had learned from the Teachers' Protest. Holmboe replied, "For the first time the Norwegian people had experience with nonviolent resistance and realised that the leaders of nonviolent resistance were as courageous and clever as those fighting in the ordinary way."

Holmboe also learned the dynamics of successful nonviolent resistance. A sense of solidarity was essential, for example, because participants needed to know "that others will do it too." In turn, such unity depended on an elaborate contact system to create a commonality of knowledge and purpose. To preserve the lessons of the Teachers' Protest and nonviolent resistance in general, Holmboe suggested setting up a special "nonviolent defence academy" where people could study past struggles, the necessary dynamics, and how to implement nonviolence against tyranny.

The legacy of resistance

In its day, the teachers' protest received international acclaim. President Franklin D. Roosevelt paid tribute to Norway's resistance, both military and nonviolent, in a speech known as "Look to Norway." On September 16, 1942, he declared, "If there is anyone who doubts the democratic will to win ... let him look to Norway ... Norway, at once conquered and unconquerable.... At home, the Norwegian people have silently resisted the invader's will with grim endurance."

Holmboe suggested setting up a special "nonviolent defence academy" where people could study past struggles.

Today, outside of Norway, the teachers' protest has been all but forgotten. Indeed, Norwegians themselves are in danger of forgetting the teachers' protest. In "Tyranny Could Not Quell Them," Sharp speculated as to why:

Over the years ... a change in attitude toward the various types of resistance seems to be taking place. There have been practically no major efforts to keep the idea of non-violent resistance alive in people's minds, as there has been for the military method which has had the added advantage of long acceptance and tradition.

The advantage of nonviolent resistance — the main lesson of the teachers' protest — is that tyrants depend on the people's support. No government can stand if obedience must be commanded literally at the point of a gun. Quisling understood this point when he wrote to Hitler in 1944 with words of advice on Germany's Eastern Front: "Russia cannot be held without the support of the population."

The reason why was enunciated centuries ago by a 16th-century Frenchman, Estienne de la Boetie, in his essay "Discourse of Voluntary Servitude":

If not one thing is yielded to them [tyrants], if, without any violence they are simply not obeyed, they become naked

and undone and as nothing, just as, when the root receives no nourishment, the branch withers and dies.... Resolve to serve no more, and you are at once freed. I do not ask that you place hands upon the tyrant to topple him over, but simply that you support him no longer; then you will behold him, like a great Colossus whose pedestal has been pulled away, fall of his own weight and break in pieces.

A better description of Quisling's downfall could not be rendered.

The teachers' protest was a remarkable example of how nonviolent resistance can topple a Colossus; it accomplished goals beyond

the reach of military power. It did not prove nonviolence is always preferable to military means but, at the very least, it showed that sometimes it is. The courage and resolve of the teachers equaled that of any soldier on a battlefield. Perhaps the strongest lesson is this: those who seek resolution through peaceful means are not utopian idealists while those who bomb strangers are the realists. It is possible to be both idealistic and realistic, with no tension between the two.

Wendy McElroy is an author for The Future of Freedom Foundation, a fellow of the Independent Institute, and the author of The Reasonable Woman: A Guide to Intellectual Survival (Prometheus Books, 1998).

Secret Side Deal With US Gave Israel Free Hand to Keep Attacking Throughout Lebanon Ceasefire

Lebanon was aware of secret agreement but did not sign it

by Jason Ditz / March 12, 2025 at 12:09 pm ET / News / Israel, Lebanon, US

Virtually from the moment the Israel-Lebanon ceasefire deal was signed in November, there have been reports that the US assured Israel they could both sign the ceasefire and be totally free to keep carrying out attacks on Hezbollah.

Sources are now reporting that not only did that happen, but that the US and Israel actually signed a secret agreement with respect to the ceasefire the US was supposed to enforce. Lebanon was made aware of the secret deal, though they never signed or approved of it.

This revelation now provides context to the in excess of 1,000 ceasefire violations Israel has committed since November 27, and why the US did absolutely nothing about it. Israel has continued near-daily attacks on southern Lebanon, and spent months after the ceasefire was agreed burning homes in southern villages.

It was unlikely that Israel would've agreed to a ceasefire if it came with the presumption they could actually have to cease firing. Israel has presented each attack they carried out as an "imminent threat" posed by Hezbollah, even though Hezbollah has not carried out a single attack on Israel since the ceasefire was agreed upon.

Lebanese MPs have been complaining about the secret agreement in recent days. The US National Security Council claimed the existence of the agreement was "not true," but refused to answer any followup questions about why Israel keeps carrying out attacks without a US reaction.

The secret agreement and the continued attacks cast a pall over ongoing US efforts to start mediation of border disputes between Israel and Lebanon. Israeli officials have suggested that the aim of the new talks about Israeli occupations of the Shebaa Farms, the ongoing military presence inside southern Lebanon, and other issues could lead to "normalization" with Lebanon.

The Lebanese PM's office insisted the talks are not in any way a path to normalization on their own. Rather, they say the new committee discussions on border issues are part of UN Resolution 1701, and that there are still no direct talks with Israel ongoing.

In the meantime, the tensions remain palpable at the border, with Israeli airstrikes continuing. Lebanese troops reportedly removed barbed wire from the area of Barkat Risha, in the south of the Tyre District along the Israel border. The wire was left there by Israeli occupation forces.

A Brief History of the Freedom of Speech

by Andrew P. Napolitano / March 27, 2025

“I disagree with what you say but will defend to the death your right to say it.”

~ Voltaire (1694-1778)

When Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, he included in it a list of the colonists' grievances with the British government. Notably absent were any complaints about infringement upon speech.

In those days, speech was as acerbic as it is today. If words were aimed at Parliament, all words were lawful. If they were aimed directly and personally at the king – as Jefferson's were in the Declaration – they constituted treason.

Needless to say, Jefferson and his 55 colleagues who signed the Declaration would all have been hanged for treasonous speech had the British prevailed.

Of course, the colonists won the war, and, six years afterward, the 13 states voluntarily ratified the Constitution. Two years after ratification, the Constitution was amended by adding the Bill of Rights.

James Madison, who drafted the Bill of Rights, insisted upon referring to speech as “the” freedom of speech, so as to emphasize that it preexisted the government. He believed the freedom of speech was one of the inalienable rights Jefferson wrote about in the Declaration.

Stated differently, each of the ratifiers of the Bill of Rights manifested in writing their unambiguous understanding that the freedom of speech is a natural right – personal to every human. It does not come from the government. It comes from within us. It cannot be taken away by legislation or executive command. It does not require a permission slip.

Yet, a mere seven years later, during the presidency of John Adams, Congress enacted the Alien and Sedition Acts, which punished speech critical of the government.

How could the same generation – in some cases, the same human beings – that prohibited congressional infringement upon speech have enacted a statute that punished speech?

To some of the framers — the Federalists, who wanted a leviathan central government as we have today – infringing upon the freedom of speech meant only silencing it before it was uttered. Today, this is called prior restraint, and the Supreme Court has essentially outlawed it.

To the anti-federalists – who believed the central government was a limited voluntary compact of states — the First Amendment prohibited Congress from interfering with or punishing any speech.

The Adams administration indicted, prosecuted and convicted anti-federalists – among them a congressman – for their critical speech.

When Jefferson won the presidency and the anti-federalists won control of Congress, the Federalists repealed three of the four Alien and Sedition Acts on the eve of their departure from congressional control, lest any be used against them.

During the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln locked up hundreds of journalists in the North – including a congressman – who were critical of his war efforts. During World War I, President Woodrow Wilson arrested students for reading the Declaration of Independence aloud at draft offices or singing German beer hall songs.

Lincoln argued that preserving the Union was more important than preserving the First Amendment, and Wilson argued that the First Amendment only restrained Congress, not the president. Both arguments have since been rejected by the courts.

In the 1950s, the feds successfully prosecuted Cold War dissenters on the theory that their speech was dangerous and might have a tendency to violence. Some of the victims of this torturous rationale died in prison; two were executed.

The government's respect for speech has waxed and waned. It is at its lowest ebb during

wartime. Of course, dissent during wartime – which challenges the government's use of lethal force – is often the most important and timely speech.

It was not until 1969, in a case called *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, that the Supreme Court gave us a modern definition of the freedom of speech. Clarence Brandenburg harangued an Ohio crowd and urged them to march to Washington and take back the federal government from Blacks and Jews, whom he argued were in control. He was convicted in an Ohio state court of criminal syndicalism – the use of speech to arouse others to violence.

The Supreme Court unanimously reversed his conviction and held that all innocuous speech is absolutely protected, and all speech is innocuous when there is time for more speech to rebut it. The same Supreme Court had just ruled in *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan* that the whole purpose of the First Amendment is to encourage and protect open, wide, robust, even caustic, hateful and unbridled speech.

In both cases, the court recognized that the speech we love needs no protection; the speech we hate does; and the government has no business evaluating the content of speech.

Yet, in perilous times like the present, we have seen the government arrest folks and deport them because of their expressive activities – speech and assembling with those of like mind.

A New York City college student who is a permanent resident alien now sits in jail in Louisiana because he spoke out in favor of a Palestinian state – a position that has been the public policy of the U.S. since 1948. A Rhode Island medical school professor, also a permanent resident alien, was sent to her native Lebanon because she attended a funeral of which the feds did not approve.

Punishing speech and association is the most dangerous business because it is subjective and value-free and there will be no end to it. The remedy for hateful or threatening speech is more speech – speech that challenges the speaker.

Why do folks in government want to silence their opponents? They must fear an undermining of their power. The dissenters might make more appealing arguments than they do. St. Augustine taught that nearly all in government want to tell others how to live.

We have hired a government to protect our speech, not to tell us how to live. Instead, it does whatever will keep it in power.

Andrew P. Napolitano, a former judge of the Superior Court of New Jersey, is the senior judicial analyst at Fox News Channel. Judge Napolitano has written seven books on the US Constitution. The most recent is Suicide Pact: The Radical Expansion of Presidential Powers and the Lethal Threat to American Liberty. To learn more about Judge Andrew Napolitano, visit <https://JudgeNap.com>.

Henry [VIII], for reasons of state, made himself Supreme Head of the Church, and made it a capital offense to say that he was not. Then, finding it inconvenient that [St. Thomas] More should live, Henry had him put to death by perjury. We may hold that such a judicial murder is contrary to Divine and Natural Law; or we may hold that it was merely a matter of taste and policy how the all-competent state disposed of the lives and bodies of inconvenient persons. But we must decide for one or the other.

– Raymond Wilson Chambers,
The Place of St. Thomas More in English Literature and History [1937]

We Are All Amalekites

By Chuck Baldwin

Chuck Baldwin Live

March 28, 2025

Israeli leaders constantly refer to the Palestinian people as being “Amalekites.” But their Jewish supremacy goes even further than that. Benjamin Netanyahu and his fellow Zionists constantly refer to the Palestinian people (the “Amalekites”) as “animals” and “subhuman” that can be mercilessly tortured and killed with moral and civil impunity.

The Amalekites during the days of Moses were the descendants of Esau, the son of Isaac and brother of Jacob—so they were biologically the nephews and nieces of Jacob (renamed “Israel” by Jehovah). The point being, the Old Testament Scriptures make it clear that the Amalekites were **people (human beings)**—even kinsmen of the Israelites.

The God of Abraham and Moses never regarded the Amalekites as anything other than people—wicked people, but people nonetheless. In fact, God dealt with the Amalekites with great longsuffering and grace, waiting over 400 years before bringing divine judgment upon them, thus giving the people of Amalek time to turn from their wickedness and find mercy and forgiveness with God. Why? Because God loves mankind, as we are all made in His image, conceived with an immortal soul. God gave His only begotten Son to die for the sins of mankind—clearly meaning that all mankind possesses an eternal soul.

The greatest-of-all Bible commentators, Matthew Henry (1662 – 1714), wrote in his commentaries regarding the Old Covenant wars of Israel:

In dealing with the worst of enemies, the laws of justice and honour must be observed.

“The laws of justice and honour [the Laws of Nature] must be observed” because even one’s enemy is a human being made in God’s image and, therefore, is a candidate for God’s mercy and redemption.

I invite readers to watch my first message in my series of messages entitled ***By What Authority Does Zionist Israel Commit Mass Murder Against Women And Children? A Clinical Study Of The Destruction Of The Amalekites And The Old Covenant Laws Of War.***

[Watch it here.](#)

But the philosophy of the Donald Trump administration is that **anyone** can be designated as a *Palestinian*, meaning an *Amalekite*, undeserving of Natural or constitutional rights.

“He’s not Jewish anymore. He’s a Palestinian.”

With [these words](#), [US](#) President Donald Trump did not merely insult Democratic Senator Chuck Schumer – he exposed something far more insidious. In Trump’s world, [Palestinian](#) is not just a nationality. It is an accusation, a sentence of exile, a mark of delegitimation.

Schumer’s crime was [questioning](#) Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s increasingly authoritarian government. Schumer, a staunch Zionist who has long positioned himself as one of [Israel](#)’s most unwavering defenders, dared to suggest that Netanyahu’s extremism was harming Israel’s future.

That alone was enough for Trump to strip him of his Jewishness, to brand him as something else – something meant to be demeaning.

This is not the first time Trump has wielded the word “Palestinian” as a slur. He has used it against former President [Joe Biden](#), against [Schumer](#) previously, and indeed

against anyone who dares to question Israel's policies.

A Palestinian can be arrested for protesting, fired for speaking, or blacklisted for dissenting. And now, [anyone](#) can be treated as one.

This is the real warning in Trump's attack. You don't have to be Palestinian to be punished like one. You don't have to be Arab or Muslim. You only have to step out of line.

Even Jewishness is no longer protection. Your identity has become conditional, your history disposable. You can be declared a traitor, an enemy within, someone who has forfeited their place.

The moment you question Israel, you become Palestinian – not by birth, but by decree. Because in this world, a Palestinian has no rights, nor does anyone who defends them.

[\(Source\)](#)

Donald Trump is ushering in a new brand of authoritarianism, one marked by a single accusation—an accusation that is so broad it can be interpreted anyway the Trump *Reich* pleases: the accusation of *antisemitism*.

Listen to Trump's uber-Zionist Attorney General Pam Bondi:

US attorney general labels pro-Palestine protesters 'domestic terrorists.'

US Attorney General Pam Bondi has described pro-Palestinian student protesters as "*domestic terrorists*," warning that universities could lose federal funding if they fail to address anti-Semitism on campus.

In February, the US Justice Department formed a multi-agency task force focused on combating anti-Semitism, with its top priority targeting harassment in schools and universities. Officials said the group would coordinate federal enforcement and "*root out*" anti-Semitic behavior on campuses nationwide.

Protesters, including Jewish students, argue that criticism of Israeli policy does not constitute anti-Semitism. They say advocacy for Palestinian rights aligns with core American values.

[\(Source\)](#)

One would think that an attorney would have at least a rudimentary understanding of the First Amendment in our Bill of Rights:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

That's pretty clear to me. The government **cannot** abridge the people's right to the freedom of speech—even speech it doesn't like—or the freedom to peaceably assemble (protest) and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Folks, let's understand what is at stake here. If we are not free to speak, we are not free!

Candace Owens nailed it in [this video clip](#):

We just don't see Muslims as human life. And to me, to speak about Gaza and talking about casinos and hotels, and these people just lost their entire families. It's so far removed from humanity. And I have been very disappointed with Trump on his perspectives about Gaza. I think it's wrong. And I'm tired of America being used as Israel's piggy bank.

For whatever reason, everyone can critique every other country for taking money from us, and then everyone's blind when it comes to Israel.

To see those Palestinian children. And the images are seared into my brain. The screaming, the crying, the bleeding, the stuff that we saw on X for the first time, and really realizing how much we had been lied to about what was happening in that region. It was very easy for me to [speak out]. I have to be on the human side of things.

As far as I know, Candace does not have a law degree, but she obviously has more understanding of the First Amendment than Trump's attorney general.

By the way, [Trump and Bondi are in the process of implementing a national Red Flag gun confiscation law](#). Obviously, neither of them understand the Second Amendment either.

And Trump and Bondi are deadly serious about expunging pro-Palestinian speech:

[President Trump's demand on Tuesday to ban masks at "illegal" anti-Israel protests](#) came just one day after Anti-Defamation League CEO Jonathan Greenblatt issued the same demand at the ADL's "Never is Now" conference.

[\(Source\)](#)

Of course, banning masks at protests allows government surveillance to identify individual protesters so that they might be prosecuted afterward. That protesters feel compelled to wear masks shows that **right now** America cannot be truly defined as a **free** country.

Trump calls anti-Israel protests "illegal." But the First Amendment says they are not only "legal" but they are "protected."

It is painfully obvious that Trump doesn't care about the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, freedom or the rule of law. Everything about Donald Trump exudes **authoritarianism**.

As long as I'm living in a world composed of morally and spiritually fallen men, I no more desire to be under right-wing authoritarianism than I do left-wing authoritarianism, theocratic authoritarianism or secular authoritarianism. In this world, authoritarianism of any kind is the enemy of Liberty.

On [April 18, 1775](#), in defiance of the soldiers of the British Crown, John Adams shouted, "We recognize no sovereign but God, and no king but Jesus!" This became the rallying cry and motto of our War for Independence.

And speaking of our War for Independence, is Trump really planning to bring America back under the British Commonwealth? Did Trump learn anything about the Battle of Lexington, Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" speech or the Declaration of Independence? If he did, you sure can't tell it.

Trump says he "loves" King Charles. That's no doubt because Trump loves the power of monarchy. And, as I have written [here](#) and [here](#), Trump and Elon Musk are working arduously to bring America under the rule of a *techno-monarchy*. It is no coincidence that British Prime Minister Keir Starmer and Canada's current Prime Minister Mark Carney were both members of the globalist/technocratic Trilateral Commission.

[Read this very important article](#) relevant to Trump's possible decision to bring the U.S. under the British Commonwealth. This is all part of the Trump/Musk/Thiel plan to bring about global technocratic rule, which I have already written about.

Trump also must love the British attack on free speech.

Trump needs to read [this report](#):

I am a Holocaust survivor. UK police interviewed me for protesting genocide

It's vital for all of us in Britain to speak out now against our own government's complicity in Israel's genocide.

I was seven years old when Germany invaded and occupied their unreliable ally, Hungary, in March 1944. This makes me 87 years old now. But my memories of hiding as a hunted Jew on false papers, and the utter devastation of the climactic fighting around us, between a trapped German Army and the Red Army, are still a crystal clear memory. I see the burnt-out cars, tanks, dead horses and human bodies, ammunition and helmets thrown about, burnt-out buildings, mountains of rubble and broken glass everywhere – just like tragically destroyed Gaza is looking today.

For over a year now it's been clear that Israel's plan is to destroy Palestinian society in Gaza in order to force as many people as possible to leave. This policy has many differences from Nazi Germany's plan to destroy Jewish society in Europe – but it also has many similarities. That is why, as a Holocaust survivor, I've felt compelled to join various pro-Palestine protests in London.

We don't know quite how far those in power intend to go with their restrictions on the right to protest. But we do know they want to portray London's pro-Palestine demos as tainted with anti-Semitism. This is despite the fact that these protests have included thousands of Jews and that many Jews, including myself, have addressed the protesters from the stage.

Most importantly, this whole campaign is an intentional distraction from the main issue, which is to stop the Gaza genocide now. As Israel resumes its indiscriminate bombing – murdering hundreds more civilians in Gaza – it's vital for all of us in Britain to speak out now against our own government's complicity in Israel's genocide.

Every time we hear a politician talk about Israel, they call it "America's greatest friend and ally." Really? What is their definition of friendship? Name **one thing** Israel has done **FOR** America. All Israel does is bleed America financially, morally, spiritually, culturally and politically—and drag America into its perpetual wars of aggression, which have ZERO national interests for the United States.

When President Donald Trump and Attorney General Pam Bondi call the people of America "Palestinians" and "domestic terrorists," they are regurgitating the Jewish supremacist/racist mantra of Benjamin Netanyahu and his fellow Zionists.

Don't believe me? Listen to what [this very influential Jewish rabbi recently said](#):

It really doesn't matter if Donald Trump or Donald Duck wins the US elections. It really doesn't matter if Kamala Harris or Kermit the Frog wins.

When it comes to international affairs, anything that impinges on the future of this world, Donald Trump, Kamala Harris have no freedom of choice. They become like puppets. And who pulls the strings of those puppets? We do. The Jewish people.

In other words, we are all Amalekites.

Reprinted with permission from [Chuck Baldwin Live](#).

[The Best of Chuck Baldwin](#)
