

Do We Still Have a Constitution?

By Andrew P. Napolitano

May 21, 2026

This week, President Donald Trump announced that he plans to give away tax dollars without congressional or judicial authorization to his friends and allies whom he believes were mistreated by the Biden administration. Can he legally do that?

Here is the backstory.

During the last year of his first term in office, Trump's tax returns were stolen along with those of 425,000 others by an IRS employee who leaked Trump's to media outlets. The acts of stealing and leaking were, of course, criminal, and the now-former IRS employee who pleaded guilty to theft of government documents served nearly four years in federal prison.

But the publication of the returns was protected under the Supreme Court's Pentagon Papers case. In that case, Daniel Ellsberg famously stole documents from the Department of Defense, where he was a civilian employee.

When word got out that he had delivered about 7,000 pages to The New York Times and The Washington Post, the Nixon Department of Justice filed complaints in two federal courts and obtained restraints on both newspapers preventing publication. The stolen documents revealed that American generals had been misleading President Lyndon B. Johnson about success in the Vietnam War, and LBJ had been misleading the public.

The Supreme Court bypassed two intermediate appellate courts and accepted appeals directly from the trial courts' decisions that imposed the injunctions.

After a very short briefing schedule and a memorable oral argument, the court ruled that while the thief who stole the secrets can be prosecuted, media outlets that publish even stolen matters that are material to the public interest may do so without criminal prosecution or civil liability. This was the high-water mark for press freedom in America.

When various publications and websites published Trump's tax returns, his lawyers persuaded him that the Pentagon Papers case was so well-settled that he shouldn't bother suing anyone in the media; and the thief, by then sitting in a federal prison, was effectively judgment-proof.

So, Trump waited until after he returned to the White House to sue the IRS for permitting the theft. Surely, a private citizen who has been harmed by grossly negligent government behavior should have a cause of action against the government.

JCRMC PACKET MAY 25 2026

But how about the president suing the IRS, which works for him? And how can the IRS be represented by the Department of Justice, which also works for the president? And how can the Acting Attorney General, who is Trump's former criminal defense lawyer, permit the DoJ he supervises to be adverse to the president, who is the chief federal law enforcement officer in the land?

Well, the case gets curiouser and curiouser, as early this week, Trump and the DoJ announced that they had "settled" his case against the IRS by using DoJ funds — appropriated to pay judgments against the U.S. — to establish a \$1.8 billion fund to distribute cash at Trump's discretion to persons he believes were aggrieved by their treatment at the hands of the Biden DoJ.

This entire litigation and its resolution implicate serious constitutional issues that the acting attorney general and President Trump wish would go away.

First is the Constitution's Case or Controversy Clause, which requires that federal courts may only hear real disputes, with real adversity between the parties — a level of conflict that is nonexistent here. One of the purposes of the clause is to prevent the use of federal courts to facilitate the very type of collusion between the parties that is paramount in this case.

How can Trump be both the plaintiff and the legal superior of the defendant? He cannot. That's why this case never reached a federal judge for disposition. Had it done so, the judge would have shelved it — dismissal without prejudice is the proper mechanism — until Trump is out of office.

The second constitutional impediment is equally as troublesome. The Constitution's Appropriations Clause requires that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury except that which has been appropriated by the Congress and spent as Congress directed. The scheme concocted by Trump and his own IRS and his own DoJ was never presented to Congress, nor did Congress appropriate these funds for this purpose.

The scheme is probably not front-page news, but it does involve nearly two billion taxpayer dollars and it is another example of the government's cavalier indifference to constitutional norms.

This is not to argue that Trump has no case against the IRS, rather the case cannot be litigated while he is in the White House; and it cannot be resolved in a way that substantially burdens the taxpayers without congressional or judicial approval.

In the post-World War II era, Congress has happily looked the other way while presidents encroached on its powers and privileges, hoping for a politically

popular outcome, but dismissive of its constitutional obligations.

While Congress and the presidency are equal branches of government, Congress is the first among equals. This is not a question of power. It is a question of will.

Congress is the preeminent branch. It can remove jurisdiction from the Supreme Court and it can remove a president from office. The Constitution's drafters contemplated a Congress jealous of the encroachment upon its powers.

Why let a president kill boat people without any due process?

Why let a president start a war when the Constitution clearly reposes that authority in Congress?

Why let the president impose and collect sales taxes on products and services originating in foreign countries when the Constitution makes clear that only Congress can do that?

And now this: Why let the president, under the guise of settling a lawsuit with no adversity between the parties, and with no judicial oversight or approval, take tax dollars and give them to his political allies?

These dangerous times are made worse by a supine Congress and a constitutionally indifferent president. The Constitution cannot enforce itself. What part of it will the president evade and Congress overlook next?

Potentially, a government is the most dangerous threat to man's rights; it holds a legal monopoly on the use of physical force against legally disarmed victims. When unlimited and unrestricted by individual rights, a government is man's deadliest enemy. It is not as protection against **private** actions, but against governmental actions that the Bill of Rights was written.

—Ayn Rand, *The Virtue of Selfishness* [1964]

"Education must be completely separated from the state. It is not the proper role of government to fund anyone's education or have anything to do with the education of anyone or their children.

— Laurence M. Vance, "[Public Schools Are Government Schools](#)" [2026]

When Our Word Is No Longer Good

by Ron Paul | May 26, 2026 | 0 Comments

The pattern of media reports – based on White House leaks – that an agreement with Iran is almost completed has become predictable. Where once the markets fluctuated wildly (and some insiders made huge profits with the information), each time we hear that the deal is almost complete only to see it fall through, the markets barely move.

It is dangerous to have a US Administration that no one in the US or the rest of the world believes. When White House “sources” claim a deal is in sight only to have President Trump post another AI graphic of the US military – or himself – firing missiles at Iran, the futility of engaging with the United States becomes reinforced to the rest of the world.

This is not projecting strength. It is signaling moral and ethical bankruptcy. And it is dangerous. In a world where no other country sees value in negotiating to end disputes with the US government, the only solution is to prepare to use force against it.

A US government whose word is no good will soon find a world that refuses to speak with it.

That is what we have seen with the Iranian response to the US surprise attacks of last June and this February 28th. Two times the US used lies and deception that we were negotiating as an honest partner as cover for a pre-planned attack. How can any country negotiate in such circumstances?

There is a word for this: nihilism. It is the belief that there is no truth. Only the convenient lies and deceptions to force one’s will. Governmental nihilism leads to bankruptcies both financial and moral. Nearly \$40 trillion in debt demonstrates the former bankruptcy, while our foreign policy of war and aggression demonstrates the latter.

A world that sees force as the only way to negotiate with the United States may not attack us immediately. But it will prepare to do so. That is what Iran has done for the past four decades. That is what our “rivals” China and Russia have done. Others are following suit.

The government and its neocon mouthpieces continue to propagandize the American people that we have the strongest military in the history of the world. And while it is true that we have a powerful military, more expensive than most others combined and capable of projecting force worldwide, it is also irrelevant.

Despite the relentless propaganda of “War Secretary” Hegseth, we are slowly learning the truth about the US war of aggression against Iran. Just a few weeks of fighting has nearly depleted our arsenal while barely denting that of Iran. Despite the US Administration’s initial claims that 90 percent or more of Iran’s military was destroyed, we now know that the opposite is the case: nearly 90 percent of Iran’s military remains intact.

What we should have learned from 20 years wasted in Afghanistan – that a nation fighting for its homeland has an immense advantage – has still not been learned.

Having the “most powerful military in the world” is irrelevant if the US continues to pursue a global military empire. There will never be a military strong enough for that. It is a lesson we have just learned in Iran.

If the American people are not willing to demand that their elected officials uphold the Constitution and restore our good name as honest brokers, I am afraid the future consequences of our current nihilism will be grave.



The Feast of Pentecost is an excellent occasion to reflect on and pray for an increase of the seven gifts of God the Holy Ghost. These gifts are enumerated and ordered from the more perfect for the less perfect in Isaiah 11:1-3:

“And there shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up out of his root. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him: the spirit of wisdom, and of understanding, the spirit of counsel, and of fortitude, the spirit of knowledge, and of piety. And he shall be filled with the spirit of the fear of the Lord.”

These seven gifts are described in Isaiah 11 as belonging to the Messiah. This signals that, as with other graces, the gifts of the Holy Ghost belong to Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, firstly and in their fulness. And it is through our union with the God-Man and our incorporation into His Mystical Body that we share in these gifts of God's grace to a greater or lesser extent. Fr. Juan Arintero, O.P. beautifully describes this reality as follows:

“Engrafted as we are on Jesus Christ, we participate in the gifts that repose fully in Him as the Head, and from Him they redound to us according to the proportionate capability of each one and according to the measure of intensity by which we live in Him and adhere to Him. For Christ is our archetype, to whom we ought to be configured so that we may be as so many other Christs, other anointed ones of the Holy Ghost, or, better still, that very Jesus Christ living within us. Through these gifts we receive a living impression of His image and we are transformed into Him in such a manner that, if we offer no resistance, it is not now we who work, but rather He who works all things through us as through His own true organs.”

When the Triune God infuses sanctifying grace into a soul at baptism, He also endows that soul with many infused virtues, including faith, hope, and charity, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Both the infused virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost are supernatural operative habits or stable principles by which the Christian performs supernaturally good actions. They differ, however, in significant ways. By the infused virtues the Christian can, by God's actual graces, perform supernaturally good acts whenever he likes. For example, the Christian can and should profess his faith and do charitable works to help his neighbor whenever infused prudence dictates that he ought to do so.

By contrast, the Christian cannot act by of the gifts of the Holy Ghost whenever he pleases. For these gifts are supernatural habits by which we are disposed to be moved directly by the Triune God according to His good pleasure. As Scripture says, “The wind blows where it wills, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know whence it comes or whither it goes; so it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit” (John 3:8). It is in keeping with this difference between the infused virtues and the gifts that the former are likened to the oars of a ship, while the latter are likened to a ship's sails. For just as the unfurled sails of a ship enable the ship to catch a favorable wind and to be moved safely and speedily to port, so likewise, the gifts enable the soul of the Christian to be moved by divine instinct safely and speedily along the difficult road to divine union. St. Thomas Aquinas explains why, in addition to the infused virtues, we need the gifts of the Holy Ghost. He writes:

“...although through grace man's mind is healed, still corruption and infection remain in his flesh through which he serves the law of sin, as is said in Romans 7:25. And a certain obscurity of ignorance remains in the intellect, according to which, as is said in Romans 8:26, ‘we do not know how to pray as we ought.’ For, on account of various changes in things, and because we don't perfectly know ourselves, we cannot fully know what is good for us. Thus, Wisdom 9:14 says, ‘the thoughts of mortal men are fearful, and our counsels are uncertain.’ And, thus, it is necessary for us to be directed and protected by God, who knows all things and can do all things. And because of this, it belongs to those who have been reborn as sons of God to say: ‘and lead us not into temptation,’ and ‘Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,’ and other things contained in the Lord's prayer pertaining to these matters.”

While the infused virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost are essentially different supernatural principles of godly activity, they often operate simultaneously in the Christian's spiritual life. Describing some examples of this, Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. says:

“It happens...that under this special inspiration the gifts are exercised at the same time that the work of the virtues is done. Thus while the boat advances by rowing, there may be a slight breeze which facilitates the labor of the rower. Likewise the inspirations of the gifts may recall to our mind many principles from the Gospel at the same time when our reason deliberates

on a decision to be made. Inversely, our prudence sometimes recognizes its powerlessness to find the solution of a difficult case of conscience, and it then moves us to ask for the light of the Holy Ghost, whose special inspiration makes us see and accomplish what is fitting. We should be increasingly docile to Him.”

Even though we cannot utilize the gifts of the Holy Ghost whenever we want, we can, by God’s grace, unfurl these seven sails within our souls so that we are disposed to receive the Holy Ghost’s special illuminations and inspirations whenever He wills to give them to us. Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange recommends that we render ourselves docile to the Holy Ghost with these three practices:

“(1) By obeying faithfully the will of God which we already know through the precepts and the counsels proper to our vocation; (2) By frequently renewing our resolution to follow the will of God in everything; (3) By asking unceasingly for the light and strength of the Holy Ghost to accomplish the will of God.”

If we resolve this Pentecost to live out practices such as these, we will undoubtedly grow not only in the gifts of the Holy Ghost, but in sanctifying grace and the infused virtues as well. ✝

5

The Unz Review • An Alternative Media Selection

A Collection of Interesting, Important, and Controversial Perspectives Largely Excluded from the American Mainstream Media

Trump Represents Zionism Not America

PAUL CRAIG ROBERTS • MAY 20, 2026 • 200 WORDS

Trump and his Zionist backers have driven the penultimate loyal American out of the US Congress.

Thomas Massie has represented the Fourth District of Kentucky in the House of Representatives since 2012. The Fourth District includes Louisville’s suburbs that extend over northeastern Kentucky. The Suburbanites fell victim to the Israeli-Trump propaganda against the most committed American left in the US Congress. I suppose Kentucky Senator Rand Paul will be next. As Trump himself has proven, it is impossible to be in American politics and represent America instead of Israel.

Americans can forget about being great again. They are not even sovereign.

This is the leader denied Americans by the Zionists, their puppet, Donald Trump, and the stupid people of the Fourth District of Kentucky:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Massie

RT tells the story this morning: <https://www.rt.com/news/640180-kentucky-primary-trump-massie/>

Trump is Israel’s voice, not America’s. His body count includes the two most American members of Congress: Thomas Massie and Marjorie Taylor Greene. Israel’s success in destroying politically those who are not Israel Firsters tells us that Chinese President Xi was correct when he told Trump the other day in China that the US is a “declining power.”

How can a country be a power when it is not even sovereign?

(Republished from paulcraigroberts by permission of author or representative)

Mob Democracy At Work

Paul Craig Roberts

May 21, 2026

The British House of Lords lost its power to mob democracy gradually, but the Parliament Act of 1911 turned the House of Lords into the Roman Senate under the Caesars by stripping the House of Lords of veto power over legislation. This eliminated the Lords' power over spending and taxation.

By 1894 the Lords' power was essentially gone. That year death duties were intentionally introduced in order to destroy the financial position of the British aristocracy, the Barons, Earls, Viscounts, and Dukes who had led the nation for centuries. The death duties exceeded the income of aristocratic families and forced them to sell centuries old family estates to new bourgeois money in order to pay the death duties. To avoid the bankruptcy legislated upon them by "democracy," many aristocrats, former rulers of Britain when it was a great empire instead of a *nothing country*, donated their beautiful homes to the National Trust in exchange for the right to live in a few rooms of their former homes, while the National Trust collected fees showing bus loads of tourists the homes in which the aristocrats formerly lived.

This dispossession was considered "liberal progress."

In addition to this dispossession of property many more dispossessions of rights were to come, including the right of free speech, equality under law, and habeas corpus. But this is a different story affecting the entire Western society that I have told elsewhere. And will tell again.

In Britain the death duties remain extreme. Estates in excess of about \$435,000 dollars (at current exchange rate between US dollar and UK pound) are taxed at 40%. If the home is left to children or grandchildren, the exemption moves to \$665,000 with anything over that amount taxed at 40%. Heirs of a British citizen who dies with \$50 million dollars are expected to turn over \$20,000,000 to mob democracy. One suspects that billionaires abandon the UK before they die.

The current DEI Labour government intends to extract another \$10,000 add-on death tax on homes worth \$2 million. Here we are not talking about the manors of the former aristocracy. We are talking about London apartments driven up in price by Arab oil billionaires, about houses in Kent where successful London businessmen live. The penalties imposed on titled aristocrats have come home to the successful bourgeois.

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/money/tax/news/labour-plots-mansion-tax-to-raid-inheritances/>

The negative incentives for well-to-do people is not my story here. The attack on a hereditary class imbued with a sense of honor and leadership, a specific class of people, is a violation of equality under law. **ONLY THE ARISTOCRACY WAS TARGETED FOR DISPOSSESSION.** So now everyone will be.

But of course the British present themselves as the home and originator of human rights dating from Alfred the Great and the Magna Carta to death duties.

But there is no human right in a death duty. Death duties and income taxes are designations that the person subject to the tax *is not a free person*, that his property is owned by others who have as large a claim to it as slave owners had to the labor of slaves.

Without wealthy independent families there is no constraint on the power of government.

The only conflict that will remain will be who has control of the government. All principle, all morality, all talk about "serving the people," will be cast aside. Government unconstrained by morality and law and countervailing power will rule. This is the future of the Western World.

The Unz Review • An Alternative Media Selection

A Collection of Interesting, Important, and Controversial Perspectives Largely Excluded from the American Mainstream Media

Was US Rep. Thomas Massie a Victim of a Stolen Primary Election?

PAUL CRAIG ROBERTS • MAY 22, 2026 • 200 WORDS

Questions have arisen whether the primary election was stolen from US Rep. Thomas Massie.

Among the evidence suggesting a stolen primary are:

A total of 30 or 40 people at Ed Gallrein's victory party.

Hundreds of people showing support for Massie at his concession speech.

Gallrein had 70 campaign donors from Kentucky. His campaign funds came from outside the district and the state.

Massie had 1,545 campaign donors from Kentucky.

The vote split was substantially different from what the polls indicated.

10,000 mail-in ballots appeared at the last minute.

A highly improbable 356% increase in voter turnout in a primary election, an indication that people who did not vote got voted. The ghost voters were not present at Gallrein's victory party.

With the Israel Lobby contributing at least \$10 million of a \$30 million war fund to unseat Massie and with Trump sending the Secretary of War on the campaign trail to stress virtues of Massie's challenger, defeat was not an option for Israel/Trump. Gallrein won by 10,000 votes, which makes one wonder about the last minute 10,000 write-in ballots.

<https://www.facebook.com/reel/2049892298929187>

An alternative explanation is that Kentucky Republicans were satisfied with Massie, as they had been for 14 years, but abandoned him when Trump emphasized the split. Perhaps not many voters were sufficiently involved to understand the issues and what was at stake and just went with the president. In other words, the outcome was another consequence of insouciant Americans.

(Republished from paulcraigroberts by permission of author or representative)

An Introduction to Lincoln's War

In the midst of his 1863 invasion of the United States, Gen. Robert E. Lee issued a proclamation to his men. After suffering for two years innumerable depredations by their enemies, some Southerners, soldiers and civilians, thought at last the time had come for retaliation. Lee would have none of that. He reminded his troops that "the duties exacted of us by civilization and Christianity are not less obligatory in the country of the enemy than in our own."

The commanding general considers that no greater disgrace could befall the army, and through it our whole people, than the perpetration of the barbarous outrages upon the unarmed and defenseless and the wanton destruction of private property, that have marked the course of the enemy in our own country. . . .

It must be remembered that we make war only upon armed men, and that we cannot take vengeance for the wrongs our people have suffered without lowering ourselves in the eyes of all whose abhorrence has been excited by the atrocities of our enemies, and offending against Him to whom vengeance belongeth, without whose favor and support our efforts must all prove in vain.¹

Accustomed as we are in our own time to war's unmitigated horrors, the injunction of Lee seems anachronistic if not quixotic, yet is a measure and reminder of how much has been lost.

Through the centuries, by common consent within what used to be called Christendom, there arose a code of civilized warfare. Though other issues are covered by the term, and despite lapses, it came to be understood that war would be confined to combatants. Thus limited, said historian F. J. P. Veale, "it necessarily followed that an enemy civilian did not forfeit his rights as a human being merely because the armed forces of his country were unable to defend him."² According to Veale, the amelioration of war's barbarism did not come as a direct result of Christianity, or even from the rise of European chivalry, but "as the product of belated common sense." As early as the eighteenth century, Swiss jurist Emeric de Vattel, author of *The Law of Nations*, expressed what should be obvious to any student of history: breaking the code on one side encourages violations by the other, multiplying hatred and bitterness that can only increase the likelihood and intensity of future wars.³ "There is today," concluded Vattel in 1758, "no Nation in any degree civilized which does not observe this rule of justice and humanity."⁴

Yet warring against noncombatants came to be the stated policy and deliberate practice of the United States in its subjugation of the Confederacy. Shelling and burning of cities, systematic destruction of entire districts, mass arrests, forced expulsions, wholesale plundering of personal property, even murder all became routine. The development of Federal policy during the war is difficult to neatly categorize. Abraham Lincoln, the commander in chief with a reputation as micromanager, well knew what was going on and approved. Commanders seemed always inclined to turn a blind eye to their soldiers' proclivity for theft and violence against the defenseless. And though the attitude of Federal authorities in waging war on Southern civilians became increasingly harsh over time, there was from the beginning a widespread conviction that the crushing of secession justified the severest of measures. Malice, not charity, is the theme most often encountered.

WPACTEN
BRIAN C1950

Lincoln's embracing of "hard war" may have had consequences more far-reaching even than defeat of the South. Union general Philip Sheridan, in Germany to observe that empire's conquest of France in 1870, told Otto von Bismarck that defeated civilians "must be left nothing but their eyes to weep with over the war." The chancellor was said to have been shocked by the unsolicited advice. But the kind of warfare practiced by the Federal military during 1861-65 turned America—and arguably the whole world—back to a darker age. "It scarcely needs pointing out," wrote Richard M. Weaver, "that from the military policies of [William T.] Sherman and Sheridan there lies but an easy step to the total war of the Nazis, the greatest affront to Western civilization since its founding."⁵

"In war, as in peace," observed Weaver, "people remain civilized by acknowledging bounds beyond which they must not go." Echoing the words of Lee, Weaver understood no necessary contradiction in the term "Christian" as applied to the profession of arms. "The Christian soldier must seek the verdict of battle always remembering that there is a higher law by which he and his opponent will be judged, and which enjoins against fighting as the barbarian."⁶

Some assume that as long as there are wars, there will be widespread excesses. Telford Taylor noted that the attitude of Americans when informed of the massacre of South Vietnamese civilians at My Lai was to discount it by saying that such things are bound to happen. "So, too," Taylor pointed out, "are murders and robberies 'bound to happen' in our streets, and they are likely to happen much more often if we cease to regard them as reprehensible."⁷ Others justify war on civilians as necessary to achieve victory. They applaud the depredations of Sherman, hail him as a man ahead of his time, and smile as they repeat his "war is hell" mantra, not hearing the totalitarian echo in their words.

Historian James M. McPherson estimated that fifty thousand Southern civilians perished in war-related deaths.⁸ Others place the figure far higher. Despite such numbers apologists for Lincoln's "hard war" then and now downplay the suffering endured and damage done, lay much to "mistakes" or "accidents," or even try to place blame on victims themselves. Little attention is paid to the poor who were plundered or to brutalized African-Americans. Many cling to the Lincolnian myth that only by the most horrendous of wars could the slaves be freed, ignoring the fact that the rest of the Western world managed to bring an end to the institution without bloodshed.

But one conviction remains an American article of faith: the war on Southern civilians was justified—the war itself was just—because it resulted in saving the union.

Abolitionist Lysander Spooner spent a lifetime battling slavery, but surprisingly found little to rejoice in over the outcome of Lincoln's war.

The principle, on which the war was waged by the North, was simply this: That men may rightfully be compelled to submit to, and support, a government that they do not want; and that resistance, on their part, makes them traitors and criminals.

No principle, that is possible to be named, can be more self-evidently false than this; or more self-evidently fatal to all political freedom. Yet it triumphed in the field, and is now assumed to be established. If it really be established, the number of slaves, instead of having been diminished by the war, has been greatly increased; for a man, thus subjected to a government that he does not want, is a slave.⁹

The Deep South understood Lincoln's sectional victory in the 1860 presidential election to be a revolutionary event that virtually abolished the confederated republic of the founders. In withdrawing from the union, they simply removed themselves from a government they did not want. It took Lincoln's declaration of war five months later to convince others of his true intentions, prompting a second wave of secession. The sovereign people—organized as sovereign states—had created the federal government in ratifying the Constitution. States that entered the union of their own free will now left it in the same manner.

"The reason Lincoln gave for launching a military invasion of the South was to save the Union," wrote Thomas J. DiLorenzo.

Translating from his obfuscating rhetoric, this means that he wanted to use military force to destroy once and for all the doctrines of federalism and states' rights that had, since the founding of the republic, frustrated ambitious politicians like himself who wanted a highly centralized and greatly enlarged state.¹⁰

Federal troops died to preserve the union. But, Lincoln's pious poetry to the contrary, it was their opponents in gray who struggled "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The people of Maryland never had the opportunity to choose whether to remain in the United States or join the new Confederacy. The Federal army overran the state, and Lincoln was quick to jail legislators and other elected officials, close newspapers, and suppress free speech in his zeal to insure "loyalty." Lee, on crossing the Potomac in 1862, issued another extraordinary document, this directed to the citizens of that suffering state.

Believing that the people of Maryland possessed a spirit too lofty to submit to such a government, the people of the South have long wished to aid you in throwing off this foreign yoke. . . . In obedience to this wish, our army has come among you, and is prepared to assist you with the power of its arms in regaining the rights of which you have been despoiled. . . .

We know no enemies among you, and will protect all, of every opinion. It is for you to decide your destiny freely and without constraint. This army will respect your choice, whatever it may be; and while the Southern people will rejoice to welcome you to your natural position among them, they will only welcome you when you come of your own free will.¹¹

That principle—of people having the right to freely choose their own destiny—was utterly repugnant to Lincoln. In waging war on civilians he returned to the barbarism of the past, but he also dealt a blow to limited, constitutional government from which America has yet to recover. That all Americans are less free today, and live in a more dangerous world, are among his legacies.

The Unz Review • An Alternative Media Selection

A Collection of Interesting, Important, and Controversial Perspectives Largely Excluded from the American Mainstream Media

Kevin Warsh's Impossible Mission

RON PAUL • MAY 18, 2026 • 600 WORDS • 5 COMMENTS

After Kevin Warsh was confirmed as Federal Reserve chairman last week, he received a stark reminder of the challenges facing the central bank. The reminder came in the form of a worldwide surge in the interest rates paid by government bonds. The surge followed the spike in oil prices caused by the Iran War.

The rise in bond yields comes along with the news that, according to government statistics (which are manipulated to understate the real rate of inflation), consumer prices increased by 3.8 percent over the past year while wages increased by 3.6 percent. This means that, even though many Americans received nominal wage increases, their real (adjusted for inflation) incomes fell.

The decline in real income is why more Americans are maxing out their credit cards or carrying large balances on cards. The high interest rates on those cards trap many Americans in debt burdens from which they are unable to escape.

President Trump's "solution" to the economic problems facing many Americans is lower interest rates. Jerome Powell, who Warsh is succeeding as Fed chair, has refused to lower rates to the level desired by President Trump. This is a big part of why the president has said he chose not to reappoint Powell.

Concerns that Warsh would allow President Trump to dictate monetary policy help explain why only one Democratic Senator voted for Warsh's confirmation.

Lowering rates may slightly reduce credit card and other interest rates paid by consumers. However, it will further erode the dollar's value, thus further reducing Americans' real incomes and causing them to go further into debt.

The Fed also faces pressure to lower rates in order to monetize the over 39 trillion dollars and rising federal debt. Before the Iran War, the Federal government was projected to spend 16 trillion dollars over the next ten years just on interest on the national debt. That amount has no doubt increased thanks to the billions spent waging an unconstitutional war against Iran.

The Iran War has harmed economies around the world and could result in a global debt crisis as the disruptions cause governments to default on their debt. The disruptions could also lead to new challenges to a basis of the dollar's world reserve currency status — the petrodollar system linking the dollar to oil.

After President Nixon severed the last link between the dollar and gold, then-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger brokered a deal with Saudi Arabia where the Saudis would use only dollars for the oil trade in exchange for American military support. In recent years, interest in challenging the petrodollar and the dollar's world reserve currency status has grown. This is in large part because of opposition to the US government's use of the dollar's status to support the US government's sanctions.

The end of the petrodollar and the dollar's world reserve currency status will likely lead to major inflation as the Fed desperately pumps money into the economy to monetize ever increasing levels of federal debt. The good news is this could bring about the final collapse of the welfare-warfare state and the fiat money system that sustains it. While the short-term results of this collapse will be painful, if those of us who know the truth are successful in convincing a critical mass of people to support free markets, limited government, and a noninterventionist foreign policy, the crisis will lead to a new age of peace, prosperity, and liberty.

Trojan horse: The shape-shifting politics of Peter Magyar

By Rafael Pinto BORGES

The Tisza leader campaigned as 'Orbán 2.0,' but days into office, he launched a Tusk-style parliamentary coup, purging conservatives, shutting down state media, and surrendering to Brussels on migration and foreign policy.

How do you win electorally having lost culturally? For Brussels, when it came to Hungary, that was the challenge. For years, now-former Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán proved quite the maverick—at the helm of a tiny, landlocked country of just 10 million people, he had succeeded in not just holding his own internally, winning election after election, approving an 'illiberal' (or, better said, post-liberal) constitution, and safeguarding his nation's border from the Brussels-approved migratory assault. More egregiously and intolerably, Orbán made Hungary a countercultural bulwark of conservative ideas and foreign policy restraint, providing nationalists and antiglobalists elsewhere in the West with a proven guideline of how to govern—that is, how to effectively fight back against the globalist-progressive machine that operates in Europe under the EU brand.

There was only one problem for the Brusselians—no matter how much foul play they were ready to resort to, from massive influence operations through the vast network of loyal NGOs the Commission funded in Budapest to the freezing of tens of billions in funding legitimately owed to the country's budget, Hungarians just couldn't be convinced to vote for the Left. For long, the propaganda narrative around Europe was that Orbán, as a political project, was an anomaly: that the prime minister's brand of conservative nationalism and foreign policy realism was Orbán's alone; that his illiberal turn was unpopular, if not reviled, at home; and that Budapest's stern opposition to EU-mandated migratory insanity, bellicose adventurism against Russia, refusal of Ukrainian membership of the Union, and self-sabotage in energy policy was not happening because of Hungarians, but in spite of them.

This public narrative was designed for the most distracted and believed by the silliest, within and outside the EU's bureaucratic machinery. But at least the wisest, savviest of these mandarins understood perfectly well that these tales had little to no connection to reality. Whatever Orbán's ills, being out of touch was not among them; in that sense, at least, he was a genuine 'populist' inasmuch as he governed in strong obedience to the popular will. True, Orbán fought tooth and nail to safeguard Hungary from the ludicrous open-door policies that have ravaged Europe in the past 15 years, even accepting the vast financial burden of a daily one million euro fine paid to the Commission for keeping the illegal intruders at bay. But in so doing, he had the overwhelming support of the Hungarian people, with 77% of voters opposing the EU's migrant quota plans, according to a 2023 poll. Similarly, 2019 polls showed that 87.5% of Hungarians opposed non-European immigration. The same goes for Orbán's war policy, with 80% opposing the supply of arms to Kiev in 2022. Even after Magyar's victory, only 27% would support Budapest unblocking EU membership negotiations with Ukraine, with 54% adamantly opposed. More than half of Hungarians (52%) also oppose giving up on Russian energy exports.

The Eurocrats knew they could not retake Hungary by offering its people a happy-clappy SJW progressive in the form of Spain's Pedro Sánchez or Canada's former prime minister Pierre Trudeau nor a rancid technocrat like Germany's Friedrich Merz. Neither would do. What they needed, rather, was someone who sounded like Orbán and walked like Orbán—but was nothing like Orbán. Having lost the argument, their only hope was an Orbán impersonator. That person was Péter Magyar, a Fidesz veteran who spared no effort to convince his people that he would be Orbán 2.0, or an Orbán without whatever people had grown tired of in the original. Magyar, thus, positioned himself firmly on the right on issues like immigration and Russian oil. On Ukraine, he opposed fast-tracking Kiev's entry into the Union and has even tied Budapest's stance on the issue to a popular referendum.

That was smart politicking—and it earned Magyar the supermajority he craved. Since Hungary's election on April 12th, however, the new prime minister has proved his critics correct by revealing himself as a Trojan horse candidate. Time and again, he had made clear that what is next for Hungary is a repetition of the Polish scenario, where Donald Tusk—despite losing the 2023 parliamentary election—concocted a parliamentary coup to place himself in power. He then proceeded to purge the government and media from conservative elements with wanton authoritarianism, even sending the police after journalists he wasn't happy with.

It is now clear that Magyar will follow that same model to impose an authoritarian, EU-aligned, and progressive regime in Hungary. Like Tusk in Poland, he has now announced his determination to close Hungary's state TV, accusing it of being close to Orbán. In his first speech as prime minister, he has made clear that he wishes to "punish" the crimes of the outgoing government, language that would be universally condemned if an incoming right-winger had said it of a previous progressive executive. He has insisted on his demand that Hungarian President Tamás Sulyok, who was lawfully elected during Orbán's tenure and is the former prime minister's ally, resign his office for no apparent reason other than Magyar's desire for total control. He is bent on crushing any form of opposition to his rule, whether political or cultural; he wishes to expropriate the assets of important conservative-leaning think tanks such as the Mathias Corvinus Collegium. Even though no court of law in a free country would agree to his authoritarian projects, Magyar's two-thirds majority in parliament allows him to vassalise the country's National Judicial Council, therefore giving him vast influence over courts. He even wanted to have his own brother-in-law, Márton Melléthei-Barna, appointed as Justice Minister. The only reason this didn't happen was the public outcry it generated.

He has seemingly tired of pretending to be centre-right, too. He nominated a far-left LGBT activist, Judith Lannert, as education minister. Meanwhile, his new Foreign Minister, Anita Orbán, is a globalist fanatic wholly committed to the erosion of Hungarian independence and the adoption of the European Commission's talking points. His government's promises of border rigidity are falling apart pretty rapidly — Anita Orbán is now on record arguing for Hungary's submission to the EU's Migration Pact, signalling a full capitulation on the migratory dossier. With Ursula von der Leyen's plots to impose her will on the Hungarian people successful, it will hardly surprise that the EU's flag has now been raised in Hungary's beautiful parliament building for the first time in years, with the EU's anthem sung during Magyar's investiture. The gratuitous insult to Hungary had a taste of 1956. Then as now, a Hungarian patriotic revolt was crushed by the machinations of a foreign empire; then as now, brute force seemed triumphant.

But it wasn't. As brazenly authoritarian and EU-aligned—that is, Hungary-disaligned—as the new regime appears to be, the fraud Magyar relied on to win the election is quickly falling apart. Many who fell for the lie are now opening their eyes, and a reorganisation of the Hungarian conservative movement is ongoing. The Hungarian right has no lack of talented leaders ready to punch back. Don't count Hungary out just yet.

Original article: [The European Conservative](#)

© 2010 - 2026 | Strategic Culture Foundation | Republishing is welcomed www.strategic-culture.eu.
The views of individual contributors do not necessarily represent those of the Strategic Culture Foundation.

Rape, Assault, and Abuse Are Signature Israeli Government Values

by Col. Ann Wright (ret.) | May 26, 2026

It has been only 72 hours since our colleagues on the Gaza flotilla arrived in Istanbul, Turkiye to tell of the rape, assaults and abuse they endured from the Israeli military on their sailboats, security personnel on the prison ship, civilian police at the Ashdod processing center and guards at the notoriously abusive Ktzi'ot prison. Shezaf, Hagar (August 5, 2024). "Torture, Sexual Abuse and Humiliation | Dozens of Testimonies From Palestinian Prisoners Describe Conditions in Israeli Jails During Gaza war". *Haaretz*.

Criminal Abuse Orchestrated and Ordered at the Highest Level of the Israeli Government

The 72 hours feel like weeks as we heard the stories from each of the 428 unarmed civilians from 45 countries who were on 50 small sailboats, kidnapped in international waters and taken against their will to a place they did not want to go-Israel-and then subjected to criminal abuse from personnel from a multitude of Israeli security institutions.

This criminal abuse was orchestrated and ordered at the highest level of the Israeli government as evidenced by the statement and actions of Minister of National Security Ben Gvir. Gvir himself posted footage on a social media platform showing himself gloating as activists from the flotilla were forced to kneel on the floor, blindfolded, roughed up with the hands bound tightly in zipties at the port of Ashdod.

The videos include a clip of Ben-Gvir waving an Israeli flag over the detainees who are hunched over on the ground with their hands bound and a clip of him smiling and chanting "Am Yisrael Chai" – Hebrew for "The nation of Israel lives" – at a detainee. Other clips showed detainees being pushed down to the ground, and detainees with their foreheads pressed against the floor, surrounded by armed guards as the Israeli national anthem plays.

Countries Ban Ben Gvir for Actions Against International Activists, But Not for Actions Against Palestinians

For his actions, France has banned Ben-Gvir from entering French territory stating that his "unspeakable behavior of taunting Gaza flotilla activists who had been arrested and abused by Israeli police forces. French Foreign Minister Jean-Noel Barrot wrote on X on May 23: "As of today, Itamar Ben-Gvir is banned from entering French territory. This decision follows his unspeakable actions towards French and European citizens who were passengers on the Global Sumud Flotilla. We cannot tolerate that French nationals can be threatened, intimidated or brutalized in this way – all the more so by a public officials." Barrot also called for the European Union to sanction Ben Gvir.

Italian Prime Minister Giorgia Meloni condemned the treatment seen in the footage in a post on X, calling the images "unacceptable" and saying it was "inadmissible" that demonstrators, including Italian citizens, were subjected to treatment that "violates human dignity".

"Italy further demands an apology for the treatment of these demonstrators and for the utter contempt shown toward the explicit requests of the Italian government," she said, adding that Israel's ambassador in Rome would also be summoned.

President Lee Jae Myung of South Korea on May 20 called Israel's actions "way out of line."

Spain and Ireland also issued statements, calling out Ben Gvir's "monstrous" and "appalling" behavior.

Even US President Donald Trump's administration issued a rare criticism of an Israeli official, branding Ben Gvir's actions "despicable. "Flotilla was stupid stunt, but Ben Gvir betrayed the dignity of his nation," wrote US Ambassador to Israel Mike Huckabee on X.

Israeli Government Values-Genocide, Ethnic Cleansing and Theft of Lands

Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu's disclaimer that Ben Gvir's incitement of violence against flotilla participants does not reflect the "values" of the state of Israel has been ridiculed around the world as the values of the state of Israel are clearly stated by their actions of recent genocide and ethnic cleansing of Palestinians in Gaza and West Bank and 80 years of Israeli abuse of Palestinians beginning in 1948 with the Israeli militias massacres of Palestinians and theft of land and homes of over 800,000 in the Nakba, "Catastrophe."

No one has to look far for the "values" of the state of Israel. The values of the state of Israel are the criminal actions documented in excruciating detail by cases brought to the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court.

Gaza Flotilla Participants Suffered Gunshots, Beatings, Sexual Assaults, Concussions, Broken Bones... and. They Still Are Willing to Challenge Israeli Brutality Toward Palestinians

Gaza flotilla participants, both men and women, young and old, endured an endless succession of criminal actions by Israeli state security officials. Three were shot by Israeli officials. Beatings, kicked in all parts of the body, dragged on the floor by the hair, forced to remain kneeling and bent over for hours at a time, beaten when one moved slightly, stripped naked numerous times, sexually assaulted, intimidation and humiliation were suffered in various degrees by virtually all of the 428 persons who were kidnapped from their flotilla boats.

Within hours of their arrival in Istanbul, flotilla participants were describing one by one, boat by boat, to Turkish police investigators and civilian lawyers what the Israeli security personnel did to them. These are official statements from participants that will be used in judicial proceedings against the State of Israel.

The first of many reports describing the treatment of many participants was issued on May 24, 2026. Titled "Global Sumud Flotilla Released Horrific, Newly Emerging Testimonies as Survivors Return Home," it contains descriptions by members of several delegations of Israeli brutality toward flotilla participants:

New Testimonies: Terror Inside the Shipping Containers

As survivors begin speaking to the press upon arrival in their home nations, a shared experience of calculated barbarism – and profound solidarity – is emerging:

– **The French Delegation:** In a chilling personal testimony, French delegate Meriem Hadjal described being dragged toward a dark shipping container by soldiers multiple times her size. "I take the first blow. Slaps that knock you out... Everything happens at the level of the head." Terrified of being raped, she resisted as a soldier repeatedly touched her, while a second soldier pulled at her chest and pants. Inside the container, she witnessed a third soldier torturing another volunteer on the ground with a taser. Another soldier grabbed her by the hair, beating her head while demanding she show her face. When the container door briefly opened, she recounted, "what I mainly see on the ground, because I don't look up, are bloodstains." Meriem noted she, along with other detainees, were stripped naked, removing any warm clothes and crammed into splintered containers where they could hear their "comrades, one by one, screaming, because they were being beaten to a pulp."

– **The Polish Delegation:** Karim Awad, a medic holding dual Polish and UK citizenship, recounted being choked with a torn Palestinian flag by an iOF soldier. Awad was subsequently subjected to continuous stompings to the head by six soldiers. Because he had written “Free Palestine” on his body, he was singled out for multiple strip searches, severe beatings with a hand-held metal detector, and having his hair ripped out. He further revealed that the iOF systematically flooded the floors of the dark shipping containers with cold water every few hours to prevent detainees from sleeping.

– **The Greek Delegation:** Delegates recounted the boarding of the Kiriakos X, where soldiers used electric shocks and brutal beatings on the crew to force them to identify their captain. To halt the torture of her crew, the female captain courageously stepped forward to claim responsibility for the boat and volunteers; the iOF responded by shooting her directly in the leg with a rubber bullet. She was wounded and denied proper medical care for days.

– **The South African Delegation:** Two South African delegates, Ebrahim Peters and Qutb Hendricks, provided powerful testimony detailing how iOF soldiers explicitly used geopolitical retaliation as a pretext for torture. Upon discovering the participants’ nationality, soldiers dragged them into an isolated room and launched a targeted physical assault. While beating the volunteers, soldiers explicitly referenced international accountability mechanisms, stating, “You guys want to take us to court? We’ll show you,” referencing South Africa’s genocide case against Israel at the International Court of Justice (ICJ).

The Belgian & Australian Delegations: 77-year-old Belgian delegate Olimpia Dìez Perlines expressed total shock at the sadism of the forces. Julien Cabral, another Belgian participant noted that soldiers could be heard explicitly saying, “let’s have fun,” as they initiated the violent attacks. And Australian delegate Juliet Lamont provided further harrowing details, confirming she was sexually assaulted “in this kind of torture chamber as five men were bashing me and smashing my face.”

– **The Canadian Delegation:** Ehab Lotayef, sailing aboard the Canadian Boat to Gaza, was directly asked by iOF personnel to assist them with translation, only to be stabbed in the hand by soldiers the moment he attempted to provide that help.

– **The Brazilian Delegation:** A delegate returning to Brazil, Ariadne Telles, detailed suffering physical and psychological torture. The delegate was subjected to severe sleep deprivation and targeted physical assaults: “They kicked me on the face, they kicked me on the legs, they zip-tied my hands; I don’t feel my fingers until now.” Detainees were forced to sit on their knees with their heads pressed to the floor for hours, while captors laughed.

Ann Wright was in the U.S. Army/Army Reserves for 29 years and retired as a Colonel. She was also a U.S. diplomat for 16 years, but resigned from the U.S. government in 2003 in opposition to the U.S. war on Iraq. She is the co-author of Dissent: Voices of Conscience. She is on the steering committee of U.S. Boats to Gaza and the Gaza Freedom Flotilla Coalition.

**If you liked this article, please support Antiwar.com.
We are 100% reader-supported.**

The Strait of Hormuz: A Constant in Iranian History

by M. Reza Behnam | May 22, 2026 | 1 Comment

The strategic and spiritual resonance of the Strait of Hormuz is deeply woven into Iran's identity. It represents a profound geographic constant in Iranian history. This narrow waterway has served as a central artery for Persian political and economic power, historical consciousness and culture across millennia.

Whether safeguarding Zoroastrian trade routes under the Sassanids, expelling European powers in the Safavid era, or commanding energy routes today, Iran's geopolitical identity is fused with this narrow stretch of water. It is a physical manifestation of sovereignty, insuring that the "Passage of the Palm Groves" and its divine namesake "Ahura Mazda" remains a focal point of global history.

Linguists and historians trace the etymology of "Hormuz" to "Ohrmazd," the Middle Persian derivation of "Ahura Mazda" (the supreme deity of Zoroastrianism). To ancient Persian monarchs, this body of water was more than a trade route; it was an extension of the imperial cosmic divine order.

In the ancient dialect of southern Iran, the name is believed to have evolved from "Hur-Mogh." In the local tongue of Hormozgan, Hur means waterway and Mogh refers to palm trees. For people who lived there for millennia, the strait was not a military chokepoint, it was simply, "The Passage of the Palm Groves."

The Strait of Hormuz presents a profound historical paradox. Its name honors the Zoroastrian source of cosmic harmony, Ahura Mazda. Yet today, this narrow chokepoint whose foundational ethos, "humata, hukhta, and huvarshta" (good thoughts, good words, and good deeds), is now the epicenter of severe international geopolitical friction and trade instability.

Long before it became the jugular vein of the modern global economy, the Strait of Hormuz was the sacred and strategic maritime gateway to the Persian empire.

The Achaemenid Empire, founded by Cyrus the Great in 550 BC, was the first imperial power to recognize the strait as a strategic artery to be owned. Its name is tied to the Sassanian dynasty (224-651 CE), the last great pre-Islamic Persian empire and initiator of Zoroastrianism as a state religion.

During the Sassanian era, its Zoroastrian rulers expanded outward from the Iranian plateau to dominate both the northern and southern shores of the strait.

By commanding the entrance to the Persian Gulf by constructing forts and coastal infrastructure, these ancient kings secured their control over the lucrative maritime trade routes, linking Mesopotamia, the Indian subcontinent and the broader world.

Control over the Strait of Hormuz – the only sea passage from the Persian Gulf to the open ocean – has long been a linchpin of imperial power in West Asia. Its control has shifted across empires, passing from Sassanian Persian rulers and the Abbasid Caliphate to the formidable Kingdom of Hormuz, and eventually into the hands of expanding European colonial powers.

When the Safavid Empire (1501-1736) recaptured the region from the Portuguese in the 17th century, the strait was reestablished as an Iranian geopolitical asset. In the modern

era, the reality of the waterway has been magnified on a global scale due to the discovery of petroleum in Iran in 1908.

The impact of the Strait of Hormuz extends far beyond the physical movement of petroleum, liquified natural gas and global commerce. Historically, this narrow sea passage became a natural crossroads connecting civilizations, diffusing and blending Persian, Arab and Indian art, philosophy and belief systems. Also, the prosperity generated by taxing trade through the chokepoint allowed for port cities like old Hormuz to build grand mosques and complex architecture.

In the modern era, particularly following the 1979 Iranian Revolution, Iran's political geography has become inextricably tied to the strait's unique topographical realities. Its main navigational corridors are incredibly constrained, forcing commercial and military vessels to travel through the territorial waters of Iran and Oman.

The once-open international thoroughfare, is now at the center of conflict because of the 28 February 2026 U.S.-Israeli war on the Islamic Republic of Iran. For Tehran, control of the natural chokepoint serves as an asymmetric strategy to counterbalance foreign military power. Iran has successfully relied on its geographical proximity, utilizing coastal missiles, fast-attack boats and strategic islands to assert control over the strait.

Today, the Strait of Hormuz, through which nearly a fifth of the world's daily energy sources flow, remains the ultimate trump card in Iranian political geography. The passage grants Iran undeniable economic and strategic leverage.

From the divine association of Zoroastrian antiquity to the modern age of energy diplomacy, the Strait of Hormuz remains a defining feature of Iranian political geography. It continues to be the narrow gate through the geopolitical ambitions, economic lifeline and historic legacy of Iran intersecting with the wider world.

© 2026, M. Reza Behnam, Ph.D.

Dr. Behnam is a political scientist who specializes in comparative politics with a focus on West Asia.

**If you liked this article, please support Antiwar.com.
We are 100% reader-supported.**

Join the Discussion!

We welcome thoughtful and respectful comments. Hateful language, illegal content, or attacks against Antiwar.com will be removed.

For more details, please see our [Comment Policy](#).

Agree to Comment