

# Enemy Within: The Greatest Danger to Liberty

①

*"Tyranny can now enter our country," from one place.*

Benjamin Rush dropped that warning in 1778 at the height of the War for Independence. But he wasn't talking about Redcoats. Recognizing the nature of power and humanity, he was giving us a timeless warning about "ourselves" and our own "great men."

The Founders knew the score. History is littered with power-hungry rulers who use deception. They stage false flags. They manufacture crises or exploit real ones. The worst of them pretend to love liberty just to destroy it.

In the end, it all leads to tyranny, and the greatest threat is from within.

## THE TRAP

The Founders understood that the story of the Trojan Horse was more than ancient mythology. It was a strategy for infiltration. They knew tyrants don't need to burn a city down if they can trick the people into opening the gates themselves.

In his 1766 sermon celebrating the repeal of the Stamp Act, Reverend Jonathan Mayhew called the victory exactly what it was: a "snare broken." Mayhew identified the Trojan Horse: The British sold the tax under the guise of security after the Seven Years War. But under the surface, it was a trick to fund a standing army and destroy liberty from within.

*"And the golden temptation, it is said, took with too many, for while. A Pandora's box, or Trojan horse, indeed!"*

The previous year in his broadside urging noncompliance with the act, John Dickinson warned the people to not fall for the trap.

*"If you quietly bend your Necks to that Yoke, you prove yourselves ready to receive any Bondage to which your Lords and Masters shall please to subject you."*

But even after repeal, Mayhew knew this single victory wasn't the end of the story – not even close. He continued his sermon, quoting the desperate warning from the priest in Virgil's ancient epic: Don't let your guard down – it's insanity to think they won't come back for more.

*"O wretched citizens, what so great a madness is this? Do you believe the enemies have gone away? Or do you think that any gifts of the Greeks lack treachery?"*

## THE FALSE FLAG

This strategy wasn't new to Mayhew or the Revolutionaries. They knew history is filled with tyrants using these pretexts to seize power. Today, we call them false flags.

Machiavelli documented the master playbook. In 6th Century BC Athens, Pisistratus staged a fake attack on himself to justify a standing army and seize total power.

*"As to the employment of deceit and cunning, I give the following instances.*

*Pisistratus, after the victory which he had gained over the people of Megara, was greatly beloved by the people of Athens. One morning he went forth from his house wounded, and charged the nobility with having attacked him from jealousy, and*

By: Michael Boldin | Published on: Nov 21, 2025 | Categories: American Revolution, Ancients, Founding Principles

JCRM C Preket  
December 29, 2025

2  
*demanding permission to keep a guard of armed followers for his protection, which was accorded him."*

In Cato's Letters, Thomas Gordon explained that the fatal danger wasn't the final army – it was the first step that this established: a tiny force of just 50 men armed only with wooden clubs.

*"Pisistratus, having procured from the city of Athens fifty fellows armed only with cudgels, for the security of his person from false and lying dangers, improved them into an army, and by it enslaved that free state."*

Machiavelli knew it – one tiny step is all an ambitious tyrant needs.

*"This first step enabled him easily to attain such power that he soon after made himself tyrant of Athens."*

### **THE FATAL PRECEDENT**

It's not just false flags.

In the early years of the American Revolution, John Dickinson gave a powerful example to show how rulers will also exploit a real crisis to establish a single precedent that will eventually destroy freedom.

*"Spain was once free. Their cortes resembled our parliaments. No money could be raised on the subject, without their consent. One of their Kings having received a grant from them, to maintain a war against the Moors, desired, that if the sum which they had given, should not be sufficient, he might be allowed, for that emergency only, to raise more money without assembling the Cortes."*

The good guys fought against it – but they lost. And that loss became the template for unlimited power in the future.

*"The request was violently opposed by the best and wisest men in the assembly. It was, however, complied with by the votes of a majority; and this single concession was a PRECEDENT for other concessions of the like kind, until at last the crown obtained a general power of raising money, in cases of necessity."*

They never recovered from that fatal mistake, and freedom was obliterated.

*"From that period the Cortes ceased to be useful – the people ceased to be free."*

### **THE PROTECTION RACKET**

The ancients knew this game well. Sometimes, all a tyrant needs to do is frighten the people.

Gordon told the story of Dionysius, the tyrant of Syracuse. 150 years after Pisistratus, he used the same strategy, but only through fear mongering.

*"He told Them, (and this was Argument enough to gain their Belief) that he went in hourly Peril of his Life; and begged them to appoint him a Guard: They readily granted him what he wanted, and he readily took what they had thus helped him to; even the Prerogative of putting Chains upon them All!"*

Like Pisistratus, he was also granted just a small force to start, 600 men. Being loyal only to him, this was quickly expanded and used to seize total control.

Being well-versed in this history, it's no surprise James Madison understood that government will always use fear of foreign danger, real or fake, to attack freedom at home.

*"Perhaps it is a universal truth that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged to provisions agst. danger real or pretended from abroad."*

### ENGINEERED CHAOS

As John Trenchard wrote in Cato's Letters, there's also a domestic version of this ploy: manufacture a crisis at home.

*"They will, by all practicable means of oppression, provoke the people to disaffection; and then make that disaffection an argument for new oppression, for not trusting them any further, and for keeping up troops; and, in fine, for depriving them of liberties and privileges, to which they are entitled by their birth, and the laws of their country."*

This isn't theory. As Gordon documented, Nero, the most infamous tyrant in history, pioneered this tactic.

*"Nero, who, disguised in the habit of a slave, went roaming about the streets, and scoured the public inns and stews, followed by a set of companions, who seized as prey whatever stood exposed to sale, and assaulted whomsoever they met; and all these violences were committed upon people so unapprized of the author, that he himself was once wounded, and bore the scar in his face."*

Once people learned it was Nero, there were copycats – and this led to widespread violence and disorder, so severe it was like the city was under siege.

*"The name of Nero being once used to warrant licentiousness, was falsly assumed as a cloak by others, and many with their own separate gangs boldly practised the same excesses. So that such were the nightly combustions at Rome, as if the city had been stormed and the inhabitants taken captive."*

Nero then used these riots, which he started and provoked, as justification to expand military rule.

*"These tumults went on, till the people being heated and rent into dissensions, and commotions still more terrible apprehended, no other remedy was found but that of driving the players out of Italy, and of recalling the soldiers to guard the theatre."*

### THE FALSE SAVIOR

The lesson is clear: if it happened in Rome, it can happen anywhere. That's exactly what the Anti-Federalist writer Cato warned us about in 1787.

*"Americans are like other men in similar situations, when the manners and opinions of the community are changed by the causes I mentioned before, and your political compact explicit, your posterity will find that great power connected with ambition, luxury, and flattery, will as readily produce a Caesar, Caligula, Nero, and Domitian in America, as the same causes did in the Roman empire."*

That brings us to the most dangerous kind of Trojan Horse: the ruler who pretends to love liberty but destroys it once they get power. For that, we have Imperator Caesar Augustus. Gordon explained that at first, he made it look like he was on the side of the people and their liberty.

4

*"Augustus paid great court to the people: the very Name that covered his Usurpation was a compliment to them: he affected to call it the Power of the Tribuneship, an Office first created purely for their protection, and as the strongest effort and barrier of popular Liberty."*

His tactics were masterful. First, he resigned the consulship, making it seem like he was **returning** power to the people. In exchange, the Senate gave him the power of the tribune, which the people understood as an office that fought against tyranny.

Then he used that power, under the guise of protecting national security, to seize total control.

*"It was for their sake and security, he pretended to assume this power, though by it he acted as absolutely as if he had called it the Dictatorial power; such energy there is in words! The Office itself was erected as a bulwark against Tyranny; and by the name of it Tyranny is now supported."*

### THE ENEMY WITHIN

The founders were very aware of their own 17th century Augustus: Oliver Cromwell.

He was supposed to be the champion of English liberty. But, as Gordon documented, he sold a military dictatorship to the people under the oldest trick in the book: protecting them from the opposing party.

*"The Partizans of Oliver Cromwell, when he was meditating Tyranny over the Three Nations, gave out, that it was the only Expedient to ballance Factions, and to keep out Charles Stuart; and so they did worse Things to keep him out, than he could have done if they had let him in."*

That's the ultimate lesson from history: the wolf always comes dressed as a sheep. Benjamin Rush knew this – even at the height of the war for Independence.

*"Tyranny can now enter our country only in the shape of a whig. All our jealousy should be of ourselves. All our fears should be of our great men, whether in civil or military authority."*

**Tags:** American Revolution, Ancients, Benjamin Rush, False Flag, Machiavelli, Trojan Horse



#### Michael Boldin

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

# The Fire Went Out: Hearths, Health, and the Wisdom We Buried

5

So many of our modern conveniences shield us from the world which God created for the purpose of pointing us to Him.

December 18, 2025

Mike Parrott

**T**his winter, many families will have left cookies for St. Nicholas on his feast day, or plan to do so on the 24th. But leave them where, exactly?

On the kitchen counter, perhaps. Near the refrigerator. Beneath electric lights and climate-controlled air. The gesture remains, but the proper place has vanished.

The hearth—once the obvious destination for such offerings—is gone, and so the ritual floats free, untethered from any physical center.

Stockings still appear in December, of course, but they are no longer what they were. They hang unused and empty, decorative Pottery Barn reenactments, intimations of their original transmissive purpose of conveying the warmth of fire to cold foot. The meaning persists in hearthless homes only faintly, like an echo whose source has been forgotten, while we go more and more unintelligibly through the motions.

We have forbidden winter to enter the home, and we may do well to examine if, thereby, Advent has become a bit more metaphorical.

The loss is largely unnoticed because we have trained ourselves to ignore things that make demands. Fire demanded attention. It demanded fuel, patience, and care. It gathered people not by convenience but by necessity. The hearth was the architectural heart of the home, and winter made that truth unavoidable. Cold pushed families inward; fire drew them together.

John Senior understood this. In *The Death of Christian Culture*, he argued that Christian culture did not collapse because people suddenly rejected doctrine. It collapsed because the embodied practices that made doctrine livable were systematically dismantled. Culture, for Senior, was not primarily ideas or institutions; it was habits—ordinary domestic disciplines that trained the imagination first. The hearth was one such discipline.

Chopping wood imposed limits. Tending the fire required vigilance. Ashes had to be cleared, smoke managed, fuel rationed. Fire rewarded care and punished neglect. These were not quaint chores but moral formation. The hearth taught patience, responsibility, and realism long before children were capable of abstract moral reasoning. Remove it, Senior warned, and the imagination loses its apprenticeship in reality.

Its disappearance, therefore, was not a neutral upgrade. It was a judgment about the kind of human beings modern life intends to form.

## The Official Case Against Fire

**Today, fireplaces** are discouraged, regulated, or removed altogether. The justification is nearly always the same: health.

A substantial body of academic literature frames residential wood combustion as a public-health hazard. Studies identify emissions of fine particulate matter (Allen et al.), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (Gustafson), black carbon, and carbon monoxide associated with wood burning indoors (Orru et al.). Epidemiological models then associate these exposures with elevated risks of respiratory illness (Martins et al.), cardiovascular disease (Noonan), and, in some studies, lung cancer (Mehta et al.). Large-scale assessments treat residential wood burning as a meaningful contributor to ambient air pollution in certain regions, particularly during winter inversions.

The literature is not frivolous. Poorly ventilated combustion, wet fuel, and older stove technology can elevate indoor pollutant concentrations. Population-level exposure matters. Prudence.

But the structure of this research deserves scrutiny.



First, it is overwhelmingly risk-aggregative. It models harms across populations, often assuming frequent or continuous exposure. The difference between an occasional, well-managed hearth and chronic, inefficient combustion is rarely decisive in the analysis.

Second, it is asymmetrically evaluative. Harms are quantified meticulously; benefits—social, psychological, formative—are treated as subjective and, therefore, methodologically invisible. What cannot be reduced to a pollutant concentration effectively does not exist.

Third, it is dreadfully technocratic. The apparent goal is risk minimization not human formation. Whether a technology disciplines responsibility, anchors family life, or orders attention lies outside the frame.

One wonders whether the implicit goal isn't the annihilation of the hearth merely to discourage family life. The scientific conclusion, seldom stated explicitly yet difficult to miss, is that the safest fire is *no fire at all*.

## Is the Science Closed?

Not entirely.

A smaller body of research complicates the prevailing narrative. Experimental and psychophysiological studies have identified calming effects associated with hearth or campfire exposure, including reductions in blood pressure and stress markers (Lynn et al.). These findings suggest that fire is not merely a pollutant source but a multisensory experience with measurable effects on the human nervous system.

This does not negate the risks identified elsewhere. Rather, it exposes a scientific limitation: the technical literature measures what it knows how to measure. The absence of a variable is not proof of its irrelevance. Benefits that are diffuse, contextual, or long-term rarely survive reductionist frameworks.

In short, the question is not whether fireplaces pose risks. They do. The question is whether modern analysis is capable of evaluating trade-offs rather than issuing blanket prohibitions.

Here, modern science hesitates—perhaps out of malice, but certainly, at least, out of methodological constraint.

## Fire as a Physical Reality

To see what may be missing, it helps to step outside epidemiology altogether.

Quantum physicist Steven A. Young, Ph.D., approaches fire not as a medical variable but as a physical phenomenon. Young observes that real fire emits a broad spectrum of electromagnetic radiation closely analogous to sunlight. An open flame produces not only infrared heat but visible light across the color spectrum and trace ultraviolet frequencies. Central heating systems (e.g., radiators, forced air, underfloor water loops) do not. They deliver warmth stripped of light.

This distinction matters. Human beings have always lived under the sun and around fire. Since the beginning, fire extended daylight, structured circadian rhythms, and provided radiant heat qualitatively different from ambient warmth. Replacing fire with sealed systems that deliver heat without light is not a neutral substitution. It alters the sensory and energetic environment of the home.

Young does not claim that fire is a medical cure. His argument is more modest and more unsettling: modern models of health may be blind to entire categories of influence. When heat is reduced to temperature alone—divorced from spectrum, rhythm, and presence—something essential is excluded by definition.

Whether Young is entirely correct is less important than the question he forces upon us: What have we decided not to see?



# The Democracy of the Dead

7

At this point, a Chestertonian appeal becomes unavoidable.

Tradition, Chesterton famously wrote, is the “democracy of the dead”—the extension of the franchise to those who came before us. The near-universal presence of hearths across civilizations was not an accident, nor was it merely an aesthetic choice. We don’t see fireplaces built into every English bedroom without reason.

For thousands of years, human beings lived closer to smoke, flame, ash, and risk than we do now. They were not ignorant of discomfort or danger. They were intimately acquainted with both. Nor were they driven by fanciful romanticism or mere aesthetics. Yet they continued to build homes around hearths. They judged the benefits as far outweighing the costs.

Modern man assumes he knows better because he measures more precisely. But measurement precision is not wisdom. To dismiss the accumulated judgment of countless generations on the basis of models that cannot account for formation, meaning, or attention is not scientific humility. It is chronological arrogance.

## What Was Really Removed

CRISIS  
MAGAZINE

The removal of hearths did not simply eliminate smoke. It eliminated winter as a teacher.

For centuries, cold was not an inconvenience to be engineered away but a reality that ordered life. Winter forced households inward. Fire gathered families not by preference but by necessity. Light mattered because darkness was real. Warmth mattered because it was earned. The hearth did not merely heat bodies; it disciplined attention, coordinated time, and made dependence visible.

Advent made more sense in such a world. Waiting was not abstract but embodied. It was felt in shortened days, chilled air, and the visible hunger for light. The Incarnation was intelligible precisely because the world was cold and dim and because warmth and radiance arrived from a source that demanded care.

Modern homes abolish this pedagogy. Central heating flattens the season. Artificial light dissolves night. The body is kept perpetually comfortable while the soul is left untrained. We are surprised when Advent feels thin, when Christmas arrives without gravity, when light no longer astonishes—yet we have removed the conditions that once made astonishment possible.

Senior was right: culture is not lost all at once. It is dismantled quietly, room by room, habit by habit, hearth by hearth. The fireplace was removed in the name of safety and efficiency, but what vanished with it was harder to measure (and easier to miss): the domestic apprenticeship in waiting, restraint, and gratitude.

Before asking whether fireplaces are safe or practical, we might ask a more uncomfortable question: What kind of human beings are we forming in homes without winter as teacher, darkness as constrainer, and warm light as comforter?

May your home, this winter or next, be warmed, lit, and bedazzled with the crackling energy and smoky scent of real fire. If you have no place this year for St. Nicholas’ cookies or to warm your stockings, may you soon rediscover (and reprioritize) a home with hearth.

## References

Allen, R.W., Semmens, E.O., & Larson, T.V. (2009). “The Impact of Wood Stove Technology Upgrades on Indoor Residential Air Quality.” *Atmospheric Environment*, 43(37), 5908–5915.

Chesterton, G.K. (1908). *Orthodoxy*. London: John Lane.

Gustafson, P., Östman, C., & Sällsten, G. (2008). “Indoor Levels of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Homes with or without Wood Burning for Heating.” *Environmental Science & Technology*, 42(14), 5074–5080.

# Birth and Redemption in Winter

⑧ The birth of Jesus Christ is celebrated four days after the Winter Solstice.

During the reign of the Emperor Augustus (27 BC — 14 AD), Romans kept vital records in all of their provinces, including Judea. However, no birth certificates for commoners in the province at that time survived. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke mention a census around the time of Jesus's birth, but no Roman census records survived to confirm their literary references. Thus, it was up to the early Roman Catholic Church to calculate Christ's probable date of birth.

It's probably no coincidence that December 25 was also the festival day of *Natalis Solis Invicti* (Birthday of the Unconquered Sun). Church leaders likely chose this date to associate Christ with the sun reversing course to return to the northern hemisphere after the winter solstice.

Early Christians calculated Jesus's conception date as March 25 (the traditional date for the Annunciation). Nine months later is December 25.

For most of human history in most of the northern hemisphere, winter was naturally associated with hard times, scarcity, and uncertainty. Pieter Bruegel the Elder captured the leanness of winter with his famous painting, *Hunters in the Snow*, dated 1565. Note that the hunters have little to show for their effort.

And yet, an element of cheerfulness is visible in the distance in the image of people dancing and skating on the frozen pond.

Shakespeare memorably captured the idea rejuvenation in the midst of winter with the opening lines of *Richard III*.

Now is the winter of our discontent

Made glorious summer by this sun of York.

Long before the Christmas tree became a decorative tradition, the fir (*Tanne* in German) had been associated with eternal life and fidelity because it remains vividly green even during the coldest of winters. The idea is expressed in the German folk song.

O Tannenbaum, o Tannenbaum,  
wie treu sind deine Blätter!  
Du grünst nicht nur zur Sommerzeit,  
Nein auch im Winter, wenn es schneit.

O Christmas tree, o Christmas tree  
How faithful are your leaves!  
You're green not only in the summertime,  
No, also in winter when it snows.

By John Leake  
Courageous Discourse  
December 27, 2025

Queen Victoria and her German husband, Prince Albert, are credited with widely introducing the Christmas tree tradition to the English speaking world in the 1840s.



# A Story of a 1930s Uprising Against British Colonialism Is Key To Understanding Gaza Today

(9)

'Palestine 36' is a potent reminder that the blueprint for Israel's depraved war crimes in Gaza were laid down by a British empire whose tyranny the Palestinians tried - and failed - to end

by Jonathan Cook | Dec 16, 2025

Anyone wondering why the British state and media, despite the latter's pretension to serve as a watchdog on power, continue to cheerlead Israel's genocidal slaughter of civilians in Gaza will find the answers in a new film.

It recounts not the current period of history, but a story from nearly 90 years ago.

*Palestine 36*, directed by the remarkable Palestinian film-maker Annemarie Jacir, illuminates more about the events unfolding for the past two years in Gaza than anything you will read in a British newspaper or watch on the BBC - if, that is, you can find anything at all about Gaza in the news since Donald Trump rebranded the killing and dispossession of Palestinians as a "ceasefire".

And *Palestine 36* does so, unusually for a Palestinian film, with a budget worthy of a Hollywood blockbuster and with a cast that includes names recognizable to western audiences, from Jeremy Irons to Liam Cunningham.

This is a major episode of British colonial history told not through British eyes but, for once, through the eyes of its victims.

The "36" of the title refers to 1936, when Palestinians rose up against British colonial tyranny - more usually, and deceitfully, referred to as a "British Mandate" issued by the League of Nations.

The problem for Palestinians was not just the systematic violence of those three decades of tyranny. It was that Britain's role as a supposed caretaker of Palestine - an "arbiter of peace" between native Palestinians and mostly Jewish immigrants - served as cover for a much more sinister project.

It was British officials who ushered Jews out of Europe - where they were unwanted by racist governments, including Britain's - to implant them in Palestine. There, they were actively nurtured as the foot soldiers of a coming "Jewish state" that was supposed to be dependent on Britain and assist in strengthening its imperial, regional agenda.

In effect, an overstretched British empire hoped over time to outsource its colonial role to a "Jewish" fortress state.

## Anti-colonial struggle

One of Britain's top priorities was crushing an Arab nationalism sweeping an area of the Middle East known as the Levant in response to British and French colonial rule.

Arab nationalism was a secular, unifying political ideology that sought to overcome the arbitrary borders imposed by the colonial powers, and strengthen Arab identity in opposition to foreign occupation. It was profoundly anti-colonial, which is why Britain and France were so deeply hostile to it.

The Palestinians were critically important to Arab nationalism because their homeland served as a geographical bridgehead between the powerhouses of Arab nationalism in Lebanon and Syria to the north, and Egypt to the south.

For the British, the impulse for liberation in Palestine had to be snuffed out at all costs. However, the increasing brutality of British despotism simply fed an insurgency that by

1936 solidified into what westerners term a three-year "Arab Revolt" and Palestinians call their very "First Intifada", or uprising.

Later, there would be years-long, large-scale Palestinian uprisings – this time against Israel's even more repressive brand of settler colonialism – that erupted in 1987 and again in 2000.

The 1936-39 Revolt grew so large that at its height, according to Palestinian historian Rashid Khalidi, Britain briefly had more British soldiers stationed in tiny Palestine than in the whole of India.

This is the story recounted by *Palestine 36* – one that British schoolchildren are never taught, and one that the British media never offer as context for today's crimes in historic Palestine.

Which is why Britons watching the film are likely not only to be shocked by the extent and nature of Britain's colonial violence but to see in those savage events a premonition of what is now unfolding in Gaza.

### War crimes training

There are small sections of the Palestinian solidarity movement quick to condemn Israel's brutality towards Palestinians as something exceptional, as something peculiar to Israel and its rationalizing ideology of Zionism.

Jacir's film is a potent reminder of how foolish this approach is.

Israel's current colonial violence is simply a more sophisticated, more hi-tech version of the techniques employed by British colonialism nearly a century ago. The Israeli military learnt from the British – quite literally.

One of the main characters in *Palestine 36* is the British officer Orde Wingate, who carried out night raids on Palestinian villages to terrify their inhabitants. Wingate organized punishment squads, comprised of British soldiers and recently arrived Jewish militia members, to conduct these raids.

The training he offered to the Jewish militias in British military colonial strategy and hybrid warfare would later serve as the Israeli military's playbook.

The death of Wingate in 1944 in a plane crash in Burma was lamented by David Ben Gurion, Israel's founding father. He commented that, had Wingate survived, he might have served as Israel's first military chief of staff.

The film shows Wingate committing routine war crimes: using a Palestinian child as a human shield; rounding up Palestinian women and children to put them in an open-air, barbed-wire camp, depriving them of water in the midday heat; burning Palestinian crops; blowing up a bus of Palestinian men he had arbitrarily detained.

Meanwhile, British colonial police officer Charles Tegart imported into Palestine militarized forts of a type he had earlier devised and constructed across India to put down the uprisings there.

These forts would become the blueprint for Israel's series of steel and concrete walls and checkpoints that have fragmented historic Palestine, and caged much of the Palestinian population into prisons – including the largest, Gaza.

Watching *Palestine 36*, it is hard not be reminded – as we see Palestinians ritually humiliated, abused and killed by the British, supposedly to instill obedience – why each Palestinian generation has grown more radicalized and more desperate.

Britain's vicious, colonial repression of the three-year uprising of 1936 led ultimately to Hamas' violent one-day jail-break on 7 October 2023 and Israel's genocidal, colonial rampage in response.

(11)

Israel's genocide will no more pacify this generation of Palestinians than Wingate's crushing of the Arab Revolt did to an earlier generation. It will simply deepen the wounds – and a collective will to resist.

### **Ideological zealotry**

Importantly, the film also grapples with – if more obliquely – Britain's contribution to an ideological zealotry usually attributed to Israel.

Wingate's fervent subjugation of the Palestinian people and his view of them as little more than animals, as well as his passionate attachment to the Jewish people, were rooted in the ideology of Zionism.

All too often overlooked is the fact that Zionism long predates its modern-day incarnation as Jewish nationalism.

Wingate followed in a long tradition of influential European Christian Zionists, who believed that Biblical prophecy would be advanced by “restoring” the Jewish people to their ancient homeland. Only then, in a supposed “end times”, would the stage be set for Christ to return and establish his kingdom on earth.

Lord Balfour – he of the 1917 Balfour Declaration that promised a “national home” for the Jewish people in Palestine – was another prominent British Christian Zionist.

Today, such views are shared by many tens of millions of Christian evangelicals, who are the support base for US President Trump.

The Palestinian people – many of whom, genetic studies suggest, are descended from the ancient Canaanites living in the region thousands of years ago, and who subsequently converted to Christianity and Islam – were viewed by Christian Zionists like Wingate as little more than an obstacle to the realization of divine prophecy.

If they would not obey God's will by clearing themselves out of their own homeland to make way for the Jewish people, then they would have to be forced to do so.

The Zionism of Israelis, as poll after poll shows, has led them in a similar, racist direction to Wingate: large numbers support ethnic cleansing and the genocide of Palestinians.

Social media posts by Israeli soldiers openly revel in their depraved treatment of Gaza's people.

### **‘Not fully human’**

Which brings us back to the present day.

Film reviews in the British press of *Palestine 36* have been, at best, lukewarm. Even the supposedly liberal Guardian damns it as “heartfelt” – as if mollifying a child over a second-rate school essay.

That should not surprise us. The British establishment – just like the US one that took on the mantle of global policeman from Britain after the Second World War – still treats Arab nationalism as a threat.

12

It still views Israel as a vital colonial outpost. It still regards Palestine as a testing ground for techniques of surveillance and counter-insurgency. It still views the Palestinians as not fully human.

Which is why British Prime Minister Keir Starmer – sounding like a modern version of Wingate, reinvented as a politician – was unabashed in defending Israel's decision to deprive the people of Gaza, including its one million children, of food, water and power. That is, to starve them in violation of the fundamentals of international law.

It is why Starmer and the British establishment keep shipping arms to Israel and supplying it with the intelligence it has been using to target civilians. It is why Starmer welcomed to Downing Street Israel's President, Isaac Herzog, who rationalized the genocide by stating there were no "uninvolved" civilians in Gaza.

It is why the British army is still training Israeli military officers in the UK, just as Wingate did with their predecessors. And it is why British officers still head to Israel to learn from its genocidal military.

It is why Britain still offers Israel diplomatic protection, and why it has threatened the International Criminal Court for seeking to hold Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to account for committing crimes against humanity in Gaza.

And it is why Starmer and his government have changed the definition of terrorism to criminalize Britons who express opposition to the genocide in Gaza.

The truth is we cannot look to our government, schools or our media to educate us about British colonial history, whether in Palestine or in any of the other places around the globe Britain has tyrannized.

Instead, we must start listening to the victims of our violence, if we are ever to understand not just the past, but the present too.

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

*Jonathan Cook is the author of three books on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and a winner of the Martha Gellhorn Special Prize for Journalism. His website and blog can be found at [www.jonathan-cook.net](http://www.jonathan-cook.net).*



# Stop Picking on Poor Little Israel

(13)

There was a mass shooting in Australia so now everyone needs to shut up and do whatever Israel wants. Israel feels sad about the shooting so now it gets to do a bit more genocide, as a treat. It's only fair.

By Caitlin Johnstone

[CaitlinJohnstone.com](http://CaitlinJohnstone.com)

December 25, 2025

Stop picking on poor little Israel. It's just sitting there minding its own business trying to do a little genocide in peace while aggressively lobbying your government to crush your freedom of speech and freedom of assembly, and you're OBSESSING about it for NO REASON.

You just hate Jews. That's the only possible reason you could spend so much time obsessing about this one tiny little harmless country: you've got a crazy, irrational fixation on a small abrahamic religion, because you're a weirdo. Stop saying it's actually about all the wars and atrocities and apartheid and starving children and lobbying and propaganda and nonstop assaults on your civil rights and your government's complicity in genocidal abuses and the fact that you can't engage in any aspect of society without having pro-Israel influence operations shoved down your throat. No. That's not it. It's because you get freakishly enraged by small hats.

Don't you know there was a shooting on Bondi Beach? Some ISIS guys killed some Jewish people, and it never would have happened if protesters hadn't been accusing Israel of doing bad things. Stop saying they did it because they had been involved with ISIS for many years. They did it because you wore a watermelon pin.

There was a mass shooting in Sydney so that means everything that happened over the previous two years gets erased, just like how October 7 automatically deleted the last eight decades. Everything that happened before the bad thing gets shaken out of existence like an Etch A Sketch, and anything that's done afterward is justified by the bad thing. If this happens to advance pre-existing Israeli agendas like massive land grabs or suppression of pro-Palestine demonstrators, so be it. Them's the rules.

There was a mass shooting in Australia so now everyone needs to shut up and do whatever Israel wants. Israel feels sad about the shooting so now it gets to do a bit more genocide, as a treat. It's only fair.

Why are you so obsessed with Israel when there are other countries doing bad things in the world, anyway? How come you're not worried about the Iran lobby manipulating your country's political affairs, huh? Why aren't you freaking out about all the bombs and war planes the United States has been sending to the Cubans to help them commit genocide? Why have I never seen you angrily objecting to Australia and the United

(14)

Kingdom outlawing criticism of China? Where are your outraged polemics about the way the western news media churn out propaganda to advance the information interests of Russia? You're just focused on that one particular country with that one particular religion for some strange reason, aren't ya, Adolf?

You're just picking on this one poor little nation that's completely defenseless except for a few dozen nukes and the backing of the most powerful empire in history and the full support of the most sophisticated propaganda machine that has ever existed. This tiny, insignificant, helpless little country that's surrounded by enemies who hate it for absolutely no reason, who are so senselessly hostile that it needs to constantly preemptively attack them in order to stay safe.

Look at a map of all the Muslim countries compared to the one tiny Jewish country that was forcefully installed right smack dab in the middle of all of them. You're telling me that one little country is the problem? Just because it was dropped on top of a pre-existing civilization in a region with no historical relationship with its immigrant inhabitants under the direct supervision of western imperialists who'd been working to subjugate the middle east for centuries? Outrageous! You just don't think the Jews are uniquely undeserving of their own state.

Get a hobby or something, loser. Stop picking on this innocent little Bambi-eyed waif of a nation who has never, ever done anything wrong. Stop obsessing over genocide and tyranny and the erosion of civil liberties throughout the western world, and pay attention to something else. Literally anything else. Please. Please stop looking at Israel and its actions. I can't keep doing this. This is getting exhausting.



TommL/iStock

“The Heart of Berlin Hangs on This Gate”



Just after midnight on December 22, 1989, workers punched a hole in the Brandenburg Gate. Once the first openings were made, West German police officers and East German border guards shook hands. Germans on both sides cheered in the darkness, celebrating with sparkling wine.

Later that day, West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl walked through the gate's center arch—once reserved for royalty—to meet East German Prime Minister Hans Modrow. Thousands of Germans on either side stood in the rain and applauded.

"The heart of Berlin hangs on this gate," West Berlin Mayor Walter Momper remarked (translated from German). "Life will become normal again, life will become even more beautiful."

The Brandenburg Gate's Neoclassical arches and columns had survived Prussian kings, Napoleon's invasion, and Nazi occupation. But in 1961, when the East German government erected the Berlin Wall—a concrete symbol of the Cold War divide—the gate was sealed.

For decades it remained closed, representing the ideological separation between communist East Berlin and democratic West Berlin. Then, on November 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall came down: When the East German government announced that travel restrictions would be lifted, jubilant crowds flooded checkpoints and even began physically dismantling the wall, chipping away with hammers and pickaxes.

After that joyful but chaotic demonstration, leaders opted for a formal reopening of the Brandenburg Gate six weeks later.

So, why did the wall come down?

The divide began after World War II, when Germany and its capital were carved up by Allied leaders. The U.S., British, and French sections of Berlin became West Berlin, and the Soviet Union took control of East Berlin. Germany split in 1949, and in 1952 the border between East and West Germany was closed. In 1961 the Berlin Wall went up, separating families overnight.

By the 1980s, however, communism was on the ropes in much of Europe. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union's newly elected general secretary of the Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, promised openness, increased transparency, and reform.

In 1987 U.S. Pres. Ronald Reagan famously entreated, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!"

Eventually, they did.

Germany reunited less than a year after the wall fell, and the Brandenburg Gate was returned to its original purpose: a peaceful welcome to the heart of the city.

## A Christmas Gift to the War Machine

RON PAUL • DECEMBER 22, 2025 • 600 WORDS • [LEAVE A COMMENT](#)

Late last week, Congress passed and President Trump signed the 2026 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). The bill marks the first time the US military budget officially passed the one trillion dollar mark. Of course, when you add in other military-related spending such as interest on the debt, veterans' affairs, and military components of other government agencies, the true number is at least one and a half times that amount.

To paraphrase the famous 1953 President Eisenhower speech, "The Chance for Peace," each of these dollars spent on military offense and the maintenance of the US global empire rather than on defense of our own nation is taken from the mouths of the hungry and off the backs of hardworking American families.

Congress is so addicted to military spending that they appropriated even more money than President Trump requested, including an unconscionable \$800 million for thoroughly corrupt Ukraine. Will Washington ever be called to answer for why Americans, who are seeing their standard of living eaten away by inflation and a declining economy, should continue to subsidize a criminal regime overseas whose ruling class enjoys the comfort of golden toilets?

The Ukraine money also undermines President Trump's claim to be a neutral mediator in the conflict. How can you be a peacemaker when you are sending nearly a billion dollars in weapons to one side to help kill the other side? It makes no sense.

Congress even included measures in the bill that would prevent President Trump from bringing any US troops home from real "forever wars" in Korea and Europe. For how many more decades must the American worker continue to subsidize a US military presence in countries completely unrelated to our own security? World War II ended 80 years ago and the Korean war some ten years later. Yet the American military empire remains, at an incalculable cost to Americans.

Some fellow critics will say this is all about welfare for rich countries overseas, and that's partly right. But more than that, it is welfare for the politically-connected US military-industrial complex at home. Imagine how many retired US military officers and former US officials-turned-lobbyists might be financially inconvenienced if we finally "just marched home"?

This week Western Christians will celebrate the coming of the Prince of Peace, with the Orthodox celebrating a few days later. It is disheartening that so many Americans who call themselves Christians also hold fast to a view that we must bankrupt our country and impoverish our people by playing policeman to the world and arbiter of whose regime must be changed by Washington.

Christians are among the biggest victims in these overseas operations, including in Syria, Lebanon, and Gaza. Yet many American Christians turn a blind eye to the suffering and misery produced by neocon-led militarism overseas. They don't care that unquestioning support for Israel, for example, has nearly erased Christianity from where it was born.

Imagine if Jesus were born in the Holy Land today.

"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." That is the message of the Savior whose birth we Christians celebrate this week. Continuing to bankrupt our country and export misery overseas in the futile pursuit of a global military empire places us in opposition to this worthwhile advice. Let us all join together and work for a real peace in the New Year!

December 26, 2025

# Zionist Israel Owns Trump

(17)

*"The Zionists indeed learnt well from the Nazis. So well that it seems that their morally repugnant treatment of the Palestinians, and their attempts to destroy Palestinian society within Israel and the occupied territories, reveals them as basically Nazis with beards and black hats."*

~ Norman Finkelstein

Bold statement you may say, but is it really? Trump is still funding genocide by Israel to the tune of billions. Most of Trump's Cabinet are either Zionists, or heavy Israeli sympathizers. More and more weapons are flowing from the U.S. to Israel, and Trump is pushing hard to save the genocide-loving Netanyahu from prosecution for war crimes, and is hosting this monster once again at the White House on December 29th. In the interim, Netanyahu is threatening the U.S. and the rest of the West if they do not bow to the Jewish State, and Trump's biggest money supporter (controller) is the billionaire Miriam Adelson, who has offered Trump another \$250 million to run again in 2028.

It seems nothing disturbs the U.S. political class when it comes to Israel, whether the USS Liberty attack, the 9/11 false flag with massive Jewish involvement, or the Australia false flag attack at Bondi that appears to have been staged by the Zionists. Of course these are just a very few examples among many more, but then who is counting? It should be accepted that Israel runs this country and its political system, and is protected at every turn of evil it commits by U.S. interests, all while your stolen tax dollars support every aspect of Israeli murder and genocide around the world. Face it, the U.S. is the bought and paid-for lapdog of Israeli Zionism.

As I said earlier this year:

*"Trump has supported, funded, and armed Zionist Israel all along, (as have many other tyrants) has been a partner in the murder of innocents in Gaza and Palestine, but also in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Ukraine, and now Iran. Trump is anxious to embroil this country in war, regardless of the mass death and destruction that is sure to follow. He cares not one iota about any American or anyone else. Warmongering States, such as the U.S., are supported and enriched by wars, and the U.S. has waged wars of aggression for the entirety of its existence."*

*"The slaughter in Gaza is not any war or conflict, and it is not meant to protect Israel or the U.S. from make-believe terrorists, it is only to eliminate an entire people, and likely going forward, an entire region, so as to allow Zionist Israel to accomplish the goal of its horrendous "Greater Israel Project." Israel has locked up the Palestinians in a giant cage, no different than a mass concentration camp, and is summarily slaughtering them, destroying their homes and lives, and killing everything that moves out of pure hatred and bogus religious biblical nonsense and lies. This is all being done in your names, and to date, very few have raised a finger to stop it."*



18

Some Jews are now running away from the term Zionist, but why did it take so long? It is not that the Rothschild Jewish 'State' just recently decided on evil, as it has always been, but the pressure for some to distance themselves from Zionist murdering colonialism has been ramped up due to exposure of its murder and slaughter, especially of children. Even the state-owned media have had to accept the fact that openly supporting Israel's genocide is not good for business, as the world is now seeing the carnage and slaughter live-streamed first hand. At this point, I do not know if this is an honest response by a minority of Jews, or is simply a protective measure due to this exposure of Zionist depravity.

But no worries, as Trump's piece of garbage son-in-law, and on Trump's orders, Jared Kushner, along with Middle East Envoy Steve Witkoff, are now in the process of launching "Project Sunrise," to make the fully destroyed genocidal Gaza into a luxury beach destination. This is meant to be a new 'smart city' with an initial build cost of \$112 billion, with more than half that amount coming from U.S. taxpayer coffers according to some. This will only be a playground for the rich and famous U.S. and Israeli money men, and pedophiles and child molesters as well, all at your expense. The evil Trump calls this 'his' "Riviera of the Middle East." But of course, this is only to assist poor mutilated Gazans; all to help them out of 'poverty' you understand, if even one is left alive. To make a statement such as this requires that Trump understands that his audience (masses) be so stupid as to not see through this heinous immoral insanity. Considering all that has happened, I think he is right.

With Christmas coming tomorrow, I will leave it here, as discussing this subject will certainly be too disturbing for all those 'Christians' who are frantically tearing open their gifts while avoiding any thought of all the victims of this Zionist/U.S. holocaust and genocide of Palestine and the Middle East.

Israel and the U.S. are one, as I have always said, and therefore, Trump's America is Zionist America, because 'Jewish' interests control America.

By **Gary D. Barnett**  
**GaryDBarnett.com**

*This article was originally published on [GaryDBarnett.com](http://GaryDBarnett.com).*

