

# The Palmer Raids: A Precedent for Today's Immigration Policy Abuses?

①  
JCRM C PCKET  
December 22, 2025

by Ted Galen Carpenter | Dec 16, 2025 | 0 Comments

Americans who value civil liberties are justifiably outraged at reports about some of the enforcement tactics used by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents. Similar complaints are now surfacing about the behavior of ICE's sister agency, Customs and Border Protection (CBP). There have been verified episodes in which masked agents have forcefully grabbed suspected illegal immigrants at their places of employment or even off the streets and taken them to jail, all while refusing to identify themselves or apprise the individuals of their constitutional rights. In some cases, the people seized have been kept in custody for days. Several of the terrorized victims have even turned out to be U.S. citizens.

Most of the news media's attention focused on ICE's role until early November 2025. However, the White House then instructed the CBP to be more active. The change became quite visible a little later that month when CBP launched a major immigration enforcement initiative ("Charlotte's Web") in Charlotte, North Carolina (a city not near any U.S. border). The crackdown resulted in 130 arrests in just the first two days. Several especially ugly incidents involving CBP agents occurred, including the rather violent arrest of two U.S. citizens for allegedly warning people that enforcement operations were taking place in their neighborhood.

ANTIWAR.COM The tactics that ICE and CBP are using seem far more appropriate for a police state than a democratic republic. As with so many other recent highlighted civil liberties abuses, though, the problem did not begin when Donald Trump became president. Instead, previous administrations set a number of troubling precedents. Unsavory practices to enforce U.S. immigration laws, including holding detainees without due process for extended periods in overcrowded conditions, certainly are nothing new. Even accosting suspects at their place of employment or on the streets is not unprecedented.

One historical episode that bears an especially troubling similarity to the current conduct of ICE and CBP was the so-called Palmer Raids during Woodrow Wilson's administration. Wilson's minions had waged a brutal crackdown on dissent regarding a wide range of issues during World War I. But that armed conflict ended in November 1918. The Palmer raids occurred months after the cessation of hostilities.

Likewise, the United States is supposedly at peace now. The Palmer raids and the current ICE-CBP crackdowns thus have occurred in peacetime settings – making the typical expansive "national security" justifications used during wars much weaker and less credible.

The Palmer raids began on November 7, 1919, coinciding with the second anniversary of Russia's Bolshevik revolution. Federal agents, operating in collaboration with state and local law enforcement agencies, led hundreds of simultaneous raids and took more than 200 radical leftists into custody. Wilson's attorney general, A. Mitchell Palmer, ordered the searches and arrests following the discovery of multiple bomb plots directed against prominent Americans in April 1919. During the rest of that year and into 1920, the detonation of several bombs took place, including one major incident on Wall Street and an attack on Palmer's own home in June 1919.

Palmer was ideologically inclined to support a hardline authoritarian approach in any case. He had been a vocal advocate of repressive wartime measures, especially the



②

Espionage Act of 1917 and sedition legislation in 1918. Even though the war was now over, Palmer lobbied for congressional passage of a new peacetime sedition act. The bill he endorsed would not only have made permanent all of the wartime restrictions of the Sedition Act of 1918, but also sought to add a provision prohibiting “incitement” to commit sedition. That language was so vague and vacuous that it could mean virtually anything law enforcement officials wanted it to mean.

Fortunately, Congress balked at the Wilson administration’s latest foray into blatant authoritarianism. However, Palmer and his allies were able to carry out part of his agenda through the raids he initiated in late 1919 and early 1920. Indeed, the Palmer raids culminated in early January 1920 with another wave of arrests that incarcerated another 3,000 suspects. The majority of the individuals targeted were immigrants, primarily from Central or East European countries. Nearly half of them were from Russia. The Bolshevik revolution in that country put Russian emigres under additional suspicion and intense scrutiny.

Officials routinely accused those arrested of being communists, anarchists, or other violent radicals. Some indeed were. However, the Wilson administration’s pervasive assault on political dissent that had occurred during World War I clearly had carried over into the post-war period. Moreover, as during the war, political authorities had little inclination to make any distinction between people with peaceful, albeit radical, views and advocates of violence and terrorism. Even peaceful dissenters were swept up in the dragnet raids and, in the case of immigrants, earmarked for deportation.

Most of the arrests conducted during the Palmer raids took place without valid warrants, much less other basic due process protections. The raids and subsequent detentions frequently were quite brutal, and many of the detainees were beaten or tortured in the process. Once again, there is a marked similarity between that episode and the ICE or CBP operations that are currently taking place. There also is a notable resemblance to the treatment that accused illegal immigrants are receiving now and the punishment inflicted on suspected terrorists in the months following the attacks on 9-11. By April 2025, 178 Venezuelan illegal immigrants apprehended in the United States were being held at the U.S. naval base in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, the same facility used for years after the 9-11 attacks to hold accused Al Qaeda terrorists.

President Trump and his advisers also have openly targeted immigrants who have dared to speak out against aspects of Washington’s foreign policy. Such hostility has been directed against defenders of Venezuela’s leftist autocracy – or even activists who oppose Washington’s increasingly apparent goal of conducting a regime change military intervention. The administration’s targeting and harassment of dissenters is even more blatant with respect to people who favor the Palestinian cause and denounce Israel’s conduct in Gaza and other portions of the Arab world. There have even been attempts to chill vocal opposition on the part of U.S. citizens to Washington’s support for Israeli policy. Indeed, the administration is taking steps to revoke the citizenship of foreign born critics.

But immigrants who are not U.S. citizens are even more vulnerable to manifestations of the administration’s displeasure. Again the similarity to the aftermath of the Palmer raids and the overall Red Scare is evident when some 249 individuals, including the famous left-wing activist Emma Goldman, were successfully deported to the Soviet Union.

The effort of the Trump administration and its political allies to legitimize and enforce the modern equivalent of the Palmer raids needs to be resisted vehemently. There already has been a dangerous erosion of basic civil liberties in the United States. People in a free country should never be required to “show their papers” to alleged law enforcement personnel, especially when those agents are masked and refuse to identify themselves. Yet that is the very real danger that we now face, as did the victims of the Palmer raids.



# Enumerated Powers are Ignored so You Can't Pay for your Home, Car, or Vacation

By Andrew Wallace

December 8, 2025

③

Sorry, but most of you are guilty of Ignorance and Apathy when you voted for a lying, charismatic Democrat, Communist, or Republican in Congress. None of these politicians give a damn about the people; they are only concerned about reelection and how much they can steal. Democrats and Communists are mean and ruthless, the Republicans are mealy-mouthed and weak.

You voted for your own destruction. So your only hope is to 1. vote every incumbent out of office and replace him/her with America-First Patriots, 2. replace the corrupt FBI with honest law enforcement who will jail every corrupt government official and employee, or 3. most importantly, demand that Congress obey the Enumerated Powers in the Constitution.

The Enumerated Powers specify exactly what the Federal Government can do; all other functions are reserved for the States and the People. The corrupt Traitors in government ignore the Enumerated Powers and usurp whatever functions they please, which is Treason and is impoverishing the people.

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC UNLESS ENUMERATED POWERS ARE FOLLOWED. OTHERWISE, MOST OF GOVERNMENT IS BUT A CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE WITH NO LEGAL BASIS FOR EXISTENCE AND SUBJECT TO REVOLUTION!

I have no fear of contradiction when I say that if government follows the Enumerated Powers that we would be living in extreme luxury. Therefore, we must do everything possible to force government to comply with the Enumerated Powers.

It goes without saying that every Democrat, Communist, and Republican hates President Trump because he is responsible for reducing their take from bribes and kickbacks. Of course, the Republicans don't admit that they, too, hate Trump.

The prostitutes you elected will continue to impoverish you until the Economic Collapse that is hanging over our heads takes over and we lose everything. Responsible Economists know how dire our situation is, but the Elites and their subservient Politicians don't give a damn.

If you limit the government to only its Enumerated Powers, you eliminate a majority of Government Expenses that are being spent, unlawfully funding a Criminal Enterprise, Welfare, and Communism that is rightfully a responsibility of the states to determine. Defunding the unconstitutional government functions would result in an almost instant and fantastic prosperity for those who work. Those who can work...and don't...will starve.

The following is a quote from Publius Huldah and a copy from her blog (<https://publiushuldah.wordpress.com/>). She is an expert on Constitutional Law. I recommend that you save this powerful information: **"Art. I, Sec. 8, clause 1, US Constitution, grants to Congress the authority to spend money on whatever THEY think is a good idea is a false interpretation which has been used to evade the constitutional limits on the federal gov's power. The only lawful powers Congress has over the Country at large are the enumerated powers..."**

**WE delegated to Congress the following Enumerated Powers over the Country at Large:**

**Article I, § 8, clauses 1-16 :**

④

**(1) To lay certain taxes;**

**(2) To pay the debts of the United States;**

**(3) To declare war and make rules of warfare, to raise and support armies and a navy and to make rules governing the military forces; to call forth the militia for certain purposes, and to make rules governing the militia;**

**(4) To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the States, and with the Indian Tribes;**

**(5) To establish uniform Rules of Naturalization;**

**(6) To establish uniform Laws on Bankruptcies;**

**(7) To coin money and regulate the value thereof;**

**(8) To fix the standard of Weights and Measures;**

**(9) To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting;**

**(10) To establish post offices and post roads;**

**(11) To issue patents and copyrights;**

**(12) To create courts inferior to the supreme court; and**

**(13) To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the Laws of Nations.**

**Other provisions of Our Constitution delegate to**

**Congress powers over the Country at Large to make laws regarding:**

**(14) An enumeration of the population for purposes of apportionment of Representatives and direct taxes (Art. I, § 2, 3);**

**(15) Elections of Senators & Representatives (Art. I, §4, cl. 1) and their pay (Art. I, § 6);**

**(16) After 1808, to prohibit importation of slaves (Art. I, § 9, 1); 2**

**(17) After 1808, to restrict migration (immigration) to these United States (Art. I, §9, cl. 1);**

**(18) A restricted power to suspend Writs of Habeas Corpus (Art. I, §9, cl. 2);**

**(19) To revise and control imposts or duties on imports or exports which may be laid by States (Art. I, § 10, cl. 2 & 3)**

**(20) A restricted power to declare the punishment of Treason**



(Art. III, §3, cl. 2);

⑤

(21) **Implementation of the Full Faith and Credit clause (Art.**

**IV, §1); and,**

(22) **Procedures for amendments to The Constitution (Art. V)."**

( end of copy from her Blog )

It is impossible to have a Constitutional Republic unless the Enumerated Powers are complied with by the federal government... and they are not. The only way to have unlimited prosperity is to follow the Constitution; the alternative is to continue as we are, taking us into a total Economic Collapse and probably a civil war. It is up to citizens to force government to comply with the law. I think President Trump and Congress will have a hell of a time freeing themselves from control by the Zionist Jewish Lobby and the Parasitic Super-Rich Ruling Class. But I must admit that Trump saved us from a civil war and has done many great things with a corrupt government that hated him and the people

## **Senate Passes Massive \$901 Billion National Defense Authorization Act, Sending It to Trump's Desk**

**When combined with a supplemental bill passed earlier this year, the NDAA will bring the US military budget to over \$1 trillion**

by Dave DeCamp | December 17, 2025 at 2:24 pm ET | ndaa

The Senate on Wednesday passed the \$901 billion 2026 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), the sweeping annual military spending bill that will be combined with legislation passed earlier this year to bring the total US military budget to over \$1 trillion.

The bill passed in a vote of 77-20, with just two Republicans, Senators Rand Paul (KY) and Mike Lee (UT), and 18 Democrats voting against it. The massive bill now heads to President Trump's desk for his signature.

Notable amendments include a provision directing the Selective Service System (SSS) to register all potential draftees in the US automatically. According to Edward Hasbrouk, an expert on the Selective Service, it marks the biggest change to the system since 1980.

The NDAA also includes a new provision to ensure Israel is not impacted by global arms restrictions that have been imposed in response to its genocidal war in Gaza. The amendment requires a review of the arms restrictions and says the US will take steps to "mitigate" any "gaps" it may find.

The spending bill includes at least two provisions that go against President Trump's agenda, including amendments to block troop drawdowns from Europe and South Korea, and one that requires the Pentagon to release to Congress videos of its bombings of alleged drug boats in Latin America.

If the Pentagon doesn't hand over the videos, the amendment would withhold a quarter of the travel budget for US Secretary of War Pete Hegseth, who has been under increasing scrutiny due to the September 2 bombing that involved multiple strikes to kill survivors.

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



⑥ “*Silent night, holy night. All is calm, all is bright.*” Such is the Christmas carol’s description of the state of things when our Lord was born. Similarly, in one of the antiphons during the Octave of Christmas, the Church prays: “*While all things were in silence, and the night was in the midst of her course, Your almighty Word, O Lord, leapt down from heaven’s royal throne, alleluia.*” It was in silence, then, that God the Son was born into the world.



What we commonly call our Lord’s “nativity” is, in truth, the second of three births of God the Son. St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that the first birth of God the Son is eternal and spiritual in nature. The *Nicene Creed* describes this birth as follows: “*the only-begotten Son of God, [was] born of the Father before all ages, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things were made.*”

By contrast, God the Son’s second birth is His temporal and bodily birth of the blessed Virgin Mary. The *Athanasian Creed* compares this birth with the Divine Son’s first birth: “*Now the true faith requires us to believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is both God and man. He is God, begotten of the substance of the Father before the world began; He is man, born of the substance of His Mother into the world.*”

Lastly, God the Son’s third birth, which occurs whenever a person is justified by God’s sanctifying grace, is temporal and spiritual. In his reflections on the spiritual fruitfulness of the virgin Church and of her members who are virgins, St. Augustine speaks of God the Son’s third birth. He writes: “*What you marvel at in the flesh of Mary, accomplish in the depths of your own soul. For he who believes in his heart according to justice conceives Christ; he who confesses unto salvation (Rom. 10:10) gives birth to Christ. In this way, fecundity may surge up in your souls and virginity may persevere.*” By an inward act

of faith in Christ, each member of Christ’s Mystical Body conceives Him within himself. And by an outward act of professing Christ, each of Christ’s members gives birth to Him in imitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Is silence in any way associated with God the Son’s first and third births, as it is with His second birth? Indeed, it is. Regarding His first birth, insofar as God the Son is born of the Father in the absolute stillness or unchangeableness of eternity, He is born in eternal silence. “*From the womb before the day-star,*” says God the Father, “*I have begotten you*” (Ps. 109: 3). Similarly, we can say that insofar as God the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son in the absolute stillness or unchangeableness of eternity, the Holy Spirit is spirated in eternal silence.

Now just as it is in eternal divine silence that the Son ineffably proceeds from the Father and the Holy Spirit ineffably proceeds from the Father and the Son, so it is in divine silence that the three Divine Persons together produce Their most ineffable effects in the created order. For it was in divine silence that the three Divine Persons united a human nature to God the Son and accomplished His birth of the Blessed Virgin Mary. And it is largely in this same silence that the Blessed Trinity continues, through the Church, to extend the salvific work of our Lord Jesus Christ. In his *The Power of Silence*, Cardinal Sarah sagaciously says:

*The transubstantiation of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, the most extraordinary, the most momentous transformation, occurs in the utmost silence. We hear the priest pronounce the words of the consecration, but the miracle of transubstantiation comes about imperceptibly, like all the greatest works of God. Silence is the law of the divine plans.”*

In keeping with this “law of the divine plans,” not only is God the Son’s third birth accomplished in silence, but so too is silence required for us to grow in our supernatural union with Him. Here it is necessary to distinguish between exterior and interior silence. Exterior silence is nothing other than the absence of noise or sound. Although exterior silence can be conducive to praying and fostering union with God the Son, it is not as necessary as interior silence. Regarding the necessity of interior silence, Fr. Gabriel of St. Mary Magdalene writes: “*it is not enough to observe exterior silence; we must also strive for interior silence, that is, silence of the interior senses – the memory, imagination, sensitive feelings, thoughts, recollections of the past and useless conjectures about the future.*”

Our Lord says of Himself: “*Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come into him and eat with him, and he with me*” (Rev. 3:20). It is principally interior silence which disposes us to hear the knock and voice of God the Son. It is principally interior silence which disposes us to open the door and to “eat” with Him.

This Christmastide, then, as we consider the silent night when God the Son was born into the world, let us also contemplate, by God’s grace, His first birth in eternal silence and His third birth in the silence of our souls. And, to assist us in this holy endeavor, let us meditate on the wise words of St. John of the Cross: “*The Father spoke one Word, which was His Son. He always speaks this Word in eternal silence. And it is in the silence of the soul that this Word must be heard.*” ✠



# HOLY PLACES

## Stealing into Our Humility

Anthony Esolen

THE DATE WAS DECEMBER 10, 1223, when the little man of God, Francis, went up to his friend, the devout mayor of the small fortress town of Greccio.

"John," he said, "if you want us to celebrate here in Greccio the feast of the Lord that is near, make haste and be sure to get ready what I tell you. For I want to honor the memory of the child who was born in Bethlehem, and to allow the eyes of the body to gaze on the hardships he endured from his needs as an infant, how he lay in a hovel, resting upon the hay, with the ox and the ass nearby." John did as the saint had ordered.

### ■ THE PLAY'S THE THING ■

Francis had in mind what we might call a sacred play or *tableau vivant*.

Drama is, historically, a shy bird, and for seven hundred years it was not a part of people's lives, till popular enthusiasm for plays that focused on events in Scripture spread throughout Europe in the early Middle Ages. Eventually, plays would be the central feature of a three-day celebration of Corpus Christi, great cycles of plays passed down from one generation to the next. Dante saw such plays. Shakespeare saw them when he was a boy.

*Tableaux vivants* used to be a popular form of educational entertainment. I've read that in the terrible Johnstown flood of 1889, the first people aware that the dam had burst were upstream, putting on just such a show for themselves. The idea was to call up a historic moment and make it present, with living and breathing statues.

### ■ LIGHT AND SONG ■

Everybody in the neighboring villages heard about what John and Francis were doing and came to the cave they had prepared: there was the ox and the ass, and a manger with hay, and Francis serving as deacon, ringing out the words of the Gospel narrative. His fellow friar Thomas tells us that people brought candles and torches "to illuminate that night that with its glittering star illuminates all days and years." Night shone like the day, to honor simplicity, to raise up poverty, to commend humility, and the people and the very animals were filled with joy, and as they sang, says Thomas, the cliffs round about them resounded. There the people heard the Christmas Mass, and Francis preached to them of the little town of Bethlehem, and whenever he uttered that sweet name, he seemed himself to have the voice of a lamb, and whenever he spoke of the little child Jesus, he lingered upon the name, and his lips seemed as they were tasting something inexpressibly sweet.

And John, standing nearby, had a vision, that there was a child in the manger, lifeless, and he saw Francis take up the child and wake it from its sleep. That vision was most fitting, says Thomas, because there were many people who had abandoned the child Jesus to oblivion, whom Francis, by the power of Jesus, had roused up again to life, impressing the Child upon their memory.

Imagine, reader, what that scene was like, in darkness flooded with the light of the infant boy, the light of Jesus, come into a world of people who had forgotten God or never known him. Imagine the friars singing, and the people rejoicing, and the ox and the ass, in their stolid innocence, contented with the people around them, and in their simple way partaking of the glory of it all.

### ■ GO AND SEE ■

⑦

And if you want some help in imagining it, you can go to that same Greccio where Francis brought the Christmas scene to life—where he fashioned, as some people put it, the first Christmas Crèche.

Francis could have chosen Assisi, but I suspect he wanted to bless a place that was smaller, humbler, less prominent. After all, the prophet Micah, foretelling the birth of the Messiah, says that Bethlehem, little among the thousands of Judah, would be that place where the great shepherd and Lord of Israel was to come (5:1). Francis had spent some time in the Holy Land, and Bethlehem then was but a small town perched on a mountain, in lands controlled by the Muslims. Greccio, enclosed within walls, approachable only by a mountain road, reminded him of Bethlehem.

You can go visit the Sanctuary of Greccio, built where the scene took place, and see, in the small chapel there, a fresco that tells the story. It has been much damaged by age and by the ravages of war. But you can still see Mary and the baby Jesus in swaddling clothes, Mary giving her breast to the child, while Joseph nearby sleeps and dreams, and learns of what he must do to protect his family. Parts of the ox and ass are still visible. To the left of that scene, the Christmas celebration itself is portrayed, and you see John, pointing to a manger where Christ appears, with the saint kneeling in adoration, while behind them, at the altar, one of the friars is saying Mass, and the only two objects on the altar are the chalice and the Missal with the word of God. Jesus is smiling at Francis. So too is the baby boy Jesus, carved of wood and surrounded by hay, set beneath the fresco and positioned in a wedge of the gray volcanic rock with which Italy abounds.

### ■ IN THE SEED ■

There are, of course, plenty of places to go if you visit that same region of Umbria where Francis spent most of his life. If you're in Greccio, you can go to the International Museum of the Crib, where they display crèches from all over the world, in a variety of artistic media and forms. You can go to Gubbio and see the place where Francis had a talking-to with the marauding Brother Wolf, guaranteeing him good dinners for the rest of his life, provided he left the people and their animals alone. You can go to Mount La Verna, high above Assisi, where Francis first received the wounds of Christ in his body. You can go to the great square in Assisi, where Francis, in front of the bishop and his father and his fellow townsmen, literally divested himself of his father's wealth, all of it, to the last stitch of clothing he had on, as if he were a babe newborn. "You are ours now," said the bishop, covering Francis with his robe.

But I'd like to return here to that little sanctuary in Greccio, for something else that Thomas of Celano recounts for us. It has to do with the hay.

Think about it for a moment. The baby Jesus was set to sleep in the manger, in Bethlehem, "House of Bread," or as we might say in English, Breadville. He himself was the bread come down from heaven. But it was Mary who fed him now, from the milk of her breasts. And the animals who shared their hovel with the Lord of all creation? They had their hay, the warm dry grass with its pleasing scent.

So did the animals in that cave in Greccio. The people saved the hay on which that vision of the Christ Child lay, and Thomas says that sick animals that ate some of the hay were cured of their diseases. Not only that, but "women in long and heavy labor, when they lay down upon some of this hay, obtained a healthy childbirth," and other people of both sexes were likewise cured of their diseases.

The kingdom of God may be compared to a mustard seed, says the Lord, and if a mustard seed, why not a wisp of hay? It doesn't grow as the mustard seed does, but it is food for the gentle dumb animals whose place the baby Jesus took, and all the world from the beginning of time



8

was so ordained by God that there would be such a thing, to be put in the manger in the place where the animals were kept, when the Son of God, wrapped in the mantle of night, stole into our world unseen, except by Mary and Joseph, and some shepherds, and all the hosts of heaven.

The modern world makes a lot of noise over what is big and brazen. But Francis was a medieval man in this way too: he beheld infinite riches in a little room. If God is, as

Augustine says, "more intimate to us than we are to ourselves," he can build his dwelling in a small stable, a wisp of hay, a seed, an impulse of the heart, a thought of love. Indeed, only God can do so.

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

## "Full, Complete" Pardons for 2020 Presidential Electors

Fake news was working overtime on November 10 by declaring, without authority, that the "full, complete" presidential pardons related to the 2020 presidential election cannot protect against bogus state charges arising from that election. The liberal media wrongly insisted that the Pardon Clause in the U.S. Constitution applies only to charges brought by federal prosecutors.

Not so. The Pardon Clause states that the President "shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment." Every attempt in court to narrow the scope of the Pardon Clause has failed.

Our system of dual sovereigns, federal and state, is subject to the Supremacy Clause, which means that state sovereignty cannot limit the scope of the Pardon Clause. It was modeled on the vast, nearly unlimited pardon power of the King of England.

The newly pardoned 77 alternate electors, federal officials, attorneys and activists who objected to voter fraud in 2020 were acting in defense of the integrity of a presidential election, and thus in defense of the United States. Their conduct is fully pardonable by the President, which Trump has appropriately done.

Yet naysayers argue that the term "United States" in the Pardon Clause means only crimes prosecuted by the federal government. If that were true, then the Supreme Court would not have upheld in *Ex parte Wells* (1856) the last-minute commutation of a death penalty by President Millard Fillmore of a man convicted of murder in a District of Columbia court, as there were no federal common law crimes.

Federal law never denied women the right to vote, but New York prosecuted Susan B. Anthony for voting illegally in the 1872 presidential election, and prosecuted local officials for allowing her to vote. After his reelection as our 18th President, U.S. Grant pardoned the state officials for their violation of state law, and in 2020 President Trump pardoned Susan B. Anthony for casting an illegal vote.

In the first week of November, an all-Democrat panel of the Second Circuit ruled in favor of Trump's argument that the charges against him in the so-called hush money case that resulted in 34 felonies should have been heard in a federal court. The charges brought by the New York District Attorney Alvin Bragg accused Trump of violating campaign finance laws during his 2016 campaign for President of the United States.

If a case can be heard in federal court, as all Trump-related cases can be, then the charges are pardonable by the president. No one credibly doubted that President Ford's pardon of President Nixon protected him against all potential charges relating to the Watergate scandal, including non-federal ones.

The tradition of complete pardons by the president, which began with President George Washington, has always precluded prosecution of the underlying conduct in state court. Those who doubt this broad scope of the pardon power cannot cite any example of a beneficiary of a presidential pardon being prosecuted in state court for the same conduct.

Even Democrat-dominated New York courts shut down an attempted prosecution of Paul Manafort after President Trump granted him a pardon. While the rationale for that decision was based on New York's strong rule against double jeopardy, the result was to prohibit a first-of-its-kind state prosecution of conduct excused by a presidential pardon.

The ban on slavery in the 13th Amendment to the Constitution prohibits its use "within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." This is not a reference to the federal government but to all of the States and territories, as demonstrated by the plural pronoun for jurisdiction.

The U.S. Supreme Court emphatically held after the Civil War, in *Ex parte Garland* (1867), that the presidential pardon "is unlimited, with the exception" for cases of impeachment. "It extends to every offence known to the law," not merely to federal crimes.

Alexander Hamilton, a Framer of our Constitution, wrote favorably of a broad pardon power in *The Federalist* No. 74. Hamilton explained, "The criminal code of every country partakes so much of necessary severity that without an easy access to exceptions in favor of unfortunate guilt, justice would wear a countenance too sanguinary and cruel."

The use of the term "United States" to mean only the federal government and only federal laws is a modern distortion of the elite in Washington, D.C., to puff themselves up. The national liberal media distorts this further by obsessively reporting on D.C. as if that enclave represented the entire United States.

As the Supreme Court recognized in *Schick v. Reed* (1974), the Framers of the Pardon Clause stated that this power is a "prerogative" of the President, which ought not be "fettered or embarrassed." The presidential pardon power would be impermissibly undermined if federal charges could be refiled as state charges by an unscrupulous local prosecutor like Alvin Bragg.

### The Phyllis Schlafly Report

PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by the Eagle Trust Fund, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Periodicals Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Phone: (618) 462-5415.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: \$1 each; 10 copies \$6; 30 copies \$12; 100 copies \$25; 1,000 copies \$150.

[www.phyllisschlafly.com](http://www.phyllisschlafly.com)

[www.pseagles.com](http://www.pseagles.com)



# Bill of Rights: Born From the Fight Over Delegated and Reserved Powers

9

On December 15, 1791, the Bill of Rights was ratified and became part of the Constitution. Most people think they know why. But most actually don't.

It was birthed out of a brutal political battle between Federalists and Anti-Federalists over a question that nearly killed ratification: When the Constitution doesn't mention a power, who gets to exercise it – the federal government or the people of the several states?

Federalists insisted a Bill of Rights was unnecessary, even dangerous. The Constitution, they argued, was already designed to limit federal power to those delegated, and nothing more. Anti-Federalists shot back with a dark reality: government always assumes it can do whatever you haven't explicitly forbidden.

That fight got settled with a deal. And the deal's centerpiece – the answer that saved ratification – was the Tenth Amendment. Understanding this forgotten debate reveals how the entire Constitution was designed to work.

## INITIAL EFFORTS REJECTED

During the Philadelphia Convention on Sept. 12, 1787, George Mason proposed adding a declaration of rights to the Constitution, but his motion was overwhelmingly rejected. Only Massachusetts abstained from voting against it.

Just three days later, Edmund Randolph proposed a new approach: allow state conventions to submit amendments for consideration in another general convention.

*"That amendments to the plan might be offered by the State Conventions, which should be submitted to and finally decided on by another general Convention."*

This motion was rejected as well. This time, unanimously. The framers didn't even want to leave that door open.

After the Philadelphia Convention sent the proposed Constitution to the Confederation Congress, Anti-Federalists like Richard Henry Lee tried again. He wanted amendments attached before the states ever saw it. His argument: forcing an all-or-nothing choice was ridiculous.

*"To insist that it should go as it is without amendments is like presenting a hungry man 50 dishes and insisting he should eat all or none."*

Despite Lee's efforts, the plan was rejected. The Constitution was sent to the states without any amendments.

## THE FEDERALIST ARGUMENT

During the ratification debates, Federalists such as James Wilson, Tench Coxe, and Alexander Hamilton made their case: listing specific rights was redundant, even dangerous. It would imply the government had powers beyond those delegated.

Wilson's widely-read *State House Yard Speech* emphasized that the federal government could only exercise powers expressly delegated to it.

*"Every thing which is not given, is reserved. This distinction being recognized, will furnish an answer to those who think the omission of a bill of rights, a defect in the proposed Constitution"*

That summed up the entire Federalist argument. If powers not delegated are automatically reserved, then why waste ink declaring what the government can't do?



(10)

*"for it would have been superfluous and absurd to have stipulated with a federal body of our own creation, that we should enjoy those privileges, of which we are not divested either by the intention or the act, that has brought that body into existence."*

Tench Coxe pointed to the precedent of the Articles of Confederation. The Union's first constitution didn't have a bill of rights either, and the states already protected personal rights in their own state constitutions.

*"The old federal Constitution contained many of the same things, which from error or disingenuousness are urged against the new one. Neither of them have a bill of rights, nor does either notice the liberty of the press, because they are already provided for by the State Constitutions; and relating only to personal rights, they could not be mentioned in a contract among sovereign states."*

Coxe drove the point home with an example: trial by jury. There was no power expressly delegated in the Constitution that would authorize the federal government to abolish it, so such a power didn't exist.

*"There is nothing in the new constitution to prevent a trial by jury."*

In *Federalist* 84, Hamilton warned that listing rights could imply that any unlisted rights were within the purview of federal power, a dangerous precedent.

*"I go further and affirm that bills of rights, in the sense and to the extent in which they are contended for, are not only unnecessary in the proposed Constitution but would even be dangerous. They would contain various exceptions to powers not granted; and, on this very account, would afford a colorable pretext to claim more than were granted."*

To illustrate the problem, Hamilton pointed to freedom of the press. The Constitution never delegated any power over it, so why declare it off limits?

*"For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do? Why, for instance, should it be said that the liberty of the press shall not be restrained, when no power is given by which restrictions may be imposed?"*

Hamilton's bottom line: if the federal government can only exercise delegated powers, rights are already protected. Listing them is redundant because any power not delegated doesn't exist in the first place.

*"The Constitution is itself, in every rational sense, and to every useful purpose, a bill of rights."*

#### **ANTI-FEDERALIST REBUTTALS**

However, Anti-Federalists weren't convinced, not even close.

In the weeks following the Philadelphia Convention, George Mason's objections were widely circulated. His first and foremost concern was *"There is no Declaration of Rights."*

A week after James Wilson's speech dismissing the need for a Bill of Rights, the Federal Farmer published his fourth essay. In it, he directly challenged the Federalist claim that it would be unnecessary under the Constitution's system of delegated and reserved powers.

*"It is said, that when the people make a constitution, and delegate powers, that all powers not delegated by them to those who govern, is reserved in the people"*

But there was another interpretation entirely, Federal Farmer noted. Politicians adopt whichever view serves their goals.



*"It is said, on the other hand, that the people, when they make a constitution, yield all power not expressly reserved to themselves. The truth is, in either case, it is mere matter of opinion, and men usually take either side of the argument, as will best answer their purposes."*

Federal Farmer's central warning: governments expand their power wherever limits are unclear. Wise constitution-makers draw clear lines between powers delegated and powers reserved.

*"But the general presumption being, that men who govern, will, in doubtful cases, construe laws and constitutions most favorably for increasing their own powers; all wise and prudent people, in forming constitutions, have drawn the line, and carefully described the powers parted with and the powers reserved."*

The Articles of Confederation provided the proof. Federal Farmer pointed to the critical difference. The Articles clearly drew this line in the sand. The new Constitution didn't.

*"And that the people, in the present case, have reserved in themselves, and in there state governments, every right and power not expressly given by the federal constitution to those who shall administer the national government."*

He was referencing Article II of the Articles, which explicitly reserved powers not delegated.

*"Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every Power, Jurisdiction and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled."*

Richard Henry Lee agreed with Alexander Hamilton on principle. A bill of rights **could** be unnecessary – but only with explicit limits. That, he noted, was the system under the Articles, where a bill of rights was "not necessary in the Confederation because it is expressly declared that no power should be exercised, but such as is expressly given."

Clear language in the new Constitution about delegated and reserved powers so *"no constructive power can be exercised,"* Lee noted, was the fundamental principle at hand. He said preventing such misconstruction of power *"is the great use of a bill of rights."*

In the Virginia Ratifying Convention, Patrick Henry argued that this federalist view of delegated and reserved powers was novel – because it had always been the other way around.

*"I repeat, that all nations have adopted this construction – That all rights not expressly and unequivocally reserved to the people, are impliedly and incidentally relinquished to rulers; as necessarily inseparable from the delegated powers. It is so in Great-Britain: For every possible right which is not reserved to the people by some express provision or compact, is within the King's prerogative."*

For Patrick Henry and many other Anti-Federalists, this new kind of system – without an express declaration – dangerously left the reservation of rights and powers to implication.

*"If you intend to reserve your unalienable rights, you must have the most express stipulation. For if implication be allowed, you are ousted of those rights. If the people do not think it necessary to reserve them, they will be supposed to be given up."*

Henry then pointed to the Revolution as the ultimate example. Americans fighting the British demanded explicit reservations because they labored under the tyranny of arbitrary power.



12

*"How were the Congressional rights defined when the people of America united by a confederacy to defend their liberties and rights against the tyrannical attempts of Great-Britain? The States were not then contented with implied reservation. No, Mr. Chairman. **It was expressly declared in our Confederation that every right was retained by the States respectively**, which was not given up to the Government of the United States."*

## THE TENTH

For much of the ratification process, Federalists insisted that the Constitution be approved or rejected in its entirety, vehemently rejecting any suggestions for amendments. This stance quickly changed when it became clear that Massachusetts would likely vote against ratification.

A loss there – Federalists understood – would send them reeling in states where it was expected to be a very close call at best – like New York and Virginia.

The entire Constitution was close to failure.

That was when Federalists made a deal with two powerful, but mostly silent, likely opponents – John Hancock and Samuel Adams: Support the Constitution if the ratification included a number of recommended amendments.

On Feb. 6, they did just that, and the very first recommended amendment was a precursor to the 10th Amendment.

*"First. That it be explicitly declared, that all powers not expressly delegated by the aforesaid Constitution are reserved to the several states, to be by them exercised."*

This language was crucial in addressing Anti-Federalist fears that the Constitution would lead to unchecked federal power.

South Carolina quickly followed their lead with a similar recommended amendment.

*"This Convention doth also declare that no Section or paragraph of the said Constitution warrants a Construction that the states do not retain every power not expressly relinquished by them and vested in the General Government of the Union."*

On June 21, New Hampshire became the ninth state to ratify, making the Constitution official. Their first recommended amendment: the same precursor to the 10th from Massachusetts.

Virginia, and then New York followed, both with precursors to the 10th prominently included in their recommended amendments.

In the end, the debate over a bill of rights – and ratification itself – boiled down to an explicit line in the sand between delegated and reserved powers.

It's no wonder that Thomas Jefferson, who repeatedly approved of "the plan of Massachusetts," later called the 10th Amendment *"the foundation of the Constitution."*

*Tags:* 10th Amendment, Anti-Federalists, Bill of Rights, Federalists, ratification debates



# Women preserve 'Tal-o Mahtal' ritual for rain in Iran's Qaleh Bala village

December 10, 2025 - 17:31

Tourism

TEHRAN – The ancient rain-seeking ritual Tal-o Mahtal, observed in Iran's Qaleh Bala village, is originated as a community response to recurring desert droughts and continues to be practiced today. The ceremony is listed as part of the national intangible cultural heritage.

Organized by the village's women, the ritual involves collecting foodstuffs from households, preparing a special rain-requesting soup in the mosque, offering collective prayers and supplications, and distributing the soup among residents. As part of the ceremony, women walk through the alleys carrying handmade dolls known locally as Chooli Chaghoor, chanting the ritual verses of Tal-o Mahtal to invoke rain from the sky.

Repeated droughts and lack of rainfall in Iran's desert regions, especially in Semnan Province, have always affected the lives of local communities. In such circumstances, traditional rain-seeking rituals emerged as part of folk culture to keep people's hope and faith alive.

'Tal-o Mahtal' has been passed down from mothers to daughters for generations and is still celebrated with grandeur."

The ritual song "Tal-o Mahtal," chanted by elderly women, is an important part of the village's oral heritage, reflecting the continuity of ancient traditions through oral literature. Beyond its religious and spiritual aspects, the ritual embodies social solidarity and collective culture among desert communities.

To perform the ceremony, the women of Qaleh Bala walk through the alleys carrying handmade traditional dolls "Chooli Chaghoor," while reciting the ritual verses of rain-seeking. "Tal-o Mahtal," resonating in the voices of village women, forms a vital part of the region's oral and cultural heritage and is recited as follows:

"Tal-o Mahtal, tonight is spring night, Red tulip flowers cry beneath the soil, O Lord, send rain, send rain, For the sake of the Qur'an, For the shepherds' staffs, For the farmers' plows, For the animals' branches, The wheat lies under the soil, Like pure rice, Dying of thirst, O Lord, send rain, send rain."







After reciting these verses, the women of the village go to seven houses whose doors face the qibla and collect foodstuffs such as chickpeas, lentils, beans, and herbs for the ritual soup. Then, in the courtyard of the mosque, they prepare the rain-requesting soup together. During the cooking, prayers and supplications are offered with sincere intention for rainfall. The soup is shared among the villagers, and part of it is poured into the qanat as a symbolic act of seeking God's blessing for abundant water resources.

"Tal-o Mahtal", beyond its aesthetic aspects, carries profound cultural and spiritual messages. The traditional chant of this ritual, performed by the women of the village, is regarded as an important part of the community's cultural memory and oral heritage.

"Tal-o Mahtal" goes beyond a simple rain-seeking ceremony; it reflects the deep bond between humans and nature and the effort to restore a sacred relationship between earth and sky. Its continuity demonstrates the strength of oral culture and the vital role of women in safeguarding Iran's spiritual heritage.

Today, it has also become one of the region's cultural tourism attractions, offering visitors a multifaceted experience of desert nature and the living traditions of the village.

Preserving and promoting this ritual can strengthen the village's position as a distinguished destination for cultural and ritual tourism.

This coexistence of tradition and contemporary life serves as an inspiring model for the development of sustainable tourism and offers a valuable opportunity to introduce Iranian culture to the world.

Qaleh Bala, situated in Shahrud county of Semnan province, is at the entrance of Touran National Park, the largest UNESCO biosphere reserve in Iran. The village, with its traditional architecture, historic fabric, and desert landscapes, represents a unique example of the coexistence of humans and nature. Thanks to its ancient rituals, local festivals, and the presence of rare species such as the Asiatic cheetah and the Iranian ground jay, Qaleh Bala has become one of the prominent destinations for cultural tourism and ecotourism.



# The Hundred Years' War and the roots of Malthusianism

15

Strategic  
Culture Foundation

*Malthusian culture is a problem Anglo-Saxons don't want to correct, writes Bruna Frascolla.*

It's funny that demographer Emmanuel Todd is celebrated after his predictions are confirmed; after all, his assessment of countries' failure or success is independent of the events that confirm his predictions. Todd predicts a country's collapse based on declining birth rates and life expectancy. Indeed, for both Todd and common sense, if people in a country stop having children and life expectancy falls, that country does not have a promising future. Nevertheless, the First World actively worked to encourage people to have fewer children and is now working to encourage them to die earlier through euthanasia. The decline in birth rates and reduced life expectancy are seen as a good thing by the mainstream.

Certainly, the United States, since Kissinger (see the 1974 NSSM-200), has viewed population growth in several countries as a threat to its own national security, and strives to reduce these populations through intermediaries who promote sterilizations and abortions abroad. However, the United States also strives to reduce its own domestic population (especially that of blacks). Kissinger's plans for global castration stem from domestic problems within U.S. democracy: if WASPs (White Anglo-Saxon Protestants) have few children, it is necessary to ensure that blacks and Catholics also have few children—otherwise, this will have electoral consequences in the medium and long term. It was not possible to dispense with this population and create a pure WASP nation, since someone had to do the low-paid work. A formally racist system would greatly damage the country's self-image and, even more so, its image among the people it sought to dominate. Thus, to remain a WASP-dominated democracy, a propaganda effort was necessary to manipulate non-WASPs and reduce their birthrate. Israel's efforts to control Arab demographics (including Arab-Israeli demographics) have this precedent in U.S. democracy.

We can therefore say that Malthusian culture is a problem Anglo-Saxons don't want to correct. Instead, realizing they are outnumbered, they strive to reduce the numbers of others. And since their culture is genuinely Malthusian, it's not difficult for them to find arguments to use in their propaganda: fewer children means children with more resources per capita; childlessness means more time and money for oneself—a woman's challenge to patriarchy!—and shorter lifespans mean better quality of life—and who doesn't want quality of life?

The fact is that Anglo-Saxons have a peculiar and counterintuitive attitude toward demographics. As we've seen, since the High Middle Ages, when the Angles merged with the Saxons upon invading Britain, they distinguished themselves from other barbarians by expelling native peasants from their lands, rather than ruling and mingling with them. In the Late Middle Ages, we saw that they continued the practice of ethnic cleansing and even emptied a French city (Calais) during the Hundred Years' War to fill it with colonists recruited from England. Now, let's continue with the Hundred Years' War: it was there that the Anglo-Saxons developed a taste for empty lands and conceived of the state as a profit-driven oligarchy.

**Bruna Frascolla**

October 24, 2025 | HISTORY

\*\*\*

The Hundred Years' War began with Edward III of England, Plantagenet, claiming the French throne after King Charles IV died without a son, leaving a messy succession. Edward III felt entitled to the throne because his mother was the daughter of the French king Philip the Fair; however, the French had already decided that women had no right to the throne—and if they did, the little daughter Charles IV left behind would be queen. Grandson of the cunning Philip the Fair, the Englishman wanted to seize the crown, and his adversary was the dead king's



(16)

cousin, the less-than-skilled Philip of Valois. However, no one in France wanted an English king—and even less so for his mother, the Frenchwoman who had ruled England with her lover, to become queen of France.

In England, Parliament already existed, a highly unusual institution that could both dethrone and recognize kings. When the war began, Parliament was unicameral and composed of nobles. Thus, all war campaigns led by the King of England had to be endorsed by the nobility in Parliament. Initially, the nobility was isolationist, disliking war expenditures. Nevertheless, they eventually agreed to the idea of the Crown borrowing from Italian bankers to finance its war investment. Significant funds would be needed, as the Hundred Years' War would long be a war fought by mercenaries.

Where would England's money come from, which would alleviate fears of default? Wool. In the words of historian Georges Minois, "England possesses a great source of wealth: wool, whose role in the national economy can be compared to that of crude oil in the modern world. The country is the main supplier of raw materials for the Flemish textile industry. [...] Grouped into societies that can be called capitalist, [the merchants] buy export licenses from the king, and their wealth allows them to play an increasingly important social and political role: they buy land and mansions, become creditors of the monarchy, and can influence its decisions" (The Hundred Years' War, p. 11, Brazilian edition).

Another very relevant difference between the skittish English nobility and the French nobility was the territorial issue. While the French dominated large contiguous tracts of land, "the great [English] nobility does not identify with a territory. The barons' holdings are dispersed, they do not form a provincial bloc [...]. [The counts] do not identify with a territory, but they are wealthy and frequented by an important clientele. They have their own administration [...] and efficient management of their domains" (op. cit. p. 14-15). Thus, while the French nobles were attached to the land, jealous of their independence from the crown, and lacking in *esprit de corps*, the English nobles could concentrate in London, form a kind of union, and discuss joint actions with the king while living off their income.

Well, for these nobles, the Hundred Years' War was a great opportunity for business (otherwise, they would not have consented to it). Always in concert with the king, the practice of using the treasury to pay mercenaries to invade France, plunder, and take hostages was adopted. When the Crown's coffers proved insufficient, it turned to Italian bankers and even caused bankruptcies. The profits from the looting went to everyone: the Crown, the nobles, the mercenaries, and the common people—even English women received personal belongings stolen from French women as gifts.

The war started well for the English because they innovated by hiring a professional army. In the medieval world, the nobility was typically called upon by the king to fight in the event of war. No one in France was prepared to fight a professional army.

This English innovation was capitalist in nature, more advanced than feudal warfare. I quote Minois once again: "The army is at the origin of the rise of private enterprise in England. From the beginning of the conflict, faced with a French monarchy that insisted on resorting to the ban and the *arrière ban*, the English king preferentially mobilized Italian bankers, whose credits allowed him to recruit troops through commercial contracts. The nobles maintained a 'retention,' a few dozen or a few hundred soldiers, whose services they rented to the sovereign through an indenture contract, for a set period and amount. In reality, the English army is made up of a professional workforce employed by war contractors in accordance with the laws of the market. These are private corps, private companies that, from a military point of view, offer advantages [...], in particular corporatism, favored by the habit of fighting together, while the feudal army only occasionally brings together men who do not know each other" (pp. 441-2).

How did France escape this? By strengthening the state, after a thousand and one misfortunes. The French even imitated the English, but discovered that periods of peace were a terrible problem, because mercenaries became unemployed and turned into bands of raiders. The solution found by the last French king to fight the Hundred Years' War, Charles



VII the Victorious, was a reform of the state. He created a permanent royal tax, without the nobility's consent, and was able to have a standing army—in addition to purchasing the latest military innovation, cannons. “At the end of the Hundred Years’ War,” says Minois, “one can say that France had a ‘national’ army in the sense that all armed forces depended on the state, even if they included many foreigners, while England used private armies under contract” (p. 442). And we can add here: France’s victory was yet another historical event that demonstrates the victory of the national state focused on the common good over the liberal state focused on the profits of the corporations that comprise it (a topic previously discussed [here](#)). The world imitated France.

\*\*\*

Let’s finally look at desertification. By invading France, Edward II, in the words of Minois, “behaved not as the sovereign of the French people, but as an enemy” (p. 90). The armies plundered the French with the aim of enriching those participating in the venture; and, furthermore, followed the normal wartime practice of destroying crops to leave the enemy undersupplied. In a letter, the Black Prince, Edward II’s son who led cavalcades through the French countryside dressed in black armor, wrote to his father: “We have devastated and destroyed this region [of Bordeaux], which caused great satisfaction to the subjects of Our Lord, the king” (op. cit., p. 122).

In addition to the war, there was also famine—which predated the war—and the plague. The result was that after the end of the war, both France and England lost 40% of their populations.

Indeed, for France, the death of the peasants led to fallow land, food shortages, and sheer poverty. The government scrambled to repopulate the fallow land. For the English, the death of the peasants meant replacing food crops with more space for wool, which was England’s main source of wealth. Thus, if the general rule is that population decline leads to poverty, the English case was an exception. Fewer people meant more wealth for the landowners.

---

© 2010 - 2025 | Strategic Culture Foundation | Republishing is welcomed [www.strategic-culture.su](http://www.strategic-culture.su).  
The views of individual contributors do not necessarily represent those of the Strategic Culture Foundation.

## John Mearsheimer: Me and Alan Dershowitz

by John Mearsheimer | Dec 4, 2025 | News | 0 Comments

ANTIWAR.COM

*Reprinted from John's Substack:*

On 1 December 2025, I was on “Piers Morgan Uncensored” talking about the April 2006 email correspondence between Jeffrey Epstein and Alan Dershowitz and how that related to Dershowitz’s efforts to smear me and Steve Walt in 2006, when our famous article on the Israel lobby had just come out in the London Review of Books. His efforts were part of a broader campaign to discredit us and seriously damage if not ruin our academic careers. Of course, we now know that Epstein was closely involved with Dershowitz in that smear campaign.

Dershowitz watched my interview with Piers and then they did a followup interview. It is amazing to me, given the viciousness of Dershowitz’s attacks on me and Steve in 2006 and afterwards, to hear him now describe himself as merely engaging in a rational-legal academic debate. Nothing could be further from the truth. It struck me that Dershowitz’s response shows how much has changed since 2006 in terms of the lobby’s position (and Israel’s) in our public discourse. Dershowitz was clearly on the defensive in his interview with Piers, which is a stunning transformation for someone who in the past ferociously attacked anyone who criticized Israel in the slightest way.

**"He Did Everything To SMEAR" Epstein's Mearsheimer Plot Revealed**





## President Trump's 'Mission Accomplished' Moment

RON PAUL • DECEMBER 15, 2025 • 600 WORDS • 9 COMMENTS

Unless President Trump reverses course, the “Lower Prices Bigger Paychecks” banner that hung behind him at his “affordability” speech this month will be remembered as being to economic policy what President George W. Bush’s “Mission Accomplished” banner was to foreign policy.

According to a Politico poll, many Americans are having difficulty paying for food, housing, transportation, and health care. Thirty-seven percent of Americans cannot afford to take their family to a professional sports event while 46 percent of Americans cannot afford airfare for a vacation.

For an increasing number of Americans, the affordability crisis is compounded by the firing crisis. Last month, approximately 120,000 small business workers lost their jobs — the highest one month decline in small business employment since the covid lockdowns. Large businesses including Amazon, Verizon, Target, and Apple are also laying off workers.

The affordability crisis began in 1971 when President Nixon severed the last link between the US dollar and gold. This removed any restraint on the Federal Reserve’s ability to pump money into the economy, leading to a continuous dollar devaluation. The decline in the dollar’s purchasing power is the real cause of the rise in prices and decline in living standards.

Fiat currency may be bad for the average American, but it is great for the welfare-warfare state and the special interests that benefit from it. This is because the fiat money system enables the Federal Reserve to monetize high levels of government debt via purchases of Treasury securities, thus making possible the explosion in government spending and power we have experienced the past fifty years. The fiat money system is also responsible for the bubble-boom-bust economy that has plagued America.

President Trump promised to reduce federal spending and end “Bidenflation.” Instead of keeping his promise, President Trump, with the help of the Republican Congress, increased spending. As a result, the federal debt is now over 38 trillion dollars and will soon exceed 39 trillion dollars.

Much of President Trump’s spending increases are on so-called “defense.” Most of this spending goes to “defending” other countries and meddling in conflicts in which the US should not be involved. Spending on militarism will no doubt increase further as President Trump prepares to launch an unconstitutional war against Venezuela. These bad policies are a betrayal of President Trump’s promise to avoid starting new wars, put an end to ongoing wars, and pursue a foreign policy that puts the American people’s needs ahead of the demands of the military-industrial complex, the deep state, and their lapdogs in Congress, the media, and the “policy community.”

President Trump still has time to regain the support of disgruntled MAGA voters who are wondering what happened to the man for whom they voted. A good first step would be for President Trump to oppose the massive National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) currently before Congress unless it cuts spending by taking pro-peace actions such as closing some of the about 750 military bases the US maintains around the world. Savings from closing these bases can be used to start paying down government debt and take care of those dependent on government programs as Congress winds down the welfare state. Additionally, President Trump should support legislation forbidding the Federal Reserve from purchasing federal debt instruments. He should also support auditing and ending the Fed. Limited government, free markets, sound money, and peace are the way to make America great again.

*(Republished from The Ron Paul Institute by permission of author or representative)*



# ‘Kill Them All’

by Andrew P. Napolitano | Dec 11, 2025 | 0 Comments

*“Does anyone know where the love of God goes  
When the waves turn the minutes to hours?”*

— Gordon Lightfoot (1938-2023)

“The Wreck of the Edmund Fitzgerald”

As we learn more about the events on Sept. 2, 2025, in international waters 1,500 miles from the United States, the behavior of the United States military becomes more legally troubling than at first blush. We have learned from members of Congress and others who have seen the videos of the attacks on the speedboat that day that the first strike mainly — but not completely — destroyed the boat and killed 9 of the 11 persons aboard.

The two survivors clung to the wreckage for 45 minutes, during which they frantically waved at what they hoped were American aircraft, expecting to be rescued. This attack was the first of many since ordered by President Donald Trump, and it was done without warning. After the passage of 45 terrifying minutes, three more attacks obliterated the two survivors and their wreckage, for “self-defense,” the White House said.

When two courageous persons privy to all this revealed it two weeks ago to reporters for *The Washington Post* who corroborated the revelations with five others, the *Post* published the story. Then, Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth denied he ordered the survivors killed; it was, he said, “the fog of war.” Then, the White House countermanded that denial. Then, the admiral in charge acknowledged that he ordered the kills pursuant to the secretary’s initial orders.

The military has a duty to rescue the injured and the shipwrecked. And the military has a duty to disregard unlawful orders — a position that Attorney General Pamela Bondi herself argued to the Supreme Court when she was in private practice, and Hegseth himself argued when he was a private citizen.

Not rescuing these survivors was criminal. But the entire killing process is criminal.

Here is the backstory.

The core legal issue here in Hegseth’s fog of fear is whether the president may lawfully order the military to kill noncombatants for law enforcement purposes. The short answer is: NO. The longer answer requires us to delve into the history and nature of the federal government and the purposes of the Constitution.

The federal government is one of limited powers. The powers are delineated in Article I of the Constitution wherein we find 16 grants of power to Congress, plus a catch-all which permits Congress to legislate in areas not specifically found in the 16 but arguably supportive of them.

Nowhere can public safety be found. In fact, the courts have ruled innumerable times that governance over health, safety, welfare and morality — called the “police power” — was and remains reserved to the states. Indeed, the 10th Amendment recites that the powers not granted to the feds are reserved to the people or to the states.



20

After the Civil War ended and during the period of Reconstruction, federal troops exercised the police power and attempted to govern and even provide safety in the formerly seceding states. Reconstruction ended after 11 years with a number of compromises, one of which is a federal statute that prohibits the use of the military for law enforcement purposes.

This is not a historic anomaly or mere footnote. It is a profound legal commitment to keep troops off American streets and out of the business of domestic law enforcement; and keep the police power local.

When the president takes an oath to uphold the Constitution, he promises to execute his office “faithfully.” James Madison, the scrivener of the Constitution, insisted that the presidential oath be in the Constitution and that the word “faithfully” be in the oath. He knew presidents would be tempted to ignore laws with which they disagreed.

He was right. Such persons are unfit to be president. “Faithfully” in the presidential oath means evenhandedly, irrespective of the president’s personal opinion of the laws. If a president could enforce the laws he liked and disregard those he didn’t like, he’d be violating his oath and veering away from the system of checks and balances Madison so carefully crafted, and toward authoritarianism.

Now back to killing people in speed boats.

Trump claims that the folks in the boats are drug dealers and the drugs are destined for the United States. That is unlikely to be accurate in the case of all the boats destroyed and all the riders killed.

Even if it were true, however, it does not legally justify killing anyone. Neither the military nor domestic law enforcement may lawfully kill nonviolent, noncombatant persons. As horrific as was the experience of those for whom the waves turned the minutes into hours, that is only a small part of the unconstitutional authoritarianism we are witnessing.

The whole program — “kill them all” — is a profound violation of the Fifth Amendment, which the president has sworn to uphold faithfully and which requires a jury trial when the government wants anyone’s life, liberty or property. If the president were really interested in drug interdiction, seizures in U.S. waters and arrests and prosecutions would yield a far better path to the source of the drugs than murdering couriers and destroying any evidence.

The admiral who gave the “kill them all” order was in Florida when he gave the order. The projectiles that struck these boats were dispatched from aircraft that took off from Florida, and the dispatchers — the folks who pulled the triggers (today, pressed the buttons) — were in Florida. No one can seriously argue that they were not subject to the Constitution.

Killing is the most horrific business. It is dangerously becoming normalized due to the demonization of the victims. But killing destroys innocent lives and the values that underlie the Constitution. If the president can demonize those whom he hates and fears, and then kill them in defiance of law and get away with it, of what value are our laws?

**If you liked this article, please support [Antiwar.com](http://Antiwar.com).  
We are 100% reader-supported.**