

The Days of Democracy Are Over

By Paul Craig Roberts

PaulCraigRoberts.org

November 1, 2025

Jerome Racher

November 3, 2025

①

For decades I have been watching American democracy unravel as it became increasingly dysfunctional. US democracy murdered President John F. Kennedy and followed up by murdering his brother, Robert F. Kennedy. Then President Nixon was murdered politically by democracy with the CIA/Washington Post orchestration of Watergate.

Democracy attempted to frame, indict, and prosecute President Trump for Russiagate, documents gate, insurrection gate, lying on mortgage loan applications, and twice tried to impeach him on false charges.

Democracy and accountable government lied to us about Vietnam, about the USS Liberty, about 9/11, Afghanistan, Saddam Hussein, Ghaddafi, Assad, Sudan, Somalia, Ukraine, South Ossetia, Iran, Russia, China, and Venezuela.

The accumulated failures of democracy eroded its foundations, thereby permitting the executive branch to encroach on the separation of powers and violate the US Constitution. The US has been in many wars since the last time Congress declared war in December 1941. The president has simply taken war out of Congress' hands.

In the 21st century presidents have gone much further by stealing power from the US Constitution and courts. President George W. Bush declared his power to ignore habeas corpus and to hold American citizens indefinitely on suspicion alone without due process. President Obama declared his power to murder US citizens on suspicion alone without due process, and he did. Nothing was done about these unconstitutional acts that ignored judicial authority.

President Trump on his own initiative has committed acts of war against Russia and Iran without a declaration of war with Venezuela waiting in the wings.

The dysfunction of American democracy has reached the point at which the government has been shut down for a month. Tomorrow 42 million Americans unable or unwilling to support themselves, thereby comprising a burden placed on the 170 million US labor force, run out of SNAP food benefits. American democracy has become so dysfunctional that nothing is being done to avoid massive violence likely to result from leaving 42 million Americans without food.

The government has been shut down by the Democrat Party, apparently intent on preventing Trump from implementing his agenda. In other words, US democracy has become so dysfunctional that Democrats are blocking the agenda elected by voters, that is, they are blocking democracy itself.

Democracy is so dysfunctional that neither the Democrats, nor Trump himself, understand that they have given Trump the opportunity to remove budgetary matters from Congress' hands just as presidents have removed war from legislators' hands. As US presidents can take the country to war without obtaining Congress' approval, they can certainly issue food stamps without Congress' approval.

Such an action by Trump would certainly swing the largest component of the Democrats' voting bloc to Trump. 42 million Americans, one fourth the size of the US labor force, abandoned by Democrats would be rescued from hunger by Trump's assumption of the budgetary power abandoned by democracy.

The tendency of democracy is to devolve or evolve, depending on your point of view, into dictatorship. We see that in Western Europe today. There is so much faction that

2

governments consist of coalitions of minority parties, often as opposed to one another as to opposition coalitions. The inability of national democracies to function has given rise to the European Union in which national governments are absorbed into an European government in which power is appointed and elected representatives are powerless. It is all happening with consent, but the consent is driven by dysfunctional democracy.

The same happened to Rome. When faction in the Senate prevented effective rule, Rome first tried appointing dictators for limited terms. Julius Caesar saw the need for a functional government as his opportunity. He centralized power in himself by absorbing the checks and balances, such as consul and pontifex Maximus into himself, while weakening the Senate by increasing its size to 900 members which increased the inability of the Senate to act in solidarity. In this way he created the autocracy in which his adopted son, Octavius, became Augustus, the first Roman Emperor.

Sooner or later American democracy will have the same fate. Trump just as well should assume autocratic power before a Democrat does. White ethnic Americans would have no future under Democrat DEI rule. It is too late to save American democracy, but there is still a chance for white ethnic Americans unless a DEI Democrat becomes our first emperor.



The DEI Democrats clearly do not believe in democracy, free speech, and equality under the law, and they most certainly do not believe in a white ethnic America which they describe as aversive racism that needs to be bred out of existence. Democrats believe that nonwhites, whether legal citizens or illegal immigrant-invaders, deserve legal privileges, originally called "affirmative action" to disguise the fact that illegal and unconstitutional racial quotas have been imposed by the Jew Blumrosen at the EEOC, reducing white Americans, especially white heterosexual males, to second class citizenship (see *The New*

Color Line). As time passed Blumrosen's race, gender, and sexual preference quotas became "Diversity, Equity, Inclusion." As US corporate boards and executives were replaced with DEI indoctrinated university graduates, Americans were flooded with advertisements pushing miscegenation. The white family disappeared in corporate advertisements. Corporations such as Starbucks and the US Department of Defense announced that they were not hiring or promoting white heterosexual males. The message to white women is there is no future in a white husband. Budweiser Light and Gillette ruined their sales with anti-white male advertisements. In America where the US Constitution guarantees equality under law it became possible to officially discriminate against white people, and nothing was done about it. Moreover, about 45% of the American electorate continued to vote for Democrats who had destroyed equality under law and the American merit-based society. American law schools teach that the Constitution is in the way of DEI, now defined as justice, and must be ignored. Journalism schools teach that facts are white racism and irrelevant. Reporting is a weapon to further a DEI revolution against ethnic American whites. The Democrat Party, the whore media, and the American educational system agree with the government of Denmark that white people must stop producing white people and instead help to wipe out racist whites by mating with peoples of color. See [this](#).

Putin still deceives himself about Russian democracy. But all Russian democracy has done is to render Russia impotent to defend itself against Western hostility. It seems more members of the Russian government are working for their own interests, for Western interests, and for global interests than for Russia's interest. In the US it has long been the situation that the legislature works for the interest of the private lobbies that fund political campaigns, not for the voters. Putin should ask himself who Kirill Dmitriev and Elvira Nabiullina are working for before Russians begin asking who Putin is working for.



The entirely Catholic "All Hallows' Eve" is the beginning of a three-day feast known as "All Hallowtide." Here's how to take it back from the hollowed out secular celebration.

October 31, 2025

Ours is the only culture in history that mocks the devil while pretending he doesn't exist. Every Halloween, we flirt with the infernal, pretending it's all make-believe—until something evil happens, and then we stand astonished that the line between play and peril has worn so thin. Halloween is, strangely enough, the one night when modern secular man admits he believes in something beyond himself—only he chooses to believe the wrong thing. Having lost his saints, he now settles for skeletons.

None of this happens in a vacuum. Over the past year, places of worship have become scenes of unthinkable carnage: at Annunciation Catholic Church in Minneapolis, a gunman opened fire during a children's Mass, killing two students and wounding over a dozen others. In Michigan, a man rammed his truck into a Latter-day Saints chapel, opened fire on congregants, and set the building ablaze—four dead and eight more wounded. And of course, Charlie Kirk—a strong and outspoken Christian who never hesitated to proclaim his faith—was brutally murdered, a sobering reminder that even courage in the public square can carry a deadly cost.

We are witnessing not merely moral confusion but violent hostility toward faith itself. In a culture that laughs at evil, it should surprise no one when evil has the last laugh.

Can the two phenomena—the way we celebrate Halloween and the open antagonism toward faith—be connected? It would be naïve to say that horror movies or Halloween costumes cause mass shootings. However, it would be equally naïve to pretend that a society that delights in mocking evil isn't slowly being desensitized to the real thing.

We have made darkness a game; then we act shocked when darkness stops playing by our rules. C.S Lewis famously said in *The Screwtape Letters* that "the devil...is a proud spirit...and cannot endure to be mocked." But that only applies if God is living inside us. In a society that has lost much of its faith, the opposite is true. When the devil becomes a joke, he no longer needs to hide. He can come out and run wild.

The frightening fact is that our laughter has become the devil's camouflage. What began as innocent Halloween fun has, over time, hollowed out our sense of reverence, leaving our souls open to temptation, confusion, and corruption.

Look around you. This October—and every October in recent memory—a supposedly Christian nation throws a party for death. Halloween has become a \$13 billion annual industry. We drape our homes in cobwebs, hang skeletons on the door, create cemeteries in our yards, and glorify gore to a ridiculous degree, and we call it fun.

And indeed, it *is* fun.

But that's not always how it's been. For centuries, *All Hallows' Eve*—the true name of Halloween—was not a flirtation with darkness but a vigil of light—the night before All Saints' Day, the beginning of a three-day feast known as *All Hallows' Tide*. Together, these days invited the faithful to meditate on the beautiful doctrine of the Communion of Saints: the Church Triumphant in Heaven, the Church Suffering in Purgatory, and the Church Militant still striving on earth—all united in Jesus Christ. It was a trinity of remembrance that dared to look death squarely in the eye and say, "You have no sting left."

That's a far cry from today's unhealthy fascination with the macabre.

Yet the popularity of Halloween does reveal something hopeful. Beneath the cynicism, commercialism, and Styrofoam tombstones lies a hunger for the transcendent. The child who dresses as a vampire or zombie, in his own innocent way, is reaching for a mystery beyond his understanding. He or she is reaching for the truth that there is more to life than the material; there is more to life than the random movement of lifeless atoms and molecules in a lifeless ether.

4

There is *spirit*.

That's why Catholics need not retreat from Halloween festivities. The Church has always been the master of transformation, the great baptizer of all things pagan. The Pantheon in Rome, for instance, once a state temple dedicated to various deities, was exorcised by Pope Boniface IV on May 13, 609 and dedicated it Santa Maria ad Martyres. The Church, like Christ Himself, has the power to turn water into wine. Halloween can be redeemed too—if we remember what it was meant to signify. The costumes, the candy, even some harmless spookiness, can all point toward a deeper joy: the fact that evil is real but temporary; the fact that death is frightening but defeated.

Good catechesis is the key. Dressing as a saint or angel is a lovely custom, but even a child dressed as a skeleton can learn something holy—if he is taught that bones are not just creepy but sacred relics, reminders of the resurrection to come. Parents should teach their children the line between play and profanity, between harmless fun and real possibility of inviting evil into their lives. For evil does its greatest damage not so much in the imagination as in the will that consents to it. Today, we must take that threat more seriously—the risk that pretending can easily turn into permission.

The goal for a good Catholic, therefore, is not to cancel Halloween but to reclaim it. The candle inside the jack-o'-lantern can remind us that the soul shines only when it's been set aflame by grace. A cemetery walk can become an instruction on mortality. A child's knock at our door to trick-or-treat can become a lesson in charity, a reminder that every visitor is an image of the Christ who stands and knocks at the door to the human heart. Even nervous laughter in a dark room can echo the first lines of the *Te Deum*—"We praise Thee, O God." For whenever we refuse to be ruled by fear, even a faint smile becomes an act of faith that whispers, *I will not be afraid, for You are here with me, Lord.*

Author

CRISIS

MAGAZINE

A soul! a soul! a soul-cake!
Please good Missus, a soul-cake!
An apple, a pear, a plum or a cherry,
Any good thing to make us all merry,
One for Peter, two for Paul,
Three for the One (Him) who made us all.
 —Traditional Souling Song

The terrific urge to prevent another person from making a "mistake" must be resisted if liberty is to be preserved. The "protective spirit" that leads a fond parent to prohibit his child from acquiring mature judgments, as he substitutes his own opinions for those of the child, leads the dictator to act as he does in "protecting" his political children.

— F.A. Harper

Consumer information is the fuel that fosters cost-decreasing competition, quality enhancement, and innovation in the marketplace.

— Steven R. Eastaugh, *Financing Health Care* [1987]

A Victim of the Banality of Evil

By Garsha Vazirian

5

October 13, 2025 - 21:45

International

Saleh al-Jaafarawi: Who he was, and why Israel silenced his voice in Gaza

TEHRAN Times

TEHRAN – Hannah Arendt’s phrase “the banality of evil” describes the terrible ordinariness of a system that makes atrocity routine. In Gaza this October, the phrase revealed itself in flesh and blood.

Saleh Al-Jaafrawi — 27, a freelance reporter who had become, in the two-year Israeli genocidal campaign, one of Gaza’s most visible witnesses — was shot dead in Sabra days after a ceasefire.

Reporters say he was wearing a press vest and was killed by members of an Israeli-backed armed militia operating inside Gaza. This is not the roar of a bombardment; this is the soft machinery that keeps criminality functioning when the world briefly looks away.

Saleh’s life was a testimony. He broadcast from bombed neighborhoods and hospitals, filmed children amid blackouts, and translated rubble into names and faces the world could not ignore.

Saleh’s last public words were simple and urgent: gratitude to the millions who protested, helped, and amplified Gaza’s suffering — and a warning: “The military war has ended, but many other struggles will unfold in the coming days.”

Those lines were not elegy but instruction: the fight for truth and memory does not end when the bombs slow. It endures in the quieter battles over who may testify, who may live, and who may be erased.

That erasure is strategic. The deliberate use of proxy militias or collaborator networks to settle scores, intimidate communities, or silence critics turns cruelty into policy with plausible deniability.

When a regime outsources killing to local proxies, it maintains the appearance of distance while still harvesting the daily dividends: a fractured society, terrorized civilians, and the quiet elimination of inconvenient witnesses.

Israel’s own recent admissions about empowering local actors to weaken Hamas strip away any illusion of disorder. What might once have been dismissed as chaos now reads as a deliberate tactic.

The regime’s systematic targeting of journalists has reached a point where the numbers themselves constitute evidence of intent. According to the Committee to Protect Journalists’ September report, at least 235 reporters and media workers have been killed since October 7, 2023 — the highest toll ever recorded against the press in any modern conflict. This figure includes journalists slain not only in Gaza but also in Yemen, Lebanon, and Iran.

In 2024 alone, Israel was responsible for 85 of the 124 journalists killed worldwide, making that year the deadliest in the Committee’s four decades of documentation.

When those who document atrocities are targeted, the archive of evidence withers; impunity finds room to grow.

What followed Saleh’s death was a moral X-ray of the internet age: the complicit silence of the Western commercially-controlled mainstream media echoed alongside dirges and funeral processions, as well as screenshots circulating of Israeli users posting with glee over his murder.

To revel in the killing of a 27-year-old Gazan journalist — visibly marked with “PRESS” and who had already survived two years of Israel’s genocidal campaign — is to revel in the annihilation of witness itself. That spectacle of gloating is not incidental; it exposes a social permission to erase, to distort, and to render the unbearable ordinary.

That public exultation is not incidental; it signals a social license to erase, to distort, to render the unbearable ordinary. Such dehumanization is not an afterthought; it is the prelude and the justification for elimination.

We must treat his murder as more than an isolated tragedy. The legal and moral demand is simple and urgent: independent, international investigations into attacks on journalists; protective measures for reporters and media workers; and scrutiny of a murderous regime that converts a ceasefire into a quieter season of reprisals.

Arendt’s warning was not that evil would always appear flamboyant, but that it would triumph whenever ordinary institutions and people failed to notice, name, and act.



Saleh asked the world to stay with Gaza. His final words were both thanks and instructions. If we believe in truth — and in the proposition that a free press is the first line of defense against forgetfulness — then to honor him is not only to lament; it is to insist: document, investigate, protect, and spread Saleh’s message.

Otherwise, the lull will not be a peace at all, but merely a pause in which memory is buried and the banality of evil resumes its work.

The Rubio Doctrine: Neocons Are Back

RON PAUL • OCTOBER 27, 2025 • 600 WORDS • 11 COMMENTS

According to several recent news reports, the two major Trump foreign policy shifts last week are the handiwork of Marco Rubio, the President’s Secretary of State and (acting) National Security Advisor. As with all neocon plans, they will be big on promises and small on delivery.

First up, according to Bloomberg it was Rubio who finally convinced President Trump to take “ownership” of the US proxy war on Russia, and for the first time place sanctions on Russia. Up to this point President Trump chose to portray himself as a mediator between Ukraine and Russia. But with this move against Russia’s oil sector he can no longer credibly claim that this is “Joe Biden’s war.”

The Trump move followed a confusing few weeks since the Trump/Putin Alaska summit in August. After that meeting Trump dropped the neocon position that a ceasefire in the Russia/Ukraine war must occur before any peace negotiations. It was a sign that Trump was looking more realistically at the war. He also said he did not think Ukraine would win, which is pretty obvious.

A surprise call to Putin the day before Ukrainian president Zelensky was to arrive in town just over a week ago reinforced that position and Zelensky left Washington empty-handed. He was seeking Tomahawk missiles that could strike deep into Russian territory.

Then out of the blue President Trump last week announced through his Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent that the US would be sanctioning Russia’s two largest oil companies until Russia declares a ceasefire in the war before negotiations. That won’t happen, but what it does mean is that Rubio and the neocons have successfully gotten Trump to step on the escalation escalator. That is what they always do. It will be much harder to back down now.

At the same time the US Administration was jumping deeper into the Russia/Ukraine war, a long-time neocon dream was suddenly back in play. Although in Trump’s first term a “regime change” operation was attempted against Venezuela, it failed spectacularly. But the neocons have long dreamed of overthrowing the Venezuelan government — they almost got their way back in 2002 — and suddenly after several weeks of extrajudicial murder on the high seas in the name of fighting the drug war, President Trump announced that land strikes on Venezuela would begin soon.

He did mention that he might brief Congress on his plans for war on Venezuela, not that Congress can be bothered to care much one way or the other.

The neocon old guard that still dominates Washington foreign policy is taking a victory lap. South Carolina Senator Lindsey Graham was on the Sunday shows beaming over the conversion of “no regime-change wars” President Trump to “regime change wars” President Trump.

The Saddam Hussein WMD factories of 2002 have become the Nicolas Maduro cocaine and fentanyl factories of 2025 and once again the neocon war lies are amplified by the US mainstream media and transmitted to the American people. A new disaster is in the making. The “global war on terror” has been rebranded the “hemispheric war on narco-terror” and the US military industrial complex is rubbing its hands in anticipation of a windfall.

After John Bolton’s disastrous stint in the first Trump Administration, promises were made that the second Trump Administration would be neocon-free. Instead, the neocons are back. Unless President Trump wakes up soon, the neocons will destroy his second term...and maybe the country.

How the Federal Government Acquired the Power of Assassination

By Jacob G. Hornberger

The Future of Freedom Foundation

November 1, 2025

7

Americans oftentimes forget that the Constitution called the federal government into existence and, equally important, limited its powers to those enumerated in the Constitution itself. In fact, the only reason our American ancestors accepted the Constitution was because they were assured that its powers would be few, limited, and extremely restricted.

Thus, the Constitution did not call into existence a government with inherent powers, like the traditional “police powers” that characterized governments throughout history. If it had done that, our American ancestors would never have approved it. Instead, it was clearly understood that the only powers that the federal government could legally exercise were those enumerated in the Constitution. If a power wasn’t enumerated, it could not legally be exercised.

This is what was meant by the term “limited-government republic.” For the first time in history, a people had limited the powers of their own government by the document that called the government into existence.

If Americans didn’t like that system, they could change it by amending the Constitution, which provided for the means to do that.

Our American ancestors were still not satisfied. They were still extremely concerned about the possibility that the federal government could end up wielding omnipotent, tyrannical powers over them, similar to those that had been wielded and exercised by King George.

They were particularly concerned that the president, even though democratically elected, might decide to use his power, especially in combination with the military, to arbitrarily kill people.

The advocates of the Constitution did their best to put their minds at ease. They pointed out that the Constitution did not give the federal government the power to arbitrarily kill people. Therefore, since such a power wasn’t enumerated, it could not legally be exercised.

Moreover, given the fierce opposition to “standing armies,” it was also understood that the president would never have a large military force to impose that type of tyranny on the American people, a tyranny that would involve the arbitrary killing of people.

Those arguments were still not sufficient for the American people. As a condition for accepting the Constitution, they demanded a Bill of Rights, which actually should have been called a Bill of Prohibitions because it doesn’t grant rights at all. Instead, it expressly prohibited the federal government from infringing or destroying rights. The Second Amendment guaranteed the right to keep and bear arms, which ensured that people would have the means by which to resist the tyranny of their own president and his army.

The Fifth Amendment prohibited the federal government from depriving any person of life without due process of law. Stretching all the way back to the Magna Carta in 1215, the term due process had come to mean, at a minimum, the dual requirement of formal notice and the right to be heard before being assassinated or executed.

Notice something important about the Fifth Amendment: Its protection applies to “persons,” not just American citizens. Our American ancestors ensured that the president would be precluded from killing anyone without due process of law — that is,

without formal notice (e.g., an indictment) and the right to be heard (e.g., a hearing or trial).

③ Thus, under our system of government, there was simply no power of assassination, given that assassination obviously involves the taking of life without due process of law.

Central to America's constitutional form of limited government was the judicial branch of the government. Its job was to enforce the Constitution against the other two branches of the federal government. Thus, if a president were to begin assassinating people, the judicial branch's responsibility would be to declare such action in violation of the Constitution and to put a stop to it through injunctive relief.

The same thing applied to Congress, which wielded the constitutional power of impeachment. If a president and his minions began assassinating people, it would be the responsibility of Congress to impeach him and remove him from office.

That was our system of government for around 150 years. That's a very long time. For a century and a half, the president had no power of assassination. I'd say that's a very big success story.

That all changed in the late 1940s, when the structure of the federal government was changed from a limited-government republic to what is called a national-security state, which consisted of the Pentagon, a vast, permanent standing army, the CIA, and the NSA — that is, precisely the type of governmental structure our American ancestors had rejected. Federal officials justified this monumental conversion by claiming that it was necessary to protect the United States from a communist takeover.

Interestingly enough, however, they effected this revolutionary change without even the semblance of a constitutional amendment, which was required by the Constitution. Why is that important? Because as a practical matter, a national-security state comes with the automatic acquisition of omnipotent, totalitarian-like, dark-side powers, including the power of assassination.

Thus, as a practical matter, the conversion to a national-security state operated as a de facto amendment of the Constitution, one that amended the Fifth Amendment — but without a constitutional amendment. Once the conversion took place, the president and his national-security establishment wielded the omnipotent, dark-side power to assassinate anyone they wanted, so long as they determined that the victim posed a threat to "national security."

Given the enormous power of this new vast, permanent, and powerful standing army, the U.S. Supreme Court and the rest of the federal judiciary immediately made it clear that they would never declare any action of the national-security establishment unconstitutional, including the newly acquired power of assassination. The reason for this judicial deference, notwithstanding its clear violation of the Fifth Amendment, was that the judiciary knew that it lacked the ability to enforce its rulings against the omnipotent power of the Pentagon, the vast military-intelligence establishment, the CIA, and the NSA.

Thus, that's how the American people ended up living in a society in which the president and his vast, all-powerful national-security establishment wield the omnipotent dark-side power to assassinate anyone they want, foreigner or American. That's obviously not what our American ancestors had in mind when they approved the establishment of the federal government.

Reprinted with permission from The Future of Freedom Foundation.

The Best of Jacob G. Hornberger

The Welfare and Warfare State

CHRISTOPHER COYNE

(9)

In his new book, Andrew Preston explores the origins of the modern, all-encompassing concept of “national security.”

IN 2022, THEN-PRESIDENT JOSEPH BIDEN INVOKED THE Defense Production Act, a 1950 law that gives the president the authority to direct domestic industry in the name of national defense, to increase the supply of baby formula available to Americans. Three years later, President Donald Trump imposed tariffs on kitchen cabinets, bathroom vanities, and associated products in the name of America's national security. How did baby formula and kitchen cabinets come to be considered as crucial parts of America's security? Andrew Preston's important book, *Total Defense*, provides an answer to this question.

The origins of the US national security state are typically traced to World War II and the Cold War. In this telling, the National Security Act of 1947, which established the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and later the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was a pivotal event, establishing the core institutions of the national security apparatus. Moreover, instead of demobilizing following World War II, US government leaders decided to maintain a permanent war economy to prepare for future wars. This was justified by the Cold War, an open-ended global conflict against the Soviet Union requiring nonstop preparation to ensure the security of both America and the world.

Preston does not deny the importance of these events, but argues that this widely accepted origin story starts too late. The US national security state, he argues, was not born with World War II or the Cold War, but rather during Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal programs. He convincingly shows that Roosevelt's policies fused domestic economic management with international security issues. The result was an expansive vision of “total defense,” which included not just domestic economic security, but also security against international threats. Importantly, the Roosevelt administration and its supporters effectively redefined “threats” to include not just the possibility of immediate military invasion, which was minimal, but also a broad range of non-military cultural, economic, and social issues. The result was a broad menu of potential government interventions, as decided by those in power, undertaken in the name of the security of the American people.

The main contribution of the book is a more accurate understanding of the foundations of the US national security state. This is not merely a matter of getting the historical timing right, although that too is important. More fundamentally, Preston's reorientation clarifies that the American welfare and warfare states are close siblings that cannot be separated in their origins and purpose. The unifying theme is their shared foundation in the Progressive ideology. As Preston writes, “Insurance and military efficiency sprouted from the same conceptual ground as progressivism: a desire for improvement by modernizing and rationalizing society in a way that preserved what were thought to be the core elements of American identity, democracy, and sovereignty. It wasn't a stretch, then, for advocates of a larger military to locate their position within broader trends that propelled a progressive state in the pursuit of a better society.” This ideology birthed a

10
large-scale and sprawling state apparatus that merged traditional military activities (the maintenance and use of a standing army and military equipment) with top-down government policies related to economic, social, and cultural policies undertaken in the name of national security. Its purpose was the same as other New Deal programs—to implement top-down state control over domestic life by an expert class who promised protection to the American populace.

Over time, and especially due to the Vietnam War, many liberals and progressives became increasingly skeptical of the national security state, coming to view it as being at odds with the welfare state and President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society program. At the same time, many conservatives came to embrace the national security state while eschewing the welfare state as a threat to American values and the country's fiscal health. Nonetheless, officials from both parties today remain quite comfortable invoking "national security" rhetoric for the benefit of their preferred policies. As Preston emphasizes, American politicians "figured out that they could build support for just about any initiative as long as they described it as vital for national security."

While it may not be politically feasible to roll back the expansive conception of national security today or tomorrow, it is important to hold space for alternatives to the status quo.

In *Crisis and Leviathan*, economic historian Robert Higgs presented a ratchet effect framework for understanding the growth of government. In his framing, a crisis presents a government with an opportunity to expand in scale and scope in response to the emergency. This expansion rarely fully recedes post-crisis, hence the ratchet effect of crises on the overall size of government. Part of why expansions persist is due to the economic incentives for government agencies to self-perpetuate. But more important are shifts in ideology where both political elites and the broader populace come to view the citizen-state relationship in a different light than prior to the crisis. Activities previously viewed as either unacceptable or outside of the purview of government become normalized as part of the regular actions of government. Preston's story about the New Deal illustrates this dynamic in a new light as a domestic economic emergency was used to justify not just a narrow economic response by the state, but rather an expansive range of policies to ensure "total defense." At the core of the story, there is a qualitative shift in the scale and scope of state power grounded in changes in ideology regarding the role of the state, both domestically and internationally.

As Preston documents, the New Deal was both grounded in, and contributed to, ideological and rhetorical shifts in American society. Many Americans came to accept and expect an expanded role of government in their lives to protect them from an ever-growing list of threats. The political elite, who were active participants in crafting the narrative of the prevalence of threats and their ability to insulate Americans from them, willingly embraced their expanded powers. At the same time, the newly expanded rhetoric of national security became prevalent across the ideological spectrum. The result was a militarization of political rhetoric and policy, characterized by security justifications for an ever-increasing range of government actions, that still exists today, as illustrated by the two examples discussed above. Beyond baby formula and kitchen cabinets, the rhetoric of government-provided national security is now tied to

international trade, environmental issues, food supply chains, income inequality, (dis)information, items deemed necessary for the nation's security (metals, minerals, etc.), technology, and public health, among a range of other areas of life. Nothing is off limits when it comes to national security. (11)

In addition to shifting the scale and scope of state power, the rise of total defense also changed how and where this power is exercised. The idea behind the Madisonian vision of the separation of powers was to establish a set of checks and balances to safeguard against abuses of concentrated power. Crises pose a challenge to this arrangement because they concentrate discretionary political power in the hands of the executive and administrative state at the expense of the legislative branch. During emergencies, it is argued that the executive must act quickly and decisively. They cannot be bound by congressional deliberation and debate, which will slow the state's response. The predictable outcome of a state tasked with providing total defense is a significant expansion of the powers of the executive at the expense of other branches. In the case of the United States, historians have documented the rise of the "imperial presidency" resulting from the role of the president expanding through time. Preston's book provides insight into this phenomenon by documenting how the New Deal contributed to the evolution of the executive branch as an office of permanent emergency powers. Given this context, is it any surprise that it is seen as entirely routine for presidents to implement a range of industrial policies or to take ownership stakes in private companies in the name of national security?

It is important to appreciate how encompassing the powers of the New Deal-inspired security state are in practice. When social and welfare policies are folded into an amorphous category of "national security," the state has an automatic justification to intrude on personal and economic liberties in the name of the public and global interest. This shift in emphasis from the primacy of individual rights to the primacy of the collective includes not only restrictions on private property but also an extensive system of state surveillance of day-to-day activities to ensure that the actions of the individual align with those of the common good as defined by the current elites in power. Also necessary is a system of punishment and enforcement to incentivize compliance and punish deviations. The risk, of course, is that these actions, which are justified on the grounds of protecting Americans from threats, end up doing just the opposite in practice as the national security state becomes the very thing it purports to protect against.

In his epilogue, Preston calls for a rethinking of what constitutes national security. He is skeptical that Americans can cast off the expansive conception of national security because "it's just too tightly woven into the fabric of American society." After reading the book, I reached a different conclusion. *Total Defense* shows that the Roosevelt administration's vision of the state, combined with its rhetoric of what constitutes security, actively reshaped political legitimacy with long-lasting effects on American society and political institutions. In other words, the fusion between the welfare and warfare states was not inevitable, but constructed through purposeful choices. This means that it can be deconstructed.

There is a tendency to view the growth of government, especially in relation to crises, as unidirectional and deterministic, and there are certainly forces that push in the direction of state growth. At the same time,

12

alternative images of the world matter, as does the rhetoric used to describe the visions of what might exist. While it may not be politically feasible to roll back the expansive conception of national security today or tomorrow, it is important to hold space for alternatives to the status quo, which is rooted in the progressive vision of state experts ruling over citizens.

How might members of a truly self-governing society think about security? What aspects of security are best left to non-state solutions (markets and civil society)? How can private people resolve collective action problems that may emerge in security provision without reliance on the top-down arrangements of the national state? These, and related, questions are of crucial importance precisely because of the threat posed by centralized government power to the security of the individual. Once this threat from within is appreciated, one might very well conclude that the protection of the individual is too important to be left to the national security state. The intellectual task then becomes envisioning and articulating what alternatives consistent with a free society might look like in practice.



The basis of our constitution is in opposition to the principle of equal political rights [if it refuses] to all but freeholders any participation in the natural right of self-government... And even among our citizens who participate in the representative privilege, the equality of political rights is entirely prostrated by our constitution... [if it gives] to every citizen of [one county] as much weight in the government as to twenty-two equal citizens in [another]... If these fundamental principles are of no importance in actual government, then no principles are important, and it is as well to rely on the dispositions of an administration, good or evil, as on the provisions of a constitution.

– Thomas Jefferson, *Letter to John Hampden Pleasants* [1824]

Our Brave Warriors

Thomas DiLorenzo

Trump has suggested changing the title of Secretary of Defense back to Secretary of War. “We all feel like warriors” after the unprovoked bombing of Iran, he said. Yes, let’s celebrate the “bravery” of those pilots who dropped 30,000 pound bombs on Iran from ten miles up in the sky while facing no air defense. And don’t leave out those gallant and brave sailors who pushed buttons to launch missiles at Iran from ships anchored 400 miles away.

11:53 am on June 26, 2025

The Best of Thomas DiLorenzo

Trump's God Complex, Slavish Pandering to Israel and War Against

Thomas Massie and Rand Paul

October 25, 2025

By Chuck Baldwin

(3)

Donald Trump is more than a bad president; he is a very bad man (to use Trump's lingo). America has had several presidents with loose morals, but we've never had one (well, except for perhaps Abraham Lincoln and Lyndon Johnson) who had NO morals.

It's really difficult to realize, much less articulate, just how much toxic damage Trump has wrought in the hearts and minds of the people on the political and religious right. Of course, they themselves are unable to recognize it, but devotion and loyalty to Trump have cost them their moral conscience, their mental capacity to reason and, yes, the forfeiture of their humanity. The unconscionable conduct, egregious crimes and attacks on civility committed by Trump on a daily (even hourly) basis that conservatives are willing to excuse and even laud stagger the imagination.

This is especially true for people calling themselves Christians.

Donald Trump has made a mockery of the office of president. He treats the Oval Office like a lavatory. His brain registers zero respect or reverence for the office. He degrades and humiliates the office day in and day out. There has never been a man in the White House who publicly profanes the name of God and insults the conscience of America's polite society with more vulgarity and profanity than Donald J. Trump (and those around him).

If a Democrat president behaved this way, Christians would howl their displeasure. But when Trump does it, they sit passive and compliant—even turn around and try to tell us how great Christians the Trumps are. To hear them talk, Abraham, Moses, Peter and Paul are carnal degenerates compared to the spirituality of the Trumps.

Evangelicals point to the two attempted assassinations on Donald Trump as proof that Trump has some sort of divine anointing. They have forgotten that Adolf Hitler had at least forty assassination attempts on his life.

When Trump survived the assassination attempt in Pennsylvania, Trump said that God saved his life. Yes, indeed. God did just that. God has saved the life of each person reading this column—probably more than once. Every breath, every heartbeat is a gift of God.

But now, in typical emperor-speak, the Trumps have changed "God saved Trump" to "Trump saved God."

Eric Trump on Tuesday claimed that President Donald Trump and the MAGA movement are "saving God" during an interview with conservative political commentator Benny Johnson.

"We're saving Christianity. We're saving God," he told Johnson. "We're saving the family unit. We're saving this nation."

(Source)

Where are you, Pastor Robert Jeffress? Where are you, Rev. Franklin Graham?

Eric Trump just boldly, brazenly and matter-of-factly publicly blasphemed Almighty God in a way never heard before by a member of an American first family, and evangelical preachers sit mute and dumb.

Can one imagine the outcry had Joe Biden's son Hunter publicly said such a thing? I guess blasphemy is only a sin if Democrats commit it.

But it is Trump's slavish pandering to Israel that really stinks to the heavens. Disgusting and nauseating do not begin to describe Trump's sheer, supine subjection to the Jewish billionaire class.

In his speech before the Israeli Knesset, Donald Trump made a fool out of the people of the United States. He crawled before Benjamin Netanyahu and Miriam Adelson like a whipped little puppy dog. It was humiliating! It was horrible!

14 "I'm gonna get her {Miriam Adelson, Zionist billionaire and Mossad asset} in trouble with this one, but I actually asked her once, 'So, Miriam, I know you love Israel. What do you love more? Israel. The United States or Israel?' She refused to answer. That might mean Israel," the president said.

Miriam's late husband, Sheldon Adelson, was also a major contributor to Trump's previous presidential campaigns, and Trump credited the couple for pro-Israel moves he made in his first administration, including recognizing the Israeli annexation of the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights.

"Miriam and Sheldon would come into the office, they'd call me. I think they had more trips to the White House than anybody else I could think of. Look at her sitting there so innocently, she got \$60 billion in the bank ... and she loves Israel," Trump said in his Knesset address, which Miriam attended.

"Her husband was a very aggressive man, but I loved him, very supportive of me. And he'd call up, 'Can I come over and see you?' I say, 'Sheldon, I'm the president of the United States, it doesn't work that way.' He'd come in and do good, though. But they were very responsible for so much, including getting me thinking about Golan Heights," Trump added.

Lest anyone forget, Trump in 2024 openly ran on handing our country over to Miriam Adelson and the Israel Lobby.

"You're going to end up winning because you're going to have the president, okay?" he told Adelson at an event for wealthy Jewish donors in August 2024.

(Source).

As I said in my message last Sunday entitled *It Is Christian Zionists Who Will Be Left Behind:*

If you saw Trump's speech before the Israeli Knesset last week, you saw what a pandering, sycophantic lackey for Israel Donald Trump really is.

He confessed to the world that he is owned by Miriam Adelson, the Mossad and Netanyahu.

He confessed to the world that the Adelsons bribed him in his first term to move the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

He confessed to the world that the Adelsons bribed him to "give" the Golan Heights to Israel.

He confessed to the world that Sheldon Adelson had unfettered access to the Oval Office.

He confessed to the world that his largest financial benefactor, Miriam Adelson, is more loyal to Israel than she is to the United States.

He confessed to the world that Netanyahu is guilty of accepting bribes.

And he further confessed to the world that he, Donald Trump, regards bribery as "no big deal," because, of course, HE has been bribed by Israel all of his life.

I was pleasantly surprised to hear USMC Major and former UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter say in an interview that even with the hundreds of millions of dollars that the Israel lobby has at its disposal with which to bribe America's politicians, it would not be enough to succeed the way it does without the popular support of America's evangelical Christian Zionists.

Hooray, Scott! I've been saying that for years.

Christian Zionism is the glue that holds the global Zionist Ponzi scheme together. And the one man that is most responsible for this gigantic global deception is Cyrus Scofield, author of the pro-Zionist notes in the *Scofield Reference Bible*. (15)

I encourage everyone to read the single most exhaustive and thoroughly researched biography of C. I. Scofield entitled *The Incredible Scofield and His Book* by Joseph Canfield.

I'm proud to say that we are a distributor of this blockbuster book that unveils the truth about the **real** C. I. Scofield. Scofield was to religion what P. T. Barnum was to entertainment.

A Zionist-owned American presidency and U.S. Congress could have never happened without Scofield. The deaths of hundreds of thousands of innocent lives in Palestine by the ethnic cleansing and genocide of Zionist Israel could have never happened without Scofield.

The genocide in Gaza, Israel-pandering politicians and blind, indifferent "Christians" are the legacy of C. I. Scofield. Read the book, and you will understand.

Now, on the home front, what is Trump doing? He's declaring political war on the two best friends that conservatives and constitutionalists have in Congress: Congressman Thomas Massie and Senator Rand Paul.

This subject was recently discussed on Ron Paul's Liberty Report podcast with Ron and co-host Daniel McAdams.

McAdams: This, honestly, Dr. Paul, this is not even a junior high-level rant on the part of President Trump. And it's honestly hard to read this and believe (and I had to double check it) to believe that this person who wrote this is the president of the United States of America. Now, I'll read it for you because it happens to be important, I think. He said,

Donald Trump Truth Social Channel: Whatever happened to "Senator" Rand Paul? He was never great, but he went really BAD! I got him elected TWICE (in the great state of Kentucky!), but he just never votes positively for the Republican Party. He's a nasty liddle' guy [misspelled], much like "Congressman" Thomas Massie, aka Rand Paul Jr., also of Kentucky (which I won three times in massive landslides!), a sick Wacko, who refuses to vote for our great Republican Party, MAGA, or America First. It's really weird!!!

There are a lot of things wrong with this, the first of which being that it's absolutely untrue in every way. He did not get Senator Paul elected twice. In 2010, he had nothing to do with the first senatorial, as you know very well, Dr. Paul, because you are actually the one involved. You were the one involved. In 2010, he did nothing. You were involved in that. So, Trump had nothing to do with that. And in 2016, Trump was running for president. They were running against each other for president. Trump certainly didn't help him then. So, an absolute bold-faced lie. Maybe he's forgotten that he had nothing to do with Senator Paul's election.

And, by the way, it should be pointed out through all of these constant attacks on Senator Paul and Massie, but certainly Senator Paul: When the chips were down, and President Trump was facing this Russiagate claims, a pack of lies, there was one person who steadfastly stood by President Trump, and that is Senator Rand Paul. And we remember this. He defended him against these charges that he's simply Putin's puppet. And he not only defended them, but Senator Paul defended President Trump even to the detriment of Senator Paul's own reputation, because they said, "Oh, you must be Putin's puppet too." So, he basically took the body blows for President Trump when the chips were down. And this is how President Trump repays people. I think it's disgusting.

16 The thing about the attack on Senator Paul and Congressman Massie is that there's a punchline to this horrible, horrible, off-color joke. And that is, right when President Trump is attacking these two gentlemen, what does he decide to do? Well, he decides to have his first fundraiser for another candidate of the election cycle. And who does he support? So, "Rand and Massie are RINOs; they're not real Republicans."

Go to that *Politico* article. There we go. He's going to go on stage for Lindsey Graham.

Politico Article: Trump's first in-person fundraiser of the 2026 cycle will be for Lindsey Graham

His first in-person appearance of the 2026 midterm campaign cycle at a fundraiser next month to support the reelection bid of Sen. Lindsey Graham.

Trump, who has largely eschewed domestic travel this year, is scheduled to join the South Carolina Republican for a golf tournament in November, according to a person familiar with this.

So, Senator Paul, Congressman Massie are anathema, but Lindsey Graham is the one who he believes is the America first, MAGA. It's unbelievable.

McAdams continues:

Well, as bad as it is attacking these two fine gentlemen and going to bat for Lindsey Graham, hold your breath, Dr. Paul, it gets even worse.

Now, you mentioned Trump was desperately trying to find a Republican to run against Massie in the primaries. He even got a bunch of out-of-state money, a couple million bucks, out-of-state money to put someone up against Massie, but they couldn't find anyone. Well, it looks like he's desperately trying to find one.

Tyler Durden Article: "Is This MAGA? Trump Wants Lindsey Graham Donor To Challenge 'RINO' Massie"

The guy's name is Ed Gallrein, and Trump is desperately trying to get him to run against Massie. Go to the next clip.

Here's what Trump wrote on Friday night.

Same Tyler Durden Article: *Third Rate Congressman **Thomas Massie**, a **Weak and Pathetic RINO** from the Great Commonwealth of Kentucky, a place I love, and won big SIX TIMES [only six?], must be thrown out of office ASAP!*

*I hope Ed gets into the race against Massie. Unlike 'lightweight' **Massie**, a **totally ineffective loser who has failed so badly**, CAPTAIN ED GALLREIGN IS A WINNER WHO WILL NOT LET YOU DOWN. Should he decide to challenge Massie, Captain Ed Gallrein has my complete and total endorsement. RUN, ED, RUN.*

I mean, Dr. Paul, reading this, does that look like it's written by the president of the United States of America? It's so weird.

It's more than weird, Daniel; it's **evil**.

Lindsey Graham is the biggest Neocon warmonger in the U.S. Congress. The blood of innocents drips from his hands and oozes from the pores of his skin.

You professing peace lovers in the GOP take note: Donald Trump is doing everything he can to re-elect your biggest enemy in Congress and to defeat your best friends in Congress. And you still give Donald Trump unyielding, total support.

What is wrong with you? You've allowed Trump to sully your soul. That's what's wrong with you.

(17)

Trump is more than a bad president; he is a very bad man. And people who blindly follow him are falling into the ditch of disaster into which he is leading them.

Reprinted with permission from Chuck Baldwin Live.

The Best of Chuck Baldwin

The End of Britain, France, and Germany

By John Leake

Courageous Discourse

October 18, 2025

Yesterday I saw in report in the Telegraph headlined Britain and France are at the end stage of 'centrist dad' collapse and found the following paragraph about Starmer and Macron especially memorable.

Wrong on almost everything, hated by voters, incapable of truth-telling, driven by a messianic belief in environmentalism and global technocracy, unable to confront reality, gripped by suicidal empathy and addicted to virtue-signalling, Starmer and Macron have ended up as unlikely brothers in arms, despite their seemingly incompatible styles.

The report resonated with me, as I had, just the day before, had a long telephone conversation with former British MP, Andrew Bridgen, about the current state of affairs in England. He perceives them to be very grim.[amazon template=*Irc ad (right)&asin=]

In the summer of 2014, on the 100th anniversary of the First World War, I found myself visiting Leipzig, Germany, where I wandered into a book store near the St. Thomas Church, where J.S. Bach had served as the music director from 1723 to 1750. The store was stocked with books by authors all trying to answer the question: **Why did the great nations of Europe essentially commit suicide in 1914-18?**

The answer, it seems to me, is the marked tendency of any society's political class to be captured by interests and ideologies that have little to do with the interests of the people they govern. Apart from bankers and arms manufacturers, the Great War of 1914-18 served no one who lived in the warring countries. On the contrary, it sent millions of their young men—including their most educated young men—to be machine gunned and gassed in the trenches.

While some elements of the state are necessary for providing basic security, maintaining critical infrastructure, and adjudicating conflict, the state invariably becomes way too big and parasitic, and ultimately cancerous.

I fear that Britain, France, and Germany are currently suffering from Stage 4 Cancer that originated in the bosom of their bizarre governments run by total weirdos who in no way represent the interests of the people they govern.

Why Does Trump Always Talk about Killing People?

Laurence M. Vance

on October 16, 2025

President Trump said today that if Hamas doesn't stop killing people in the Gaza Strip, then the United States would have no other choice but to "go in and kill them." Trump is always talking about killing people, and apparently likes ordering Americans to kill for him. Is any boat in the Atlantic safe?

Historical amnesia: Europe turns a blind eye to Iran's WWII humanitarian legacy

By Shahrokh Saei

October 28, 2025 - 17:56

Politics

Professor Azarov: Israel and the US shape West's anti-Iran stance

TEHRAN Times

TEHRAN – During the darkest days of World War II, when Europe was engulfed in flames, Iran extended a hand of humanity—welcoming more than 100,000 Polish refugees and offering them safety, dignity, and a chance to rebuild their shattered lives. That chapter of compassion and solidarity remains etched in history as a testament to Iran's generosity.

Yet, in a striking act of political amnesia, Poland's Foreign Minister Radoslaw Sikorski appeared before the UK Parliament in mid-October, where he attempted to smear Iran by displaying what he claimed was an Iranian-made drone used in the Ukraine war. The accusation—unsupported by concrete evidence—not only vilifies Iran but also betrays the memory of the very nation that once gave refuge to his compatriots.

Iran's Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi rejected the claim, denouncing it as a "politically motivated act based on falsehoods" orchestrated by the Israeli lobby and its allies. Both Iran and Russia have consistently dismissed Western allegations of Iranian arms transfers to Moscow for use in the Ukraine war.

To examine the hostile posture of Poland and other European countries toward Iran—sharply at odds with the historical bond forged in the 1940s—the Tehran Times sat down with Professor Vladimir Azarov, a member of the Russian Writers' Union and professor at the Academy of Military Sciences as well as a veteran of local wars and military conflicts. Below is an excerpt from that conversation.

During World War II, Iran provided refuge to over 100,000 Polish citizens. How should this extraordinary humanitarian contribution influence Poland's and Europe's perception of Iran today?

Talking about how Iran provided refuge to more than 100,000 Polish citizens during World War II, and how this contribution might somehow affect Poland's and Europe's perception of Iran today, is simply an illusion, a misconception, and a lack of understanding of the current geopolitical landscape.



In 1942, more than 100,000 refugees from Poland began their exodus to Iran

Who in the world, and particularly in Poland, remembers what happened eighty years ago? No politician in Europe will ever bring up this topic or tell the truth. You can't be so naive as to believe that you can hope, through memories of something good that happened many years ago, that this will somehow influence the European policy against other countries in the world. This is not only utopian but also dangerous.