

The Militia the Founders Envisioned, and What Remains Today

"Who are the militia? They consist now of the whole people."

George Mason cut to the heart of it: the militia was not a government creation, but the people themselves.

That simple truth has been twisted, ignored, or totally forgotten.

Say the word "militia" today and most people look at you like you're a fringe nutcase. But the founding generation saw it differently. They viewed a well-armed and well-trained people as the backbone of liberty, the essential security of a free republic.

The Constitution's militia clauses were supposed to secure that principle. The Anti-Federalists warned they would do the opposite – and time has proven them right.

CITIZEN MILITIA VS. STANDING ARMY

This story really begins with a principle most Americans have forgotten, and most were never even taught: the choice between a citizen militia and a permanent professional standing army.

Henry Knox, Washington's Secretary of War, reinforced this: in a free society, the ultimate safeguard had to be an armed people, themselves.

"An energetic national militia is to be regarded as the Capital security of a free republic; and not a standing army, forming a distinct class in the community."

That view was widespread because almost the entire founding generation viewed standing armies, especially large permanent ones, as one of the greatest dangers to liberty. A perfect example of this view came from the great revolutionary war hero Joseph Warren.

"It is further certain, from a consideration of the nature of mankind, as well as from constant experience, that standing armies always endanger the liberty of the subject."

The same warning carried forward to the ratification debates over the Constitution. "A Democratic Federalist," possibly Samuel Bryan, pointed to the long record of history. From every angle, the conclusion was the same: a standing army was the single greatest danger.

"The experience of past ages, and the result of the enquiries of the best and most celebrated patriots have taught us to dread a standing army above all earthly evils."

And Tench Coxe drove the distinction home. A militia of the people worked for the people, defending their own freedom. A professional army was nothing but the tool of those in power. And people in power always find ways to use that power for the worst.

"There is a wide difference between the troops of such a commonwealth as ours, founded on equal and unalterable principles, and those of a regal government, where ambition and oppression are the profession of the king. In the first case, a military officer is the occasional servant of the people, employed for their defence; in the second, he is the ever ready instrument to execute the schemes of conquest or oppression, with which the mind of his royal master may be disturbed."

MILITIA IN THE CONSTITUTION

By: Michael Boldin|Published on: Aug 15, 2025|Categories: 2nd Amendment,

Militia

JCRMC PACKET
SEPTEMBER 1, 2025



James Madison tied the whole question of liberty to the militia itself. What others had warned about in theory, he pressed as a principle to be written into the Constitution itself.

"As the greatest danger to liberty is from large standing armies, it is best to prevent them, by an effectual provision for a good Militia."

Tench Coxe tied those principles together into one clear doctrine. The militia was the people themselves, and he affirmed Madison's view that they made a standing army unnecessary.

"The militia, who are in fact the effective part of the people at large, will render many troops quite unnecessary."

He explained why. An armed population, by sheer numbers, could act as a check on regular troops, because the geographic situation of the country meant there would seldom be many of them in the first place.

"They will form a powerful check upon the regular troops, and will generally be sufficient to overawe them – for our detached situation will seldom give occasion to raise an army, though a few scattered companies may often be necessary."

The framers sought to write these principles into the Constitution, where the word "militia" is included six times.

Article II, Section 2 made the president commander in chief not only of the army and navy, but also of the militia of the several states when called into the actual service of the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 15 explained when that could happen. Congress could provide for calling forth the militia only in three situations: "to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions." Clause 16 delegated to Congress the power to "provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States."

That last power would become the heart of the coming debate.

The Bill of Rights added two more mentions of the word militia. The Fifth Amendment exempted cases *"arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger."*

The Second Amendment put the principle beyond dispute, tying the people's right to arms directly to the survival of a free state.

"A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

THE BIG DEBATE

During the ratification debates, there was strong opposition to giving Congress power to organize, arm, and discipline the militia. As Federal Farmer wrote, the starting point was clear: liberty required the great mass of the people themselves to remain armed.

"To preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms, and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them"

Patrick Henry pressed the point even harder. Liberty could not be secured by a portion of the people.

"The great object is, that every man be armed"

That demand ran headlong into Alexander Hamilton's approach. He began by acknowledging the opposition's concern that federal power over the militia could be used to form a select corps, loyal to government instead of the people.

"By a curious refinement upon the spirit of republican jealousy, we are even taught to apprehend danger from the militia itself, in the hands of the federal government. It is observed that select corps may be formed, composed of the young and ardent, who may be rendered subservient to the views of arbitrary power."

Hamilton then made his own claim. A general militia, he said, was not the safeguard of liberty but an impractical and dangerous burden.

"The project of disciplining all the militia of the United States is as futile as it would be injurious, if it were capable of being carried into execution."

In one stroke he dismissed the idea that ordinary citizens should give their time and effort to arms and training, calling such effort a nuisance to be avoided.

"To oblige the great body of the yeomanry, and of the other classes of the citizens, to be under arms for the purpose of going through military exercises and evolutions, as often as might be necessary to acquire the degree of perfection which would entitle them to the character of a well-regulated militia, would be a real grievance to the people, and a serious public inconvenience and loss."

THE SELECT MILITIA

The Anti-Federalists repeatedly warned that any plan allowing a "select corps," or what they called a "select militia," could be extremely dangerous. In Pennsylvania, John Smilie warned that this would, in practice, be a standing army.

"Congress may give us a select militia which will, in fact, be a standing army"

And if men hostile to liberty gained power, they would have every reason to cripple the one institution that could resist them. That meant abolishing the general militia altogether.

"Or – Congress, afraid of a general militia, may say there shall be no militia at all."

Either way, the stage would be set for the ultimate danger.

"When a select militia is formed; the people in general may be disarmed."

George Mason explained how easily this could happen. Congress would not need to seize weapons outright. It could let the militia wither through neglect.

"The militia may be here destroyed by that method which has been practised in other parts of the world before. That is, by rendering them useless, by disarming them. Under various pretences, Congress may neglect to provide for arming and disciplining the militia, and the State Governments cannot do it, for Congress has an exclusive right to arm them"

But Mason saw something even more sinister – what if this wasn't accidental neglect, but the whole point?

"Should the national Government wish to render the militia useless, they may neglect them, and let them perish, in order to have a pretence of establishing standing army"

Even Hamilton conceded that the scope of power was wide open. No one could predict what Congress might choose to do.

"What plan for the regulation of the militia may be pursued by the national government, is impossible to be foreseen"

Mason brought the issue back to first principles. In 1788, there was no ambiguity – the militia still meant the people themselves – all of them.

"I ask who are the militia? They consist now of the whole people, except a few public officers."

Mason drove it home with a warning that would prove to be prophetic. To grant Congress control over organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia was to guarantee a select militia – and with it, every danger the Anti-Federalists had warned against.

"But I cannot say who will be the militia of the future day. If that paper on the table gets no alteration, the militia of the future day may not consist of all classes, high and low, and rich and poor; but may be confined to the lower and middle classes of the people, granting exclusion to the higher classes of the people. If we should ever see that day, the most ignominious punishments and heavy fines may be expected."

THE PUSH FOR AMENDMENTS

This fear of Congress neglecting the militia, or even disarming the people and leaving only a select corps, was a driving force behind the push for amendments.

At Virginia's ratifying convention, they proposed one in unmistakable terms:

"That the people have a right to keep and bear arms; that a well regulated Militia composed of the body of the people trained to arms is the proper, natural and safe defence of a free State."

New York, North Carolina, and Rhode Island all ratified with nearly the same recommended amendment.

Years later, Thomas Jefferson recalled just how urgent the issue had been. From Europe, he pressed James Madison for amendments to guarantee that the Constitution itself would help prevent that great threat to liberty – a standing army – by securing the militia.

"I wrote strongly to mr Madison urging the want of provision for the freedom of religion, freedom of the press, trial by jury, habeas corpus, the substitution of militia for a standing army, and an express reservation to the states of all rights not specifically granted to the union."

THE WARNING CAME TRUE

Remember George Mason's warning about Congress turning the militia into a narrow class, while exempting those with the greatest means? A century later, that prediction became law.

The Militia Act of 1903, what most people today call the Dick Act, narrowed the definition of the militia from "the whole people" to a specific segment of the people.

"The militia shall consist of every able-bodied male citizen of the respective States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and every able-bodied male of foreign birth

who has declared his intention to become a citizen, who is more than eighteen and less than forty-five years of age"

From there the Act went even further, creating the very "select militia" Mason and the Anti-Federalists had warned would destroy liberty.

"And shall be divided into two classes, the organized militia, to be known as the National Guard of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia ... and the remainder to be known as the Reserve Militia."

And then, of course – to ensure it's just like the standing army we were warned about, Congress ensured that politicians were completely exempt.

"That the Vice-President of the United States, the officers, judicial and executive, of the Government of the United States, the members and officers of each House of Congress ... shall be exempted from militia duty, without regard to age"

THE ONE-TWO PUNCH

The militia was, and always will be, the people themselves.

But just as the Anti-Federalists warned, once Congress was given the power to organize, arm, and discipline only **part** of the militia, the results were inevitable.

Today we live with the one-two punch they predicted:

1. A select militia – the National Guard – is treated as nothing more than an arm of the permanent standing army.
2. Tens of millions of Americans are not armed today.

AmericanRhetoric.com

And so it has come to pass that the Soviet Union itself has shared and suffered the very fears it has fostered in the rest of the world. This has been the way of life forged by eight years of fear and force. What can the world, or any nation in it, hope for if no turning is found on this dread road? The worst to be feared and the best to be expected can be simply stated. The worst is atomic war. The best would be this: a life of perpetual fear and tension; a burden of arms draining the wealth and labor of all peoples; a wasting of strength that defies the American system, or the Soviet system, or any system to achieve true abundance and happiness for the peoples of this earth.

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children. The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities. It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population. It is two fine, fully equipped hospitals. It is some fifty miles of concrete pavement. We pay for a single fighter plane with a half million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

This is, I repeat, the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking. This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron. These plain and cruel truths define the peril and point the hope that come with this spring of 1953.

Russia Did NOT Invade Ukraine

PAUL CRAIG ROBERTS • AUGUST 18, 2025 •

A totally transparent blatant lie has been turned into a truth throughout the Western world. The lie is that Russia invaded Ukraine. I will provide the factual history which is easy to verify.

When Washington overthrew the Ukrainian government in 2014 and installed a puppet, Washington relied on the Banderites to push the government into hostility with the Russian settled areas of Ukraine, areas such as Crimea and Donbas, that originally were part of Russia. Whether or not the Banderites, followers of Stepan Bandera are neo-Nazis, they are certainly hostile to Russians.

The conflict in Ukraine began in 2014 with street assaults on Russians in Donbas and government attempts to ban the use of the Russian language and other prohibitions placed on the Russian areas. These street assaults soon grew into artillery attacks on Donbas towns and occupation of Donbas territory by Ukrainian militias sporting Nazi insignia. To protect themselves, Donbas formed into two independent republics—Luhansk and Donetsk—and formed paramilitaries to defend themselves.

In 2014 Donetsk and Luhansk voted overwhelmingly to be reabsorbed into Russia like Crimea, but Putin refused. Instead, Putin relied on the Minsk Agreement, which Ukraine and the independent republics signed, and which Germany and France were supposed to enforce. The agreement, sponsored by Russia, kept Donbas in Ukraine but provided some autonomy, such as independent police and courts to protect the rights of the Russian inhabitants. Putin naively relied on the Minsk Agreement, which the chancellor of Germany and president of France later said was used to deceive Putin while the US built and equipped a large Ukrainian army.

By late 2021 this army was prepared to invade Donbas, much of which was already under Ukrainian occupation, and forcibly reincorporate Donbas into Ukraine without any autonomy. Faced with the abuse and possible slaughter of Russian people, Putin and his foreign minister Lavrov tried during December 2021-February 2022 to obtain a mutual security agreement with the West that would exclude Ukraine from NATO membership and contribute to mutual security by normalizing relations between Russia and the West. The Biden regime, NATO, and the EU flatly refused. The conflict followed this refusal.

Seeing the writing on the wall and unable to avoid it, Russia gave official recognition to the Donbas republics. This allowed Donetsk and Luhansk to request Russia to come to their aid, which Putin did at the last minute eight years too late. As Russia was invited into Donbas, Russia did not even invade Donbas, much less Ukraine.

Putin designated the Russian intervention a “special military operation” limited to clearing Ukrainian troops from Russian areas. Seven months into the military intervention on September 30, 2022, Russia reincorporated the Russian areas of Donetsk, Luhansk, Zaporizhzhia, and Kherson into Russia. The ground fighting has been limited to clearing Ukrainian troops from territory that is again part of Russia.

Ask yourselves how and why did the truth get replaced by a lie? The answer is that those who profit from war provide the war propaganda.

Now ask why does it matter? The answer is that propaganda is a barrier to understanding and to a peaceful diplomatic solution to a conflict that can easily spin out of control into a wider war.

The propaganda that the evil-dictator-war-criminal-Putin’s invasion of Ukraine is the first step in reconstruction the Soviet Empire places restraints on Trump and Putin’s ability to put East-West relations on a less dangerous footing. Already the Western whore media is screaming that Trump is selling out Ukraine, that Trump is selling out Europe, that Trump is putty in Putin’s hands. These and other such ignorant slogans will be used by the Zionist neoconservatives and US military/security complex to drive wedges between Trump and his supporters. Americans have been indoctrinated to think of Russia as the enemy for 75 years. The belief is institutionalized.

Progress toward peaceful relations requires truthful reporting and correction of established beliefs that are false. Can this be achieved when the well-placed neoconservative supporters of US hegemony are defending their interest, and the military/security complex is determined to protect its power and profit? Trump can expect little help from the media. Naive Russians should not get carried away with their hopes for an accommodation with the West. Powerful barriers are in the way of Russian hopes, and Russians have no means of removing the barriers. It is doubtful that Trump does.

Now ask yourselves a final question? Why is it PCR who is making the case for common sense and for truth? Why isn't it the US foreign policy community, the Kremlin, the Chinese, the Russian media, the Western media, the German government, the British government, the government of India? Why aren't Trump's supporters making the case? I am only one voice easily shouted down as a "Putin agent/dupe" by the Washington Post, CNN, Fox News, NPR, BBC, MSNBC, NY Times, Wall Street Journal, The Guardian, and the rest of the whore media and a plethora of internet sites sponsored by war-mongers. The normalization of relations between the West and Russia will take many voices. Where are those voices?

Note: The whores at the BBC and the rest of the prostitute media incorrectly report that Russia's restoration of Crimea, Donbas, Zaporizhzhia, and Kherson to Russian citizenship is illegal. The restoration of Russian citizenship is completely legal under the international rules of self-determination. There is no effort on the part of Crimea, Donbas, Zaporizhzhia, and Kherson to return to Ukraine.

(Republished from paulcraigroberts by permission of author or representative)

NEWS.ANTIWAR.COM



IDF Admits to Hundreds of Ceasefire Violations as Finance Minister Vows Israel Won't Withdraw From Lebanon

Israeli drone strike kills one, wounds four in Nabatieh

by Jason Ditz | July 30, 2025 at 10:28 am ET | Barrack, Hezbollah, Israel, Lebanon

The Lebanese government has documented several thousand ceasefire violations by Israeli forces since the ceasefire went into effect in late November. Today, the Israeli Army bragged about launching around 500 strikes against Lebanon since then, so they're admitting to at least some of those violations.

Not that they're contrite about this. Rather, they present those hundreds of violations as "achievements." They went on to claim that the 230 people they've killed in those strikes, most of whom have never been conclusively identified and many of them who were plainly civilians, were all Hezbollah members, and argued they'd destroyed a lot of Hezbollah infrastructure.

Hezbollah, by contrast, hasn't launched a single rocket at Israel since the ceasefire went into effect, so despite the constant Israeli claims they're violating the ceasefire by existing, the difference in violations in practical matters is starkly different.

SANCTIONS ARE JUST AS DEADLY AS WAR: LANCET STUDY

by Connor Freeman / Aug. 14, 2025

Ron Paul, the libertarian leaning former Texas congressman and GOP candidate for president, has always maintained that sanctions are acts of war. *The Lancet Global Health* recently published a study that proves him right.

Economists Mark Weisbrot, Francisco Rodríguez, and Silvio Rendón have found that the yearly total excess human death toll associated with economic sanctions across the world is roughly equivalent to the annual human death tolls of active wars and combat. In fact, the research reveals that on average, the civilian deaths caused by sanctions exceed battle-related casualties in kinetic conflicts each year.

According to the study, the worst effects on populations across various age groups are caused by unilateral US and EU sanctions against targeted countries. The researchers argue that “unilateral sanctions imposed by the USA or the EU might be designed in ways that have a greater negative effect on target populations.” UN sanctions, they add, “have been framed as efforts to minimise their impact on civilian populations, although the extent to which they have achieved this goal remains debated.”

In the period of 2012–2021, for example, the average yearly death toll of unilateral sanctions worldwide was 564,258. The study also notes that most of the civilian deaths attributable to sanctions between 1970 and 2020 were children less than 5 years old.

Economic and unilateral sanctions kill the most vulnerable members of a population, including primarily children, the elderly, and the sick. The press release announcing the study, published by the Center for Economic and Policy Research, states, “The researchers studied sanctions’ effects on age-specific mortality rates. They found that children under five made up 51 percent of total deaths due to sanctions over the 1970–2021 period. Most deaths (77 percent over the same period) were aged 0–15 and 60–80.”

The
LIBERTARIAN
INSTITUTE

The press release continues, “The study is the first to systematically examine the effects of sanctions on age-specific mortality in cross-country data using methods designed to address causal questions on observational data.”

The researchers conclude that “the effects of sanctions on mortality generally increase over time, with longer-lived sanctions episodes resulting in higher tolls on lives.”

Washington has imposed brutal “maximum pressure” or “crippling” sanctions on poor countries across the world, among them Venezuela, North Korea, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Cuba. Over the years, it has been documented that these sanctions have contributed to the preventable deaths of tens of thousands, and in some cases hundreds of thousands, of people in Venezuela and Iraq alone.

The US also imposes extensive sanctions on more powerful countries than those listed above, such as Russia and Iran. By cutting off the possibility of economic cooperation and interdependence, war has resulted in both cases in the last three years.

In 2021, erstwhile Secretary of State Antony Blinken declared that Washington was absolutely committed “to [opposing] the reconstruction of Syria” absent regime change. To that end, the US implemented a callous sanctions regime on Syria using the bipartisan Caesar Act, a law which applied to any person or entity of any nationality that attempted to do business with the war-torn country. These sanctions deliberately targeted the country’s engineering and construction sectors.

As a result, the civilian population was devastated. In 2022, Alena Douhan, a UN special rapporteur on unilateral coercive measures, visited Syria. She explained at the time that the sanctions “severely harm human rights and prevent any efforts for early recovery, rebuilding and reconstruction.”

Douhan stressed that “12 million Syrians grapple with food insecurity” and “90% of Syria’s population currently lives in poverty,” with limited access to food, shelter, water, electricity, healthcare, heating, cooking, fuel, and transportation. Partly as a result of the bipartisan economic war on Syria, Al Qaeda offshoots were able to seize Damascus and take over the country. Since then, sectarian violence has seen thousands of civilians slaughtered.

The use of sanctions, largely spearheaded by the US, has spread across the world over the last several decades. The *Lancet* study continued, “25% of all countries [were] subject to some type of sanctions by either the USA, the EU, or the UN in the 2010–22 period, by contrast with an average of only 8% in the 1960s.”

Rodríguez insists the entire policy of economic warfare must be reevaluated. “We have seen economic sanctions — especially those imposed by the US — contribute substantially to economic collapse in targeted countries, such as Venezuela... Sanctions often fail to achieve their stated objectives and instead only punish the civilian populations of the targeted countries. It is well past time that the US, EU, and other powerful actors in the international community seriously reconsider this cruel and often counterproductive mechanism.”

I began to sense faintly that secrecy is the keystone of all tyranny. Not force, but secrecy ... censorship. When any government, or any church for that matter, undertakes to say to its subjects, "This you may not read, this you must not see, this you are forbidden to know," the end result is tyranny and oppression, no matter how holy the motives. Mighty little force is needed to control a man whose mind has been hoodwinked; contrariwise, no amount of force can control a free man, a man whose mind is free. No, not the rack, not fission bombs, not anything -- you can't conquer a free man; the most you can do is kill him.

– Robert A. Heinlein

They Lied to You About *Rerum Novarum* By Veronica Burchard

The foundational document of modern Catholic Social Teaching calls private property sacred and condemns instigating class envy in the poor.

August 7, 2025

Crisis Magazine

In his first address to the College of Cardinals, Leo XIV explained his choice of name was inspired by "Pope Leo XIII [who] in his historic Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* addressed the social question in the context of the first great industrial revolution."

I knew of *Rerum Novarum* as the foundation of Catholic Social Teaching, and I had accepted the common claim that it rejects both socialism and capitalism. But there was a certain dissatisfaction about this understanding, a sense that I must have been missing something. As the daughter of Cuban exiles, I could not fathom how the Church could reject these two systems to the same degree when one had lifted millions out of poverty while the other had slaughtered millions in the name of equality.

So, now that Leo XIV had given this encyclical a place of honor in his new pontificate, I stopped relying on secondhand interpretations and read it for myself.

What Does *Rerum Novarum* Really Say?

As I read it, disbelief gave way to outrage. How misled I had been! This was no evenhanded critique of socialism on the one hand and capitalism on the other! It was a strong condemnation of socialism backed by a vigorous, principled defense of private property and the family. And, even more radically for our day, it was an explanation of why socialism hurts the poor rather than helps them. Leo never once promotes government redistribution of wealth as a general policy, but he does say—several times!—that only when private property is held sacred (yes, *sacred*) can we truly help the needy.

I could hardly think of a more provocative statement these days, certain to make most modern social justice warriors uncomfortable.

And it seems others feel the same. The opening paragraph of the Wikipedia entry on *Rerum Novarum* (RN) contains what I now know are multiple misrepresentations:

It supports the rights of labor to form trade unions [true], and rejects both socialism and capitalism [false] while affirming the right to private property [true, though vastly understated] and to a living wage [misleading, given how the term is used today].

Does RN champion the right to form unions governed by Christian morality? Absolutely, and with good reason.

Does it critique the treatment of workers as means to an end, inhumane working conditions, defrauding workers of their wages, and other practices where the rich and powerful treat workers as slaves? Yes, strongly. But capitalism hardly has a monopoly on these—it's got nothing on atheistic Communism. And as the horrors of Communism began to be made known two generations after Leo XIII wrote RN, the Church has left absolutely no doubt that Communism is evil and irreconcilable with Christianity.

What Is a "Living Wage"?

One point from the Wikipedia entry is especially salient today: the "living wage" claim. Does RN argue that workers have the right to a living wage? Yes, though it does not use that term. Here is how RN expresses the idea (emphasis added):

Let the working man and the employer make free agreements, and in particular let them agree freely as to the wages; nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man,

namely, that wages should support a frugal and well-behaved wage-earner... If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him comfortably to support himself, his wife, and his children, he will find it easy, if he be a sensible man, to practice thrift, and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by some little savings and thus secure a modest source of income. Nature itself would urge him to this. We have seen that this great labor question cannot be solved save by assuming as a principle that private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable. The law, therefore, should favor ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many as possible of the people to become owners. Many excellent results will follow from this; and, first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided...

Do you believe the average Wikipedia reader thinks this is what "living wage" means? Sadly, the term is often used by those aiming to stoke division and envy, and nothing will put that fire out more quickly than realizing Catholic Social Teaching emphasizes property ownership as a natural right, requires wages to reflect the individual's situation, and places demands on how employees spend their earnings. And that, Leo XIII argues, is how you get a more equitable distribution of property. Equity!

But it gets even worse for the "wage gap" crowd. If, as Leo XIII claims, "*it is a most sacred law of nature that a father should provide food and all necessities for those whom he has begotten,*" then "*a workman's wages [must] be sufficient to enable him comfortably to support himself, his wife, and his children....*" And it follows, then, that employers cannot pay everyone the same for the same work. Christian employers must, for example, pay a father of five more than they do a young, unmarried woman.

Ironically, paying employees different wages for the same work based on family status (e.g., whether they have children) is not praised as an example of social justice but would, in fact, almost certainly violate U.S. employment discrimination laws and could result in serious consequences. But there is, as Leo XIII contends, "a dictate of *natural justice* more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man." As a matter of distributive justice (which RN notes is an end of government), the father of five is due more than is the young, single woman because it is a sacred law of nature that he must provide for his wife and children.

Mutual Responsibilities

Similar to family relationships, RN describes the relationship between employers and employees as one of mutual responsibility. Employers have more responsibilities; chief among them are to provide humane and moral working conditions and a wage that supports a thrifty, well-behaved wage earner and his family; The employee, for his part, must put in an honest day's work and wisely steward his earnings, save for the future, and not squander money on vices.

Leo XIII derives this employee responsibility from Christian anthropology and the created order. Unlike any other animal, he points out, man has the ability to plan for his and his family's future; and property rights flow, in part, from this responsibility (and not any collectivist ideology—the family precedes the state).

A final warning from Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum* bears taking to heart. Leo XIII repeatedly condemns those who work up "the poor man's envy of the rich" to incite violence and tear at the fabric of society: "They delude the people and impose upon them, and their lying promises will only one day bring forth evils worse than the present." Similarly, put no faith in their promises of a secular utopia. "If human society is to be healed now, in no other way can it be healed save by a return to Christian life and Christian institutions."

For a correct understanding of the foundations of Catholic Social Teaching, examine *Rerum Novarum* for yourself! Make no mistake, its meaning is at the center of a propaganda war that counts on you not reading it.

Veronica Burchard is Chief Operating Officer at Sophia Institute. For the last decade, she has played a key role in the shaping of Sophia's catechetical formation programs, as well as the production of Sophia's religion textbook series, now used in over 1500 schools and parishes, and is the author of *The Pocket Guide to Rerum Novarum* (Sophia Institute Press, 2025).

Expulsion of the Palestinians-- Lydda and Ramleh in 1948 *By Donald Neff July 7 1994*

IT WAS 46 YEARS ago when Israel turned its forces against the all-Palestinian towns of Lydda and Ramleh. On July 13, 1948, Israeli troops forcefully compelled the entire population of as many as 70,000 men, women and children to flee their homes. Systematic looting followed. Swarms of new Jewish immigrants flocked to Lydda and Rainleh, and within days these ancient towns were transformed from Palestinian to Jewish municipalities.

Lydda and Ramleh lay east of Jaffa, between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, and were to be part of the Palestinian state—as was Jaffa—according to the United Nations Partition Plan of 1947. However, since serious fighting had begun in April 1948, Israel had not only secured its own territory designated by the U.N. as part of the Jewish state but was now expanding its control into areas designated Palestinian. Jaffa had already been "cleansed" of its Palestinian population and come under Israeli control.

The initial attack against Lydda-Ramleh was led on April 11 by Lt. Col. Moshe Dayan, who Search Our Archives was later Israel's defense minister and foreign minister. Israeli historians describe him as driving at the head of his armored battalion "full speed into Lydda, shooting up the town and creating confusion and a degree of terror among the population."¹

Two American news correspondents witnessed what happened in the ensuing assault. Keith Wheeler of the *Chicago Sun Times* wrote in an article titled "Blitz Tactics Won Lydda" that "practically everything in their way died. Riddled corpses lay by the roadside." Kenneth Bilby of the *New York Herald Tribune* wrote that he saw "the corpses of Arab men, women and even children strewn about in the wake of the ruthlessly brilliant charge."²

All men of military age were sent to camps and all transport commandeered. The residents of Lydda were promised that if they congregated in mosques and churches they would be safe. On July 12, a brief firefight broke out in Lydda between Israeli soldiers and a Jordanian reconnaissance team in which two Israelis were killed. In retaliation, the Israeli commander issued orders to shoot anyone on the streets. Israeli soldiers turned their wrath at those cowering in mosques and churches, killing scores of them in Dahmash mosque alone. Palestinians venturing from their homes were also shot and killed. At least 250 Lyddans were killed and many others wounded.³

That same day, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion ordered all the Palestinians expelled. The order said: "The residents of Lydda must be expelled quickly without attention to age." It was signed by Lieutenant Colonel Yitzhak Rabin, operations chief of the Lydda-Ramleh attack and later Israel's military chief of staff and its prime minister in 1974-77 and again today since 1992.⁴ A similar order was issued about Ramleh.

The next day the massive forced exodus of the Palestinians began. The Ramlehans were luckier than their neighbors from Lydda. Most of the Ramleh expellees were driven into exile in buses and trucks. The Lyddans were forced to walk.

The exodus was an extended episode of suffering for the refugees.

The commander of Jordan's Arab Legion, John Bagot Glubb Pasha, reported: "Perhaps 30,000 people or more, almost entirely women and children, snatched up what they could and fled from their homes across the open fields It was a blazing day in July in the coastal plains—the temperature about 100 degrees in the shade. It was 10 miles across open hilly country, much of it ploughed, part of it stony fallow covered with thorn bushes, to the nearest Arab village of Beit Sira. Nobody will ever know how many children died."⁵

Israeli historian Benny Morris reported: "All the Israelis who witnessed the events agreed that the exodus, under a hot July sun, was an extended episode of suffering for the refugees, especially from Lydda. Some were stripped by soldiers of their valuables as they left town or at checkpoints along the way One Israeli soldier ... recorded vivid impressions of the thirst and hunger of the refugees on the roads, and of how 'children got lost' and of how a child fell into a well and drowned, ignored, as his fellow refugees fought each other to draw water. Another soldier described the spoor left by the slow-shuffling columns, 'to begin with [jettisoning] utensils and furniture and in the end, bodies of men, women and children, scattered along the way!

"Quite a few refugees died—from exhaustion, dehydration and disease—along the roads eastwards, from Lydda and Ramleh, before reaching temporary rest near and in Ramallah. Nimr Khatib put the death toll among the Lydda refugees during the trek eastward at 335; Arab Legion commander John Glubb Pasha more carefully wrote that 'nobody will ever know how many children died.'"⁶

More than just the murderous sun and rough terrain contributed to the miseries of the displaced Palestinians. Israeli soldiers searched them for valuables and indiscriminately killed those they took a dislike to or thought were hiding possessions. The *London Economist* reported: "The Arab refugees were systematically stripped of all their belongings before they were sent on their trek to the frontier. Household belongings, stores, clothing, all had to be left behind."⁷ One youthful Palestinian survivor recalled: "Two of my friends were killed in cold blood. One was carrying a box presumed to have money and the other a pillow which was believed to contain valuables. A friend of mine resisted and was killed in front of me. He had 400 Palestinian pounds in his pocket."⁸

THE OUTBREAK OF LOOTING

After the forced exit of the Palestinians, looting began in Lydda and Ramleh. Israeli historian Simha Flapan reported: "With the population gone, the Israeli soldiers proceeded to loot the two towns in an outbreak of mass pillaging that the officers could neither prevent nor control Even the soldiers from the Palmach—most of whom came from or were preparing to join kibbutzim—took part, stealing mechanical and agricultural equipment."⁹ Israeli, troops carted away 1,800 truck loads of Palestinian property, including a button factory, a sausage factory, a soft drinks plant, a macaroni factory, a textile mill, 7,000 retail shops, 1,000 warehouses and 500 workshops."¹⁰

In place of the Palestinians came new Jewish immigrants and Lydda and Ramleh quickly "became mainly Jewish towns," in the words of historian Morris."¹¹ Lydda is now called Lod.

The brutal expulsion of the Palestinians of Lydda and Ramleh long remained a sensitive topic in Israel. Rabin candidly wrote about the incident in his memoirs in the late 1970s but the passage was censored by the Israeli government."¹² In 1978, the Israeli censor canceled a TV film based on Yzhar Smilansky's classic *The Tale of Hirber Hiza*, a novella he wrote under the pen name of S.Yzhar about his experiences as a young Israeli intelligence officer who witnessed in 1948 the expulsion of Palestinians from their homes. Smilansky's offending lines included this one: "We came, shot, burned. Blew up, pushed and exiled....Will the walls not scream in the ears of those who will live in this village?"¹³

The reverberations of the brutal treatment of the residents of Lydda and Ramleh continue to this today. One of the families forced from Lydda was that of George Habash. He later became one of Israel's most feared foes as head of the militant Palestinian guerrilla group Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.¹⁴ The PLFP today is among the rejectionist groups opposing peace with Israel.

Donald Neff is author of the Warriors trilogy on U.S.-Middle East relations and of the unpublished Middle East Handbook, a chronological data bank of significant events affecting U.S. policy and the middle East on which this article is based. His books are available through the AET Book Club (<http://www.middleeastbooks.com/>).

"Doctor" Mike Evans and the Evangelicals

By Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

June 18, 2025

Tim McGraw wrote:

"The evangelical community helped deliver the White House to President Donald Trump and, therefore, believes his administration should support Israel's biblical rights to its historical heartland of Judea and Samaria, Dr. Mike Evans, founder of Friends of Zion, told Fox News Digital.

"We hold strongly to that stand. President Trump won because of the Evangelical vote. There are 52 million of us in America, and we are Bible believers," he continued. "Jesus said, 'You will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria,'" he said. His organization claims nearly 30 million members." LRC Political Theater

...

Hi Lew,

Oh, this "doctor" Mike Evans is a piece of work. "52 million Bible believers", I hope it's a bit higher than that. 30 million members claimed by Evans in his group of Zionist supporters. That is depressing if true.

The quote Evans cites is Jesus saying that witnesses in Jerusalem, etc., who saw his crucifixion (torture and murder) and Resurrection should testify to the Truth. It doesn't mean that today's Christians should defend Zionists running the Levant. Evans is insane, but no doubt very rich.

President Trump Should Return to an 'America First' Foreign Policy

RON PAUL • AUGUST 25, 2025 • 600 WORDS • 3 COMMENTS

After four years of unnecessarily confrontational foreign policy under President Biden, Americans elected Donald Trump in part for his promise to put America first at home and overseas. He promised a war-weary America that he would start no new wars and would get us out of the existing ones. Eight months into his second Administration it appears his promise remains to be fulfilled, as his approval rating continues to slip.

On Ukraine, President Trump wisely observed coming into office that the conflict is “Joe Biden’s war” not his own. Unfortunately he could not resist the temptation to get involved in the conflict, even under the guise of “peacemaker.” I’ve often said that getting out of conflicts overseas is not that complicated: we should just come home. Even when there are no troops involved, “just come home” means disengage from the conflict. But President Trump wants to play referee in the war while arming and supporting one side. Is it any wonder he is making no progress in ending the war?

Likewise with Israel and Gaza, Trump’s promise to put America first has faltered. President Biden put Americans on the hook for additional billions of dollars to support Israel’s actions in Gaza without even a word about the slaughter and destruction. As more Americans become disgusted by Israel’s obliteration of the property and population of that tiny strip of land, Trump shows no signs of shifting from Biden’s approach. More money and more weapons are sent as starvation claims more and more children each day. Trump has reportedly remarked to a donor that his own base is turning against him because of his Israel policy. Yet he refuses to alter course and “just come home.”

Trump has even returned to the failed Latin America policy of his first Administration, in last week’s move toward a military confrontation with oil-rich Venezuela. Trump sent two warships and 4,000 US troops to the waters near Venezuela under the highly suspect accusation that the country’s president is actually head of an international drug cartel. He should have learned from the almost comical recognition of Juan Guaido as the real president of Venezuela in his first term that meddling in that country is not in America’s interest. It seems the neocons around him, including warhawk Marco Rubio, are sucking him into another unnecessary conflict.

Add in Trump’s military attacks on Yemen and Iran and the balance sheet thus far does not point to an “America first” foreign policy.

There is still time for President Trump to change course and fulfil his promises to the American people. Put Ukraine and Russia on notice that from this point the US is withdrawing from any role in the conflict. Let the Europeans work it out if they feel it is in their interest. Getting us out of NATO is also a good idea.

End US financial and military support for an Israel that cannot seem to get along with its neighbors. Perhaps without the US backstopping Israel’s warmongering, the country and its leadership would start to reflect on the wisdom of starting wars with multiple countries in its neighborhood.

Stop trying to overthrow Venezuela’s Maduro and everyone else the neocons have placed on the “hit list.” End all sanctions and open up trade instead. Maduro’s failed socialist economic policies will be his undoing, not American sanctions or saber-rattling.

America first above all means “just come home.” It’s that simple.

By Muhammad Akmal Khan

Netanyahu's lies: Offering water, spilling blood

August 17, 2025 - 20:22

International *TEHRAN TIMES*

ISLAMABAD - Benjamin Netanyahu's latest act on the world stage played like a morality tale, except its moral was hypocrisy written in blood. Bathed in studio lights, the Israeli prime minister crowned himself the savior of the Iranian people, vowing to "save countless lives" from the cruelty of water scarcity.

Brandishing Iranian water statistics as prophecy, he warned of 50 million displaced souls and praised Israel's "solutions" for a declared enemy. Yet, as his words travelled the airwaves, only seventy kilometers away, Gaza's children are dying of thirst, their water cut off by the very state that claims to rescue strangers from water scarcity.

When those words were used and the internet spread, the children of Gaza were consuming brackish, bacteria contaminated water- when they could even get a drop to drink at all. Areas in the besieged strip were without clean running water in months at a time. Pipelines that are shattered and buried under rubbles lie in bombed out districts. Gaza Health Ministry, UNICEF, and UNRWA state that water shortages combined with famine caused by blockade-related starvation, has claimed at least 315 lives in recent months, more than half of whom are under five.

Indeed, the inhumanity is not by chance, but is by policy. Israeli Defence Minister Yoav Gallant outlined a full siege of Gaza two days later providing similar information: "No electricity, no food, no fuel, everything is closed." Water was understood, although not spoken. Israeli officials closed Mekorot, the state water firm, which had been supplying almost 10 million liters a day. The outcome was a man-made drought in one of the most populated lands on our planet.

According to OCHA, in December 2023 the average amount of available water daily in Gaza was reduced to less than three liters of water per person, a fifth of the minimum amount required to survive by WHO. By March 2024, residents of northern Gaza were enduring less than one liter a day, and this is in most cases not even drinkable. Up to 65 water wells were bombed out, as were three major desalination plants, and more than 50 kilometers of water piping; fuel shortages disabled pumping stations.

This is a crime that is clear as per the international humanitarian law. Article 54 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions also prohibits "attacking, destroying, removing or rendering useless objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population" which should explicitly include water infrastructure. The International Committee of the Red Cross views the denial of water as one of the war crimes in case it is employed as a means to starve civilians or displace them. In April 2024, Human Rights Watch published the report entitled "Hopeless, Starving, and Besieged", which concluded that Israel had turned deprivation of water and food into a weapon of war as the blockade had been causing epidemic levels of disease that disproportionately killed children and elderly people. The United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF, has termed it as an imminent death sentence of the children of Gaza.

The most damaging numbers are not counted using liters, but in human lives. UNICEF's March 2025 assessment reported a 45% rise in diarrheal disease among children under five compared to pre-war levels. At least 120 cases of infant mortality due to dehydration and water-borne diseases were recorded in the first year of the siege by the Palestinian ministry of health.

The story of Mariam, a six-year-old child in Khan Younis, who died of drinking contaminated water collected in a rooftop tank because of shortage of bottled water in January of the year 2025, is a sad commentary of the lives of children in and around Khan Younis, because of water shortages. Her mother has described to Al Jazeera: "She cried the whole night with stomach pain. By the following morning, she was gone." In Beit Lahia, seventy-year-old Hassan who had already survived four Israeli aggressions succumbed to kidney failure due to the closure of dialysis machines due to shortage of sterile water. Physicians at the Kamal Adwan Hospital reported cancelations of 70 percent of dialysis sessions in the north of the Gaza Strip due to the inability to ensure safety of water.

It is not the first time water can be used as a weapon. During the 2014 operation Protective Edge, Israeli attacks left the largest wastewater treatment plant in Gaza damaged, resulting in raw sewage flowing to water aquifers. In 2021, the desalination plants funded by the EU were bombed. On every occasion, reconstruction was held up not by technical difficulty, but by Israel's import control of necessary supplies. The Gaza Water Authority has constantly cautioned that even after the war, full healing would take years, so long as the blockade is lifted. Even talk about the rehabilitation becomes nonsense when there is no fuel, spare parts, and chemicals to treat.

The message by Netanyahu to the Iranians is designed to suit international view. But the hypocrisy is obvious: Gaza, which is only 70 kilometers away Tel Aviv, is deliberately denied the very water-saving technologies, which Israel displays at international expos. The same can be said about the death of Palestinian journalists at the hands of Israel, notes Iranian Foreign Minister Seyed Abbas Araghchi: "Such a thing does not indicate strength, but the crumbling regime of despise losing global solidarity." Netanyahu seeks to undermine Iranian unity—a key barrier against Israeli aggression—by presenting himself as a potential savior of Iran and attempting to rehabilitate Israel's image on the global stage.

The policy has been described by the Global South. Pakistan has criticized the blockade as a war crime anchored by siege tactics. China and Russia have urged the United Nations to investigate the deliberate targeting of water infrastructure, stressing that such actions breach international humanitarian law. Their demand comes amid conflicts where attacks on vital water facilities in Gaza have directly harmed civilians.

The airstrikes have been referred to by Iran as environmental war on a people. Washington and European capitals, by contrast, have protected Israel. All resolutions issued by the Security Council to restore the utilities in Gaza have been vetoed by the United States. Countries, mostly Europeans, that provide funding for the Palestinian water projects have declined to publicly penalize Israel on the destruction of this project yet they engage in silent dialogues that do not make any difference.

Almost 90 percent of waste water is reused in Israel—the highest rate globally. It has invented drip irrigation and made it commercial. Netanyahu employs these figures to pose as a savior of the climate disaster. Nevertheless, as said by one of the Palestinian engineers displaced in Beit Hanoun, "They want to be remembered as the nation which makes the desert bloom but they have transformed our home to come and make desert."

Propaganda may shape the narrative, but the images emerging from Gaza—children clutching empty jerrycans, mothers boiling brackish water, and hospital wards shuttered for lack of sterilized equipment—will endure far longer than Netanyahu's speeches.

Gaza siege is the best documented instance of a humanitarian crisis in the recent times. The evidence exists in the form of UN cables, satellite pictures and hospital death certificates. It will not be read in the history books that Netanyahu has made this offer with a Christian spirit, but rather it will go down in history as the hideous representation of hypocrites, a man extends his hand to give water to foreigners whilst standing on the throats of his neighbors to prevent them drinking that water. And as the world hears his hymn, it must not forget the unmarked graves of the children of Gaza who died with dry lips.

Muhammad Akmal Khan is a Pakistani journalist and foreign affairs analyst. He writes on South Asia-Middle East relations, conflict diplomacy, and media freedom under war.

A great many persons at the present day are quite contented with this sort of compromise between administrative despotism and the sovereignty of the people; and they think they have done enough for the protection of individual freedom when they have surrendered it to the power of the nation at large. This does not satisfy me: the nature of him I am to obey signifies less to me than the fact of extorted obedience.

— Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* [1835]