Inside this issue:

- "Have Guns, Chaos Will Travel": Antifa, No Kings and Their Mega-billionaire Donors
- Arizona Representative-elect Adelita Grijalva to Carry on Family Radical Tradition
- Appeals Court Restores Order: Ninth Circuit Overturns Immergut, Clears Trump to Deploy National Guard
- U.K. Establishment May Cancel Local Elections to Derail Farage's Reform Party
- Quote the Bible, Go to Jail: Christian Physician/Parliamentarian Faces Wrath of Finland/EU LGBTQ Mafia
- Bolivia's Not-so-consequential Electoral Results
- UN's IMO Global Carbon Tax Thwarted by Trump Administration
- Report: Trump Admin to End UN Role in Refugee Admissions
- Trump Advisor Peter Navarro Criticizes CFR at Group's Own Event
- Japanese Parliament Elects Conservative Sanae Takaichi as Prime Minister
- Officials Call for More Sex Ed to Groom Kids:
 The SIECUS Subversion/Perversion Push
- Congressman Thomas Massie Bringing Real America First Solutions
- Portuguese Bilderberg Steering Committee Member, EU Promoter Francisco Pinto Balsemão, dies at 88
- NYMHM: News You May Have Missed

"Have Guns, Chaos — Will Travel": Antifa, No Kings and Their Mega-billionaire Donors

From 1957 through 1963, "Have Gun — Will Travel" was a popular Western television series. Richard Boone

starred as "Paladin," the suave investigator/gunfighter for hire, helping bring justice to lawless areas of the Old West. Paladin advertised his services with the simple newspaper ad line: "Have Gun — Will Travel." Today's "social justice warriors" don't need to advertise; their billionaire clients shower them with hundreds of millions of dollars to ensure that these professional agitators keep their protests and riots in perpetual motion. And, as recent news stories have borne out, the Antifa branches of "Riot, Inc." are graduating from merely burning down cities and causing general havoc to shooting police and ICE officers. According to researcher/author Seamus Bruner of the Government Accountability Institute, six of the largest donors chipped in nearly \$300 million to keep the chaos going. Seamus Bruner tweeted on October 16:

We traced \$294,487,641 to the official No Kings 2.0 partners & organizers...all funneled through the same "Riot Inc." dark-money networks:

Arabella network \$79.7M+ Soros network \$72.1M+ Ford network \$51.7M+ Tides \$45.5M+ Rockefeller \$28.6M+ Buffett \$16.6M+

With the help of a <u>posting on X</u> by Representative Anna Paulina Luna (R-Fla.), the No Kings funding exposé went viral. Bruner was among the journalists/podcasters who were featured at the White House Journalists' Roundtable on Antifa on October 8. His riveting testimony can be seen <u>here</u>. Noteworthy videos exposing

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez

the "No Kings" protests can be seen <u>here</u>, <u>here</u>, <u>here</u>, <u>here</u>, and <u>here</u>. — William F. Jasper


Arizona Representative-elect Adelita Grijalva to Carry on Family Radical Tradition

On September 23, Adelita Grijalva was elected to Arizona's 7th Congressional District to take the place of her father, Raul Grijalva, who died last March. Representative Raul Grijalva (lifetime Freedom Index score of 27 percent) had represented the district since 2003. Grijalva's extreme leftist record (which is detailed at Trevor Loudon's Keywiki) includes longtime involvement with the Communist Party, Progressive Democrats of America, Congressional Progressive Caucus, Democratic Socialists of America, Raza Unida Party, Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan, Our Revolution (a Bernie Sanders Marxist operation), and much more. "I'm a Saul Alinsky guy," he once boasted in an interview with left-wing publication In These *Times.* And he has proven it with his actions. Now his daughter, Adelita, is set to replace him in the U.S. House of Representatives. Unfortunately, she is virtually certain to follow in his subversive footsteps. Again, Keywiki provides disturbing details regarding Adelita Grijalva's record of activities on the far left. — William F. Jasper

Appeals Court Restores Order: Ninth Circuit Overturns Immergut, Clears Trump to Deploy National Guard

In a decision that re-asserts lawful executive authority against the tide of judicial obstruction, a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has struck down Judge Karin Immergut's injunction that had barred President Donald Trump from deploying federalized National Guard units to Portland. The ruling breathes new life into the president's constitutional duty to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed" — a duty that does not dissolve simply because it displeases the bench or the mob.

Judge Immergut's original order, cloaked in the language of "constitutional restraint," effectively stripped the executive of one of its oldest and most essential powers: the ability to quell insurrection and enforce federal law when local authorities refuse or fail to do so. Her



argument — that Trump's portrayal of Portland as "warravaged" was "untethered to the facts" — ignored the reality of two years of sustained lawlessness, vandalism, and violent intimidation that plagued the city while local leaders stood by wringing their hands.

The Ninth Circuit, to its credit, recognized that the Constitution does not subordinate the executive to the passions of local politics. Citing the president's statutory authority under 10 U.S.C. § 12406 and the Insurrection Act, the court affirmed that the federal government may call up National Guard troops when "the laws of the United States are opposed or obstructed." This is not martial law — it is constitutional order. The president is not above the law, but neither is he beneath it.

Yet this should not be read as a blank check for federal intervention. The Founders designed a delicate balance between the powers of the several states and the national government. Federal deployment within the states must be an *exception*, justified by manifest necessity — not a

routine tool of executive convenience. The proper question is whether the government of Oregon has, by omission or design, permitted an environment where federal law cannot be enforced. If so, the president's action, though extraordinary, is both lawful and moral.

Judge Immergut's misplaced idealism would have left citizens and federal property at the mercy of mobs. The appellate court's ruling restores a modicum of sanity: the recognition that liberty cannot long survive if law collapses. Order is not the enemy of freedom; it is its guardian.

Let the states govern themselves, yes — but let no governor or judge make anarchy a sanctuary. — Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

U.K. Establishment May Cancel Local Elections to Derail Farage's Reform Party

The U.K.'s Labour Party government is <u>poised to cancel</u> <u>elections</u> in seven English county councils again, after <u>previously postponing</u> several May 2025 elections to May 2026. This would potentially stretch five-year terms to seven years in an effort to protect establishment politicians from Nigel Farage's surging Reform UK party.

The targeted county councils represent more than five million voters: East and West Sussex, Essex, Hampshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Surrey. Already delayed once to 2026, voters now face another year without elections. One unnamed council leader admitted, "We are lobbying hard for their elections to be delayed because we are confident we will get Reform mayors next year," warning that such victories would "create instability" and stop "what needs to be achieved." Another remarked that current "competent experienced" Conservative leadership shouldn't be replaced. *The Times*, citing an unnamed government source, reported that the government supported canceling elections because "democracies are in crisis around the world."

In response, Farage stated, "The establishment are planning to cancel local elections again. Let the people vote." Polling shows Reform UK is Britain's most popular party, with special election results showing

Labour falling far below expectations, while Reform continues to gain momentum.

This strategy of collusion in the United Kingdom echoes the same tactics that have plagued the United States and other Western governments: Deep State elites conspiring to rig elections to maintain their grip on power and silence citizens who will demand accountability at the ballot box. — David DeRidder

Quote the Bible, Go to Jail: Christian Physician/Parliamentarian Faces Wrath of Finland/EU LGBTQ Mafia

Päivi Räsänen faces a "hate speech" trial on October 30 before the Supreme Court of Finland for a social-media post quoting the Bible, despite two previous acquittals. Who is Päivi Räsänen? Finland's minister of the interior, and a sitting member of Finland's Parliament since 1995. She was criminally charged with "agitation against a





minority group" in 2021, under a section of the Finnish criminal code titled "war crimes and crimes against humanity" for sharing her Christian beliefs on marriage and sexual ethics in a 2019 tweet.

Paul Coleman, executive director of Alliance in Defense of Freedom International, serving on Räsänen's legal team, stated at an October 22 press conference: "Free societies should never criminalize peaceful expression. Yet for over six years, Päivi Räsänen has endured interrogations, trials, and appeals for simply sharing a belief rooted in her faith. The outcome of this case will set a precedent not only for Finland, but also for free speech across Europe. It's time to reaffirm that democracy depends on the right to speak freely — even when others disagree."

Under Finland's criminal code, "agitation against a minority group" falls under the section of "war crimes and crimes against humanity" punishable by tens of thousands of dollars in fines — and up to two years in prison. For a full account of her story see here. — William F. Jasper

Bolivia's Not-so-consequential Electoral Results

In an outcome steeped in laudatory coverage by the legacy media, Bolivia has allegedly repudiated more than two decades of socialism in last weekend's presidential runoff election and opted for the responsible, "centrist" candidate Rodrigo Paz over the worrisome right winger Jorge "Tuto" Quiroga. Quiroga had pledged to renew ties with the United States over narco-

trafficking, and would have been a staunch ally of the Trump administration and the United States. But — so the media narrative goes — Bolivians opted for the more palatable, centrist alternative, instead of a potential Javier Milei mini-me in La Paz.

As is usual with "centrists" (scare quotes warranted!) of the social democrat persuasion, there's a lot more to Paz than meets the eye. His father, former Bolivian president Jaime Paz Zamora, was the founder of the communist, Castro-allied Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR), which features the communist flag at its rallies, and his campaign manager and fundraiser, Oscar Eid, is a convicted drug lord who was released from prison by Paz Zamora in the 1990s under a sweeping amnesty act for convicted drug traffickers.

According to one U.S. intelligence author, quoted by *The American Spectator*, Paz is "another Petro," referring to Colombian president Gustavo Petro, a former Marxist guerilla-turned-politician who affected centrism to get elected — and then quickly turned into a staunch Nicolás Maduro ally.

Many Bolivians suspect that Paz is secretly in league with disgraced former president and wanted criminal Evo Morales, who has been trying to incite violent revolution from his remaining stronghold in Bolivian Amazonia. Whatever the case, it would appear that, yet again, the long-suffering Bolivian people have been sold down the Amazon River. — Steve Bonta

UN's IMO Global Carbon Tax Thwarted by Trump Administration

In a stunning turn of events, the UN's plan to institute the first-ever global tax on carbon emissions, only recently portrayed as all but inevitable, <u>has been scuttled</u> by the Trump administration.

For several years now, the UN's International Maritime Organization (IMO) — the body that regulates international shipping — has been pushing for a tax to be levied on shipping companies for supposed excessive carbon consumption, to be collected by the United Nations and redistributed as the global body sees fit, in the name of climate equity. *The New American* has extensively covered this long-developing issue, as, for instance, here, here, and here. Billed as a necessary



expedient to help bring about global net-zero carbon emissions by 2050, the new carbon tax was widely expected to be adopted at this month's IMO London summit, in spite of Trump's vocal opposition. As such, it would become the very first bona fide global tax imposed by the United Nations, and would provide for the very first time a stream of revenue independent of contributions by member states.

But a funny thing happened on the way to IMO summit. It turned out that, for once, Trump was serious in his opposition to a globalist scheme, and completely uninterested in any "transactional" outcome. After correctly branding the proposed carbon tax as an "unconstitutional global tax," Trump wrote on Truth Social the day before the IMO vote on the measure:

I am outraged that the International Maritime Organization is voting in London this week to pass a global Carbon Tax. The United States will NOT stand for this Global Green New Scam Tax on Shipping, and will not adhere to it in any way, shape, or form. We will not tolerate increased prices on American Consumers OR the creation of a Green New Scam Bureaucracy to spend YOUR money on their Green dreams. Stand with the United States, and vote NO in London tomorrow!

Marco Rubio also weighed in on X:

This week, the UN is attempting to pass the first global carbon tax, which will increase energy, food, and fuel costs across the world. We will not allow the UN to tax American citizens and companies.

The Trump administration underscored its opposition by threatening trade sanctions on countries supportive of the tax, a move that prompted a number of countries that previously had supported the tax or had abstained from voting to change their position. Argentina, for example, abstained from voting in April, when October's meeting was being planned, but has since switched to a "No" vote. Besides the United States, many petroleum producing nations, such as Saudi Arabia and Russia, opposed the measure, as did some Caribbean island nations with economies crucially dependent on cruise ships. The supporting bloc was anchored by China, the EU, Brazil, and the U.K.

In the end, the measure was derailed — but only temporarily. The globalists, unwilling to give up on their cherished project of instituting a global tax system so close to fruition, managed to switch the vote from an up or down vote on the measure itself to a motion to table the proposal for one year, until the next IMO summit. That motion passed by a vote of 57-49. The proposal is going to be resurrected again and again until the politics are once again propitious for the UN and its agenda.

Many of the most important globalist agenda items, from the creation of the World Trade Organization and the International Criminal Court, to the launch of the European Union and the euro, took decades, and multiple failed attempts before reaching fruition. A UNadministered global tax system has been a pet project of CFR globalists such as C. Fred Bergsten for decades, with many different options on the table, from carbon taxes to taxes on international e-commerce. Not so important is what kind of tax ends up being levied; the critical thing, in the eyes of globalist schemers, is that the UN acquire some kind of taxing authority independent of the say-so of member states, in order to smooth the path towards transforming the UN into a fullfledged world government. Right now, the carbon tax on shipping happens to be center stage, but thanks to the efforts of the Trump administration, this dangerous globalist innovation (the ultimate expression of taxation without representation, by the way) has been set aside, at least temporarily. — Steve Bonta

Report: Trump Admin to End UN Role in Refugee Admissions

The Trump administration is reportedly planning on ending the United Nations' role in refugee admissions. *The New York Times* reports:

Administration officials are not done submitting proposals to the White House. According to a draft of a third report, obtained by The New York Times, the latest proposal calls for U.S. embassies to make referrals for who should be considered for refugee status, rather than the United Nations, which has long been the practice. The change would allow for greater American control of who gets funneled into the refugee pipeline.

Additionally, both *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* have reported that the Trump administration is considering lowering the fiscal 2026 refugee cap to 7,500, down from the 125,000 cap set by the Biden administration for fiscal 2025. On his first day back in office, President Donald Trump signed an executive order temporarily suspending the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, though lower federal courts have partially enjoined it.

These actions, if ultimately enacted, would be the <u>latest steps</u> taken by the Trump administration to <u>limit mass</u> migration. <u>Mass migration</u> — both legal and illegal — threatens American independence. By importing migrants into the United States en masse, which prevents their assimilation into American philosophy and culture, the Insiders are able to reshape the nation to their liking.

Additionally, removing the UN from the U.S. refugee-admissions process, if realized, would be another step toward restoring U.S. sovereignty and limiting foreign entanglements. Ultimately, the United States should fully withdraw from the UN, but this would be a good first step in that direction. — Peter Rykowski

Trump Advisor Peter Navarro Criticizes CFR at Group's Own Event

Peter Navarro, President Trump's senior counselor to the president for trade and manufacturing, <u>spoke</u> at a Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) event on October



17, where he criticized the organization's globalist ideology.

Navarro began his talk by noting that "it's not every day I get to speak before an audience that has opposed nearly every policy I've ever helped advance in the White House." He went on to state that the CFR "embodies an establishment, technocratic, and globalist ideology, one comfortably wedded with Wall Street and the multinational corporations that love open borders, cheap offshore labor, and an endless stream of subsidized imported goods."

Navarro continued by criticizing the CFR's support for "free-trade dogma," including supporting U.S. entry into the North American Free Trade Agreement and Trans-Pacific Partnership, as well as admitting China into the World Trade Organization. He concluded by calling on the CFR to "stop mistaking nationalism for isolationism, sovereignty for retreat, and strength for aggression."

Although Navarro's remarks are refreshing — especially considering that he spoke at the CFR's own event — they indicate he doesn't fully understand the group's true purpose. As *The Shadows of Power* chronicles in detail, the CFR was founded with the goal of subverting U.S. sovereignty and paving the way for a one-world government, and CFR members <u>embedded in the federal government</u> have worked for decades to implement this goal.

Rather than urging the CFR to "catch up," the Trump administration should cut all ties with the globalist group. Furthermore, rather than seeking to "reform" globalist institutions such as the World Trade Organization, United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, and United Nations, the United States should exit them entirely. — Peter Rykowski

Japanese Parliament Elects Conservative Sanae Takaichi as Prime Minister

The Japanese National Diet (parliament) has elected Sanae Takaichi, a conservative by Japanese standards, as prime minister.

As we <u>reported</u> last week, Takaichi's bid for Japan's premiership had been in doubt after Komeito, the Liberal Democratic Party's (LDP) longtime coalition partner, unilaterally ended the coalition agreement, citing Takaichi's conservative positions on immigration and other issues.

However, Takaichi quickly <u>formed</u> a coalition agreement with the Japan Innovation Party (JIP), a moderately conservative party that shares many positions with the LDP — ironically, more so than the centrist Komeito did. On Tuesday, the National Diet <u>voted</u> to confirm her as prime minister, and she <u>assumed</u> office later the same day.

Takaichi is <u>expected</u> to take a <u>tougher line</u> on immigration than her predecessors, <u>increase</u> defense spending, and <u>abolish</u> Japan's gas tax. She supports amending Japan's constitution to explicitly allow the country to possess a military, though it is unclear whether she will succeed.

Will Takaichi successfully push Japan in a conservative direction? Although Japan is widely regarded as a socially conservative country by world standards, it has moved steadily toward the Left. For example, the country's government has embraced the UN's Agenda 2030 and "Net Zero" emissions-reduction target, and has allowed foreign migration to increase significantly. And although the LDP — which has been in power nearly continuously since its establishment in 1955 — is often labeled as "conservative," many of its leaders embrace the globalist, socialist policies Japan is increasingly adopting.

Takaichi's election as prime minister is part of a wider backlash against this trend. Two recently established parties, Sanseitō and the Conservative Party of Japan (CPJ), which hold more strongly conservative positions, have performed well in recent elections. Sanseitō's leader, Sohei Kamiya, has expressed openness to working with Takaichi. For Takaichi, success won't just

mean implementing her favored policies, but preventing the continued siphoning of votes from the LDP to Sanseitō and CPJ.


Takaichi has begun her premiership with a <u>high approval</u> rating, but time will tell whether she can overcome Japan's fractured, establishment-friendly politics and implement the policies she campaigned on. — Peter Rykowski

Officials Call for More Sex Ed to Groom Kids: The SIECUS Subversion/Perversion Push

Officials in some states say they need more sex education to combat high rates of teen pregnancy.

"Oklahoma ranks fifth-highest in the country for teen pregnancy, and educators worry that lack of sex education could be partly to blame," reports <u>Stillwater News Press</u>, while the <u>Ohio Capital Journal</u> (OCJ) parrots that "Ohio, one of a handful of states without comprehensive sex education taught in schools, has a higher teen birth rate than the national average."

"What we've seen is states that have no sex ed or poor sex ed policies, they typically fare worse on health



indicators such as STI [sexually transmitted infections] rates, teen birth rates, having lower contraceptive knowledge, and other existing health disparities," Nawal Umar told OCJ. She is senior policy analyst for the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS). Since 1964 that organization has set the standard for sex education (i.e., child grooming) in this country.

So, SIECUS, *more* sex education means *lower* birth rates? That's odd. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Idaho's teen birth rate (TBR) — the number of live births per 1,000 females ages 15-19 — is 10.5, which is *lower* than the national average of 13.1. Yet your website gives Idaho a grade of "F" since the state requires no sex education or instruction about HIV or STIs. Additionally, Idaho demands fetal development videos to be included in its biology classes, earning an extra demerit from SIECUS.

But that's not all. Wyoming's TBR of 12.6 is also lower than the national average, as is Florida's: 12.7. Yet they both earn F's from SIECUS as well, for limiting sex education in the classroom. The TBRs of Nebraska and Nevada offer an interesting comparison. Both are equivalent to the national average of 13.1. However, SIECUS scores are F and C+, respectively. Nebraska doesn't require sex ed; Nevada does.

On the flip side, Massachusetts has the third-lowest TBR in the country at 5.8, but it still gets a D- from SIECUS because the state leaves decisions about whether and how to teach sex ed at the local level. So much for the hypothesis that more sex education translates to fewer unwed mothers. SIECUS is lying.



The group is intentionally obfuscating data collected by the <u>CDC</u> and the U.S. Congress. In 2017, the latter's <u>Joint Economic Committee</u> reported, "Three times as many births today are from unwed pregnancies than in the early 1960s, and only 9 percent of these pregnancies are followed by a shotgun marriage — down from 43 percent in the early 1960s." (For those who may speculate about the success of those marriages, according to <u>CDC data</u>, the divorce rate in 1960 was 9.2 per 1,000 married women. As of 2022 it was 14.6.)

In fact, between 1940 and 1960 the share of births to unmarried women rose by only one percent, from four to five. In the next 20 years, it had skyrocketed to 18 percent and has since more than doubled to greater than 40 percent.

What happened? Could the dismal statistics have anything to do with SIECUS' founding in 1964? If the organization were so effective, shouldn't we see opposite trends? Or, maybe there's another agenda at play, and SIECUS is doing precisely what it was intended to do.

"No one should be surprised to learn the first sponsor of modern 'comprehensive sex education' was Big Porn," writes Mary Harrington for the *New York Post*. "Playboy founder Hugh Hefner was an early funder of SIECUS," and "under its guidance, lessons that once focused narrowly on the mechanics of reproduction have taken on an activist streak" to cover "gender identity, STIs, pornography," and many depraved acts vividly described and graphically depicted in today's sex-education curricula.

Hefner had a profit motive; obscenity laws in the United States held him back. What better way to overturn them than by blurring the lines between sex ed and porn? In fact, as Harrington points out, today "Playboy's online successor Pornhub offers 'sex ed' content," presenting itself as an 'educational resource for sexual self discovery."

However, the SIECUS link to pedophilia and child trafficking couldn't have been more clearly stated than by its principal founder and first director, Dr. Mary Calderone, whom Playboy dubbed the "First Lady of Sex Education." She had been a medical director of Planned Parenthood, and in a 1995 issue of *The New American*, William Norman Grigg recorded what this degenerate woman said during a conference held a decade earlier on child sex abuse. She advocated *for* the depravity, cooing:

"What do we know about situations in which young children and older people have had a sexual relationship of one kind or another that has been pleasant, and the child feels good about it because it's warm and seductive and tender?... If the child really enjoys this, it may be the only time the child ever gets a loving touch."

The organization's mission has remained the same. As if to brag, six years ago it added the tagline "Sex Ed for Social Change" to its name. What it means by "social change" is easily determined from its list of radically leftist funders, including the Ford Foundation, George Soros' Open Society Foundations, the Hewlett Foundation, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Of course, SIECUS also counts among its most lucrative donors our federal government, which has been ramping up funding in recent years. If you're tired of your tax dollars funding groomers and pedophiliacs, contact your legislators to demand they pull the plug. — Rebecca Terrell

Congressman Thomas Massie Bringing Real America First Solutions

In an interview with *The New American* on Wednesday, Representative Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) delivered a powerful critique of Washington's globalist economic policies and unconstitutional governance, offering practical legislative solutions rooted in constitutional and America First principles.

The discussion began with the Trump administration's decision to bail out Argentina with \$40 billion and purchase Argentine beef, a move President Trump said "will bring our beef prices down." Representative Massie warned that flooding the U.S. market with foreign beef "hurts U.S. farmers" and undermines domestic agriculture. He argued that "there are better solutions to bringing the price of beef down in the supermarket without hurting our farmers." His twofold solution: reinstate Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) and pass his PRIME Act (H.R. 4700).

COOL allowed consumers to know where their meat originated from, but it was repealed by Congress in a Republican-passed Omnibus bill that Democratic President Barack Obama signed into law on December 18, 2015. Instead of such labels, all beef is stamped "USDA," misleading shoppers into believing it is from the United States. "People think that means USA,"



Massie said, "but when that Argentine beef shows up at the supermarket, it's likely nobody will know where it came from." Reinstating COOL would let consumers "put America first" by choosing domestic products voluntarily — something that the WTO previously ruled as being "discriminatory" toward Canada and Mexico. Massie rejects that logic, calling it "a really contrived argument," and is currently working to introduce new legislation to restore the mandatory labeling for beef and pork.

His PRIME Act complements that effort by reducing the burdensome federal inspection rules that favor large corporate processors over small, local custom slaughterhouses. His proposed bill would allow farmers and butchers to sell directly to local consumers under state supervision rather than federal oversight, helping to decentralize the food supply and strengthen rural economies. "Right now, we have scale prejudicial regulations. If you're a custom slaughterhouse and you butcher, let's say eight animals a day, you have the same compliance overhead as the Oscar Mayer Wiener factory that's butchering hundreds, if not thousands, of animals a day," Massie said.

The conversation then shifted to the ongoing government shutdown. Massie criticized the House of Representative's current recess during the government shutdown, which he said was "unprecedented," and accused Speaker Mike Johnson of delaying the swearing-in of a newly elected member of Congress (Representative-elect Adelita Grijalva of Arizona) in order to block a discharge petition to release all of the

government's Epstein files and list of clients, while protecting the names of the victims.

The interview also covered Massie's efforts to stop the government from propagandizing Americans. Massie highlighted his bill to repeal the 2013 Smith-Mundt Modernization Act, which legalized domestic government propaganda. Originally banned after World War II, taxpayer-funded propaganda was reinstated under the "Tea Party" Republican House in 2012 and signed into law by President Obama. "They inserted a little provision into the National Defense Authorization Act," Massie said. "I don't think any president should have this power." His new bill would restore the prohibition, preventing agencies such as the little-known U.S. Agency for Global Media, which prevents Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Asia, among others, from targeting American citizens with federally funded disinformation.

Despite his consistent constitutional voting record — holding a 99-percent lifetime Freedom Index score — Massie was labeled a "RINO" by President Trump, in a screed posted by the president a week ago on Truth Social. With his usual calm, Massie responded: "Two things can't simultaneously be true. You can't vote for every one of these big giant bills, and at the same time get 100% on defending the Constitution, because the bigger the bill gets, the more likely it is to infringe on the Constitution."

Whether fighting foreign entanglements, corporate welfare, or domestic propaganda, Congressman Thomas Massie remains steadfast in his defense of liberty, free-markets, government transparency, and constitutionalist



governance. His example is a reminder that true conservatism is not fealty to a president, it's fidelity to the Constitution. You can watch the half-hour long video interview here at TheNewAmerican.com or here on Rumble. — Christian Gomez

Portuguese Bilderberg Steering Committee Member, EU Promoter Francisco Pinto Balsemão, dies at 88

In an October 22 post on X, Giorgio Bombassei wrote

IN MEMORIAM Former Portuguese Prime Minister and Chairman of Impresa Group, Francisco Pinto Balsemão, died on October 21, 2025, at the age of 88. He first participated in a #Bilderberg Conference in 1981, when he was Prime Minister. He was co-opted to the Bilderberg Steering Committee in 1987, where he served as Portugal's representative until 2014, when he handed over to former Portuguese Prime Minister and former President of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso.

Media mogul Balsemão was a stalwart globalist who used his media clout and financial wherewithal to support the Bilderberg schemes aimed at destroying the national sovereignty of the nations of Europe and merging them into a regional government — on the way to eventual world government. His Impresa Group conglomerate includes television stations, newspapers, magazines, and digital news outlets. — William F. Jasper

NYMHM: News You May Have Missed

<u>Texas Finds Thousands of Potential Illegals on Voter</u> <u>Rolls</u>

<u>Internet Suffers "Temporary Amnesia" After Amazon</u> <u>Web Services Experiences Outage</u>

<u>Trump Endorses Combat Vet to Unseat "RINO" Thomas</u>
<u>Massie</u>

<u>DOJ Believes Comey's Attorney Has a Conflict of</u> Interest

[END]