

April 17, 2026

INSIDER REPORT

A publication of *The New American*

Edited by William F. Jasper

Inside this issue:

- **China Arms Iran, BRICS Ditches the Dollar, Mackinder's Heartland Strategy in Action**
- **Trump Administration's Ratepayer Protection Pledge Seeks to Shield Households From Big Tech Data Center Costs**
- **Hungarian Election Highlights Need for "Firewalls for Freedom"**
- **Trump Endorses Lindsey Graham. Ten Years Ago, He Attacked Him.**
- **America at a Crossroads Between NATO and Israel, Regarding Turkey**
- **Tankers Rerouting From Strait of Hormuz Boosts U.S. Oil Exports, But Claims of a Clear "Big Winner" Are Overstated**
- **Spain Legalizes Half a Million Illegal Aliens. Is Europe Committing Suicide?**
- **Judicial Accountability in Immigration Enforcement Sparks Nationwide Debate**
- **Trump Stages Oval Office McDonald's Event to Promote "No Tax on Tips." Who Really Benefits?**
- **The Architecture of Jihad: Exploring the Communist-Islamic Axis**
- **Democrats' Stealth Assault on the Constitution: Bypassing the Electoral College to Finish the Job Begun in the 1820s**
- **NYMHM: News You May Have Missed**

China Arms Iran, BRICS Ditches the Dollar, Mackinder's Heartland Strategy in Action

As a fragile U.S.-Iran ceasefire holds, U.S. intelligence reports that China is preparing to ship shoulder-fired MANPADS (man-portable air-defense systems) to

Tehran in the coming weeks. According to [CNN](#) and [The New York Times](#), Beijing may route the weapons through third countries while also allowing dual-use components for Iranian missile production. Meanwhile, Chinese vessels are reportedly delivering missile-fuel chemicals and exploiting the key China-Iran railway link completed last year.

[Analyst Robin Monotti](#) highlighted the railway's strategic significance, drawing attention to the major 10,400-kilometer China-Iran rail corridor that was inaugurated in May 2025. (This stretch of the Belt and Road Initiative would significantly reduce cargo travel time to approximately 15 days.) He argued that U.S.-Israeli strikes targeted the Iran leg of this overland route — not merely nuclear sites or Hormuz shipping lanes. Monotti tied the conflict to a deeper geopolitical imperative: preventing Eurasian integration. He alluded to the work of British strategist Sir Halford Mackinder, whose 1904 "Heartland Theory" warned that control of the vast Eurasian interior (the "Heartland") would grant dominance over the "World-Island" (Europe, Asia, and Africa) and, ultimately, the planet.

Mackinder's thesis, refined in *Democratic Ideals and Reality* (1919), posited that sea powers such as Britain (and later the United States) must prevent any single land power from consolidating the Heartland. He explicitly noted Palestine's role as a buffer "between ancient Babylon and Egypt" and saw a Jewish national home there as a British imperial asset to secure the World-Island's center. Monotti and other analysts, including Alex Krainer, argue today's U.S.-Israeli actions echo that 20th-century playbook: disrupt land corridors that would allow Russia, China, and Iran to bypass

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

William F. Jasper • John T. Larabell • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2026 by *The New American*

vulnerable maritime chokepoints such as the Strait of Hormuz.

China's potential arms shipments fit this pattern. By bolstering Iran's air defenses, Beijing protects its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) investments and the new rail artery linking Xi'an (in western China) to Tehran. This overland route reduces reliance on sea lanes the U.S. Navy can interdict, directly challenging the "rimland" containment strategy Mackinder's heirs still favor.

At the same time, [BRICS nations](#) are accelerating de-dollarization. Russia and China have settled over \$244 billion in bilateral trade without the dollar, with 90 to 99 percent of transactions now in yuan and rubles. [BRICS Pay](#), a decentralized payment platform, along with central bank digital currency (CBDC) interoperability pilots among members (including new entrants Iran, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE), are routing energy and commodity deals outside [SWIFT](#) (the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication, a partnership between the European Central Bank, the U.S.

Federal Reserve, and others). Indian refiners buy Russian crude in yuan; Iran levies yuan-denominated tolls. These moves erode the petrodollar's foundation — the very mechanism that has funded America's deficits and global military posture.

From Mackinder's vantage, this is no coincidence. A unified Eurasian Heartland — linked by rail, armed by China, and financed without dollars — would render sea-power dominance obsolete. The United States, as the current rimland guardian, faces the exact threat Mackinder warned sea powers must avert.

For Americans, endless Middle East engagements drain treasure and blood while accelerating the very Eurasian bloc they purport to contain. An America First policy — securing borders, balancing the budget, and avoiding imperial overstretch — offers the only realistic counter. Mackinder understood geography's iron logic. Ignoring it invites the very eclipse of Western influence he foresaw more than a century ago. — Rebecca Terrell

Trump Administration's Ratepayer Protection Pledge Seeks to Shield Households From Big Tech Data Center Costs

The Trump administration has positioned its [Ratepayer Protection Pledge](#) as a practical safeguard for American families. The [voluntary agreement](#) requires major artificial intelligence (AI) and hyperscale companies to "build, bring, or buy" their own power generation and cover all infrastructure upgrades for new data centers, explicitly preventing those costs from being passed on to ordinary utility ratepayers.

Seven leading firms — Amazon, Google, Meta, Microsoft, OpenAI, Oracle, and xAI — signed the pledge. Under its terms, the companies commit to negotiating separate rate structures with utilities and states, paying for power whether fully utilized or not, investing in local workforce training, and enhancing grid resilience. President Trump hailed it as a "[historic](#)" win that will keep electricity bills down "very, very substantially" for millions of Americans while allowing the AI boom to proceed without burdening households.

Explosive data-center growth, driven by artificial intelligence and cloud computing, has strained electric grids and raised fears of higher utility rates. Prior to the



RAINSTAMP[®]

R M

MANUFACTURING

**PROVIDING THE LARGEST SELECTION
OF RAINWARE PRODUCTS IN THE WORLD**



**YOUR TRUSTED SOURCE FOR TOP-QUALITY
RAINWARE PRODUCTS**

RAINSTAMP.COM
© 2024 RAINSTAMP MANUFACTURING
227 SOUTH TOWN EAST BLVD. MESQUITE, TX 75149



MADE IN AMERICA

agreement, utilities in some states warned that residential customers could face double-digit increases to subsidize hyperscale demand. By asking Big Tech to internalize these costs, the administration gets to promote its “America First” energy policy that prioritizes ratepayer protection over corporate welfare.

Meanwhile, the administration is attempting to modernize what it frames as an antiquated financial system. Trump has repeatedly described the legacy system as outdated and inefficient, arguing that stablecoins and related technologies offer a market-driven path to faster, cheaper, and more secure transactions. During last year’s [signing of the GENIUS Act](#) (Guiding and Establishing National Innovation for U.S. Stablecoins), Trump said: “Many Americans are unaware that behind the scenes, the technical backbone of the financial system is decades out of date — many, many years out of date ... payments and money transfers are costly and take days or even weeks to clear. Under this bill, the entire ancient system will be eligible for a 21st-century upgrade using the state-of-the-art crypto technology.” (Read our liberty-minded opposition to the GENIUS Act [here](#) and [here](#).)

Supporters praised the GENIUS Act for establishing the first federal regulatory framework for payment stablecoins, aiming to strengthen the U.S. dollar’s role in digital finance, reduce reliance on slow legacy payment rails, and promote blockchain-based innovation without creating a government-controlled central bank digital currency.

Could AI centers and stablecoins be related? A [viral social-media post](#) expresses public skepticism about the rapid proliferation of data centers across the United States, and then points out: “If you’re wondering what all these DATA Centers are for ... yes, data centers are essential infrastructure for Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDC). They serve as the foundational IT backbone for hosting, processing, and securing digital currency transactions.”

Because of these fears, communities have been able to rally against data centers, with complaints about energy demands and water-rate hikes being useful tools in the argument against what some see as an emerging digital prison. To undercut these voices, the administration is



addressing at least one aspect of the concerns: the boost in water prices. Critics note, however, that the Ratepayer Protection Pledge is voluntary and non-binding, with enforcement relying on good-faith negotiations and state utility laws. Some data-center developers did not sign, and consumer advocates question long-term impact. Still, supporters — including U.S. Senators Rick Scott (R-Fla.) and Roger Marshall (R-Kan.), who introduced a [concurrent resolution](#) — see it as a model of limited-government accountability: tech giants pay their own way rather than socializing costs onto taxpayers.

So is the Ratepayer Protection Pledge merely a smokescreen, or is it a legitimate policy counter to economic burdens? Whether data centers are merely infrastructure for AI innovation or, as some fear, the backbone of future digital control systems, the administration is drawing attention away from immediate concerns by assuring Americans that they will not foot the bill for the energy demands of the emerging tech economy. — Rebecca Terrell

Hungarian Election Highlights Need for “Firewalls for Freedom”

On Sunday, Hungarian voters [ousted](#) Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, ending his 16-year tenure as Hungary’s head of government. His opponent, Péter Magyar, who leads the centrist Tisza Party, won a two-thirds majority in the country’s National Assembly (despite receiving only 52 percent of the vote), enough to amend or even replace Hungary’s constitution.

Although commentators have largely focused on the political implications of Hungary's election, it also demonstrates the dangers of a political system that lacks checks and balances — and the strength of America's system of government.

Hungary has a unicameral parliament, the National Assembly. In addition to passing legislation, it elects the country's president and can unilaterally change (or replace) the Constitution with a two-thirds vote. (In fact, Orbán used his parliamentary supermajority in 2011 to [replace](#) Hungary's 1949 Soviet-imposed constitution.) Additionally, Hungary is a unitary state, meaning that the national government is supreme and subnational governments owe their very existence to it.

In other words, whoever controls Hungary's National Assembly wields almost total power over the country, especially if they have a two-thirds majority — and under Hungary's electoral system, it is relatively easy to obtain a supermajority.

Magyar and his Tisza Party are expected to surrender more of Hungary's sovereignty to the EU and NATO, including by potentially joining the Eurozone, and greenlight EU aid to Ukraine and other globalist EU policies. Additionally, they are likely to roll back certain conservative policies enacted under Orbán, including on nongovernmental organizations and LGBTQ issues. With stronger checks and balances in Hungary's system of government, it would be far more difficult to enact these changes, particularly since several of those policies are enshrined in Hungary's constitution.

This demonstrates why America's system of government — which includes federalism, bicameralism, enumerated powers, and a robust separation of powers — is so important for maintaining a free republic. To learn more about what makes the U.S. government under the Constitution such a strong shield against tyranny, read "[Firewalls for Freedom](#)" by Gary Benoit, most recently

published in the May 24, 2021 issue of *The New American*. — Peter Rykowski

Trump Endorses Lindsey Graham. Ten Years Ago, He Attacked Him.

In another example of the president's errant shift in views and policies, he recently endorsed Senator Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) for reelection. Ten years ago, Trump called Graham "one of the worst representatives of any representative in the United States."

"Senator Lindsey Graham is doing a fantastic job," President Donald Trump [said](#) Friday on his social-media platform Truth Social. He added that Graham's opponent reminds him of one of the most constitutionally obedient legislators in Congress. "He is running against a LUNATIC named Mark Lynch, who supports perhaps the Worst Congressman in the History of our Country, Thomas Massie, of the Great Commonwealth of Kentucky," Trump said.

Graham, who has gotten very close to the president in his second term, is the poster child for the warmongering neoconservative. He supports military adventurism with a zeal few can match. Moreover, he's made comments suggesting a cavalier view toward killing. "We're killing all the right people and we're cutting your taxes," he [said](#) during a speech at the Republican Jewish Coalition Annual Leadership Summit in October. "Trump is my favorite president. We've run out of bombs. We didn't run out of bombs in World War II."

Graham is also credited with playing a major role in Trump's decision to launch the war in Iran. As *The Daily Caller* [noted](#):

Graham took an active, behind-the-scenes role pushing the U.S. toward military action against Iran by working closely with foreign officials and intelligence sources. He traveled repeatedly to Israel, where he met with members of the country's





intelligence agency and gathered information that he later brought back to Washington.

Ten years ago, Trump had a radically different view of Graham, as did Graham of Trump. The president [said](#) this in February 2016:

I think Lindsey Graham is a disgrace, and ... one of the worst representatives of any representative in the United States, and I don't think he should run. I don't think he could run for dog catcher in this state and win again. I really don't. Other than that, I think he's wonderful.

At the time, Graham was a never-Trumper who was endorsing Jeb Bush. He said Trump would make a "terrible commander in chief" and predicted that the GOP would get "slaughtered" if he were nominated.

Graham went on to win reelection in 2016. Afterward, he managed to compile a voting record for the 114th Congress aligned with constitutional principles only 33 percent of the time.

The South Carolinian has occupied a seat in Congress for three decades, since the mid-1990s. If there is any silver lining, it's that his lifetime score in *The New American's* Freedom Index is higher than it was the two years after he was reelected in 2016. Yet it is still a dismal [57 percent](#).

Republicans tout themselves as the party of limited government and personal liberty, but Graham's votes say otherwise. They indicate that he's all on board with deficit spending, warring, and Big Government power. In addition to supporting any bill or measure that fuels wars, he's voted against restricting green initiative subsidies and reining in the surveillance state.

Unfortunately, he's not an anomaly, but more or less the norm. Nearly all Republicans have voted in support of wars, reckless spending, and FISA Section 702, the "security" measure that allows the government to spy on Americans without a warrant.

This is more evidence that a Uniparty controls the government, as opposed to power shifting between two genuinely different political parties. The Democrats also support wars, unchecked spending, and perpetual government growth. In total, for more than half a century both parties have agreed on foreign intervention, deficit spending, and the never-ending increase of government power at the expense of individual liberty.

Trump's endorsement of Graham and digs at Massie are part of a long series of bad recommendations and attacks on the kind of people who would help restore the original vision of limited government the Framers put in motion. In Georgia, Trump backed Clay Fuller over the more Americanist GOP candidate Colton Moore for Marjorie Taylor Greene's former seat. He backed Mike Rogers — another war-loving, surveillance state-supporting neocon — for a Michigan seat in 2024.

Meanwhile, he goes after constitutionally obedient congressmen like Massie, who refuse to go along to get along, whose compass for voting is the U.S. Constitution, not the whims of whoever occupies the White House. — Paul Dragu

Read the conclusion of this article at [TheNewAmerican.com](https://www.thenewamerican.com).

America at a Crossroads Between NATO and Israel, Regarding Turkey

In his Farewell Address of 1796, George Washington wisely emphasized the importance of avoiding entangling alliances with foreign nations. So it came with some relief when patriotic Americans heard President Trump openly talk about [withdrawing the United States from NATO](#).

Predictably, the Council on Foreign Relations, [expressed outrage](#) at such talk (and encouraged members of Congress to oppose any hypothetical plan to wrest America from the pact), but other voices are sounding the alarm for a very different reason. Retired U.S. Army

Colonel [Douglas Macgregor](#), for instance, warned that after the recent U.S.-Israeli campaign against Iran, “attention will turn to destroying Turkey.” The problem? Turkey is a NATO ally.

Macgregor noted the formidable Turkish navy and status as NATO’s second-largest military force, predicting an inevitable clash with Israel, “most likely in Syria.” A [second person](#) echoing these concerns was former National Counterterrorism Center Director [Joe Kent](#) (who [resigned in March](#) over the Iran war), saying the U.S. would [exit NATO](#) “so we can side with Israel when Turkey & Israel eventually clash in Syria.”

Social media is likewise crackling with [prognostications](#), with one critic writing, “Rumors are circulating that Israel and America intend to launch an attack on Turkey following America’s withdrawal from NATO.” Tel Aviv’s silence isn’t helped by the [Jerusalem Post](#), which recently listed Turkey as Israel’s next great existential threat.

President Trump has sharply criticized NATO allies for refusing to assist in reopening the Strait of Hormuz during the Iran conflict, calling the alliance a “paper tiger” and stating he is “absolutely” considering withdrawal. He raised the issue directly with NATO Secretary-General Mark Rutte on April 8. Turkey has its own disputes with Israel and the United States over Syria, the Kurds, and regional influence.

However, U.S. withdrawal from NATO by the president alone remains legally impossible. In 2023, Congress enacted [Section 1250A](#) of the National Defense Authorization Act, explicitly prohibiting any president from suspending, terminating, denouncing, or withdrawing the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty without the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate or a separate act of Congress. This bipartisan safeguard was designed precisely to prevent impulsive executive action.

If observers take into consideration Trump’s rhetoric and Macgregor and Kent’s concerns about Israel’s ambitions to be the regional hegemon, they will quickly realize that the United States is something of a fulcrum between the power of Tel Aviv and the influence of NATO. Future events hinge on which way the pivot swings. — Rebecca Terrell

Tankers Rerouting From Strait of Hormuz Boosts U.S. Oil Exports, But Claims of a Clear “Big Winner” Are Overstated

A bevy of influencers recently claimed that Iran’s effective closure of the Strait of Hormuz has handed America a strategic victory. Supertankers, the argument goes, are U-turning *en masse* toward U.S. Gulf Coast terminals to load American crude because Persian Gulf oil is stranded. Some, such as [General Michael Flynn](#), framed it as a geopolitical masterstroke benefiting U.S. producers, while others dismissed it as propaganda to bolster the Trump administration and allow it to save face after the Iran conflict drew sharp criticism.

While it’s a well-known phenomenon in the financial realm that war can stimulate capital flight (with Western institutions being the beneficiaries, as resources seek a safe haven), the facts are more nuanced. The Strait of Hormuz, which normally carries about 20 percent of global seaborne crude oil and liquefied natural gas [LNG], was largely paralyzed from early March after Iranian forces imposed tolls exceeding \$1 million per vessel, restricted routes, and threatened U.S.- and Israeli-linked shipping in retaliation for joint U.S.-Israeli strikes that began February 28. Daily transits plunged from roughly 135 vessels to near zero. A fragile two-week U.S.-Iran ceasefire announced in early April has allowed only a trickle of traffic: three laden Very Large Crude Carriers (VLCCs) exited on April 11 — the busiest non-Iranian day since the war began — but [hundreds of tankers](#) remain backed up, and full normalization could take weeks.

[Real-time shipping data](#) confirm a measurable uptick in tankers heading to the United States. Empty VLCCs have rerouted from the Indian Ocean and Atlantic toward Texas and Louisiana export hubs such as Corpus Christi





and Houston. U.S. crude exports, already near record levels of 4-5 million barrels per day (bpd) before the crisis, are rising as Asian and European refiners seek reliable alternatives. The [U.S. Energy Information Administration](#) (EIA) has revised its 2026 oil-price forecasts upward, reflecting tighter global supply.

The correct metric for this shift is the Baltic Dirty Tanker Index (BDTI), which tracks crude tanker rates. It hit an all-time high near 3,723 points in late March and remained elevated around 3,561 as of April 10 — up more than 200 percent year-over-year — driven by longer U.S.-to-Asia voyages (40 to 50 days versus 21 days from the Gulf) and surging tonne-mile demand. Yet the “America is the big beneficiary” narrative oversimplifies reality. The Hormuz disruption stranded roughly 20 million bpd of Gulf exports; U.S. export capacity tops out around 5 to 6 million bpd even at full stretch. Saudi and UAE pipelines have rerouted only 3 to 5 million bpd incrementally. Asian refineries, optimized for heavier Middle Eastern grades, require blending and adjustments to process lighter U.S. shale crude. Higher global prices have lifted revenues for U.S. producers and exporters, but they have also pushed U.S. gasoline above \$4 per gallon in many markets, raising consumer and industrial costs.

In short, the United States has gained market share as a swing supplier, and tanker data validate the core observation of increased Gulf Coast loadings. But physics, scale, and economics prevent a full replacement of lost Gulf volumes. The crisis has raised energy prices worldwide, illustrating that no single nation emerges as an unqualified winner from chokepoint warfare. As tensions persist, sustained monitoring of BDTI, oil tanker tracking, and EIA export figures will reveal the lasting effects of the rerouting. — Rebecca Terrell

Spain Legalizes Half a Million Illegal Aliens. Is Europe Committing Suicide?

On April 14, Spain’s Council of Ministers, or cabinet, approved a proposal to legalize more than 500,000 illegal aliens in the country.

As “Insider Report” [noted](#) in February, after the Spanish government initially endorsed the measure, the legalization would apply to illegal aliens who entered the country through December 31, 2025, lived in Spain for at least five months, and had no criminal record — besides entering Spain illegally. It is expected to result in more than 500,000 illegal aliens receiving legal status, though Spain’s conservative-leaning opposition [argues](#) that up to one million illegals could benefit.

The amnesty proposal is being imposed via a royal decree, not the Cortes Generales (parliament). According to Elma Saiz, Spain’s minister of inclusion, social security and migration, eligible migrants [could apply](#) for legal status beginning on April 16 online and April 20 in person. The application window will last through June 30. According to social-media [reports](#), thousands of migrants have already begun lining up to take advantage of the amnesty.

In a post on X, Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez [described](#) the measure as “an act of normalization, of recognizing the reality of nearly half a million people who already form part of our daily life. And, also, an act of justice and necessity.” This is the first legalization proposal since 2005, when the Spanish government provided legal status to [577,000](#) migrants.

The current amnesty proposal originated as a [popular legislative initiative](#) signed by [about 700,000](#) Spaniards, and is based on a previous legislative proposal supported by nearly every Spanish party. *El País* [reports](#):

The regularization is being done through a decree to amend immigration laws, after a similar bill stalled



in parliament. The main opposition group, the mainstream conservative Popular Party (PP), has already announced it will challenge the move, despite having voted in favor in Congress in 2024. At the time, lawmakers voted 310-33 to accept the proposal for consideration, with only the [far-right, anti-immigration Vox party](#) voting against it.

The Spanish government and Establishment-aligned groups are framing the amnesty proposal as a way to sustain Spain's workforce amid critically low native birthrates, despite the erroneous notion of mass migration being economically necessary having been [repeatedly debunked](#).

France 24 [reports](#):

Migration Policy Institute Europe deputy director Jasmijn Slootjes said that Spain's decision was partly in response to fears that the ageing native-born population won't be capable of sustaining the kind of workforce the country needs to thrive.

"If you look at the demographic decline, the fertility rate in Spain is the lowest in Europe — so it's really, really low," she said.

"There were a lot of skill shortages, labour shortages, and de facto a lot of irregular migrants are working, although in informal work. And through regularising you can, of course, get more tax payments, and you also get better matching [to] their skills — because people can actually work at their skill level. So it's a very pragmatic approach."

In other words, rather than try to encourage higher native birthrates or let the free market adapt to fewer available workers, Spain's government is attempting to manipulate the economy by importing (and giving legal status to) foreign workers.

Spain's mass amnesty — and Europe's broader, [Establishment-orchestrated](#) acceptance of mass migration over the last few decades, [particularly since 2015](#) — is reminiscent of the late Roman Empire in A.D. 376, when Rome provided asylum to a large horde of Goths.

In his article "Rome's Dark Night of Tyranny," published in the February 7, 2005, issue of *The New American*, Steve Bonta recounts this fateful incident:

To escape the ravaging barbarians from the hinterlands, the Goths fled en masse to the banks of the Danube and sent envoys to the Roman emperor Valens, begging for permission to cross into Roman territory to escape the marauding hordes, and to settle in the province of Thrace. Valens, persuaded of the need for a mercenary and labor force to fortify and protect the northern boundaries of the empire, and anxious to expand his tax base, made one of the most fateful decisions in all of history: he opened the borders of the empire and invited the Goths to immigrate to Roman territory.

With the help of boats furnished by the Romans, the Goths poured across the Danube into Roman territory.... The Goths ... soon rebelled against the Roman authorities. Before too many months, the Goths, led by their crafty general, Fritigern, were pillaging and laying waste to cities all across Thrace.

The Gothic rebellion culminated in the Battle of Adrianople in A.D. 378, in which the Goths and Alans decisively defeated the Roman Army. Historians generally consider this battle as marking the beginning of the end of the Western Roman Empire.

In his article "The Fall of Rome," published in the October 30, 2006, issue of *The New American*, Dennis Behreandt notes:

It took 100 years for the Roman Empire in the west to disappear. It is noteworthy that, while it was

incredibly violent, it didn't happen through conquest alone. The Goths Christianized by Ulfilas did not seek to overturn imperial authority, nor did the Goths under Alaric seek the end of the empire. Nor for that matter did the Vandals in Africa or Attila in central Europe. They all sought, to greater or lesser degrees, accommodation and self-rule within the empire, and settling there, eventually transformed Europe from the homogeneous state ruled by Rome into a continent of independent kingdoms. "In my view," concluded historian Peter Heather, "it is impossible to escape the fact that the western Empire broke up because too many outside groups established themselves on its territories." In the end, the Roman Empire, built by controlled immigration, perished under an onslaught of uncontrollable barbarian migration.

In modern-day Europe, mass migration is slowly erasing the continent's nations, both by eroding their unique identities and by [expanding the European Union's powers](#) at the expense of its member states' national sovereignty.

Ironically, as the Roman Empire declined and eventually disintegrated, its government bureaucracy vastly expanded — mirroring the EU's [continued expansion](#) while its nations are flooded with migrants.

Will Spain and the rest of Europe go the way of Rome?
Time will tell — though the future does not look bright.
— Peter Rykowski

Judicial Accountability in Immigration Enforcement Sparks Nationwide Debate

Recent high-profile cases and legislative efforts have intensified public debate about the balance between

judicial authority and federal immigration enforcement. A notable example involves former Milwaukee County Circuit Court Judge Hannah Dugan, whose [conviction for obstructing federal agents](#) has drawn widespread attention.

In April 2025, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents arrived at the Milwaukee County Courthouse with an administrative arrest warrant for Eduardo Flores-Ruiz, an undocumented Mexican national appearing in Dugan's courtroom on unrelated charges. According to trial testimony and court records, Dugan confronted the agents in a hallway, directed them to the chief judge's office, and then allowed Flores-Ruiz and his attorney to exit through a restricted juror-only door. Agents later apprehended Flores-Ruiz after a foot chase outside the building. He was deported in November.

One month later, a federal jury convicted Dugan of felony obstruction of a federal proceeding while acquitting her on a misdemeanor charge of concealing an individual. Prosecutors argued she knowingly hindered the agents' efforts. Dugan maintained she acted within her judicial authority amid confusing courthouse guidelines on handling immigration enforcement.

On April 6, U.S. District Judge Lynn Adelman issued a 39-page order denying Dugan's motions for acquittal or a new trial. Adelman rejected claims of judicial immunity, finding sufficient evidence that Dugan deliberately impeded federal officers and that her actions were not performed in her official judicial capacity. Dugan, who resigned from the bench in January, faces up to five years in prison and a \$350,000 fine at her sentencing, scheduled for June 3. Her legal team has announced plans to appeal to the 7th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

This case coincides with congressional efforts to address concerns over expansive judicial remedies. In February 2025, Representative Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) introduced H.R. 1526, the No Rogue Rulings Act ([NORRA](#)). The bill, which passed the House by a 219 to 213 vote, seeks to limit federal district courts' authority to issue nationwide injunctions. Under the legislation, injunctive relief would generally be restricted to the parties in a specific case, with limited exceptions requiring



involvement of multiple state attorneys general and a three-judge panel. The measure is now pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Supporters argue the bill prevents single judges from halting national executive policies, while opponents are trying to spin it as an attempt to curb legitimate judicial checks on executive power. Governors on the state level are pushing back against the federal level of government. A growing number of them are pursuing new legal strategies to inhibit law enforcement officials from executing federal immigration injunctions. Their tactic is using “Bivens Acts” (or “converse-1983” laws), which address a gap left by the narrowing of the federal *Bivens* doctrine. As of early 2026, five states have enacted such statutes, with more considering similar legislation.

The U.S. Supreme Court’s 1971 decision in *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents* recognized an implied right to sue federal officials for damages when they violate certain constitutional protections, such as the Fourth Amendment. Unlike 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which allows suits against state and local officials for federal rights violations, no equivalent federal statute exists for federal agents. Over the past several decades, the Supreme Court has sharply limited *Bivens* claims, refusing to extend them to most new contexts. This has left many plaintiffs of alleged federal constitutional violations without a clear path to monetary damages in federal court.

States have begun efforts to exploit this (trying to misapply protections meant for legal Americans for foreigners in the country illegally). California’s Bane Act (1987), Massachusetts’ Civil Rights Act (1979), and similar statutes in Maine and New Jersey already authorize damages actions against “any person” who interferes with constitutional rights, language that courts have interpreted to reach federal officials in some cases. Illinois became the fifth state to act when Governor J.B. Pritzker signed the Illinois Bivens Act ([Public Act 104-0440](#)) on December 9, 2025. The law is narrowly tailored: It creates a state-law cause of action against any individual who, “while conducting civil immigration enforcement,” knowingly violates the Illinois or U.S. Constitution. Plaintiffs are encouraged to seek monetary damages (including punitive damages), injunctive and declaratory relief, and attorney fees if they prevail. Specific factors for assessing punitive damages include

whether the defendant wore a facial covering, failed to identify as law enforcement, operated a vehicle without proper plates, or used crowd-control equipment. Qualified immunity remains available as a defense. The statute also includes whistleblower protections for employees who report violations.

The law took effect immediately. On December 22, 2025, the [U.S. Department of Justice sued](#) Governor Pritzker and Attorney General Kwame Raoul in federal court, arguing that the Illinois Bivens Act violates the Supremacy Clause by attempting to regulate and discriminate against federal immigration enforcement operations. The suit claims the measure exposes federal officers to personal liability and chills lawful federal activity. As of April 2026, the law remains in effect; the federal government did not seek a preliminary injunction. Whether these state laws survive legal challenges will likely shape future efforts to close what many view as an accountability gap in government. — Rebecca Terrell

Trump Stages Oval Office McDonald’s Event to Promote “No Tax on Tips.” Who Really Benefits?

On April 13, President Donald Trump staged a [made-for-television event](#) in the Oval Office. A DoorDash driver known as “DoorDash Grandma,” Sharon Simmons, delivered two bags of McDonald’s cheeseburgers and fries. Trump greeted her on camera, tipped her \$100 in cash, and highlighted how the [“No Tax on Tips”](#) provision had reportedly saved her more than \$11,000 in taxes. “This doesn’t look staged, does it?” he joked to reporters as the event unfolded. The stunt marked the one-year anniversary of the policy, part of the 2025 “One Big Beautiful Bill,” which allows eligible tipped workers to deduct up to \$25,000 in qualified tip income from their federal taxable income for tax years 2025 through 2028. The deduction applies only to workers in occupations that “customarily and regularly” received tips before 2025 and phases out for higher earners above roughly \$150,000 (single) or \$300,000 (joint) in modified adjusted gross income.

On the surface, the policy appears to deliver direct relief to working-class servers, bartenders, delivery drivers, and others in the service industry. Promoted as a way for Americans to keep more of their hard-earned gratuities,

it has been touted as a populist win that puts money back in the pockets of tipped employees rather than the IRS.

Yet [the numbers tell a different story](#). Analyses show the benefits are heavily skewed. Many low-income tipped workers already pay little or no federal income tax because of the standard deduction and credits such as the Earned Income Tax Credit. For the bottom 40 percent of tipped earners, the deduction delivers virtually no savings — often \$0 to \$200 annually. The largest dollar benefits flow to middle- and upper-middle-income tipped workers in higher-end establishments who routinely clear tens of thousands in tips. Employers in the hospitality sector emerge as among the biggest indirect winners: By making after-tax tips more valuable, the policy reduces pressure on businesses to raise base wages, allowing them to maintain the sub-minimum tipped wage system that keeps fixed labor costs low.

This pattern — populist rhetoric masking upward redistribution — echoes earlier episodes in American history. In the 1840s, reformers in Rhode Island pushed to eliminate property-ownership requirements for voting and holding office. The campaign was framed as a win for democracy and a way to empower the common man. In reality, it was driven by rising mercantile and business interests eager to break the political monopoly of landowners. Historian Charles A. Beard [described the dynamic](#):

The changing circumstances of American life, however, soon challenged the rule of those with property. Prominent among the new forces were the rising mercantile and business interests. Where the freehold qualification was applied, business men who did not own land were deprived of the vote and excluded from office. In New York, for example, the most illiterate farmer who had one hundred pounds' worth of land could vote for state senator and governor, while the landless banker or merchant could not. It is not surprising, therefore, to find business men taking the lead in breaking down freehold limitations on the suffrage.... It was a schoolmaster, Thomas Dorr, who led the popular uprising in Rhode Island which brought the exclusive rule by freeholders to an end.

So the humble schoolteacher, Thomas Dorr, was used in the 1840s as a front-man for bankers and merchants. Once the laws were changed (removing property requirements from the ability to vote), Dorr was shoved aside and men of higher means raced to acquire political power.

Just as the Dorr Rebellion opened political doors for the *nouveau riche* under the banner of expanded “democracy,” today’s “No Tax on Tips” slogan markets tax relief to the working class while structurally favoring higher-earning tipped employees and the businesses that employ them. In both cases, the little guy’s name is invoked, but the enduring winners sit higher up the economic ladder. The honest solution would be to end the unconstitutional, Marxist federal income tax entirely.

— Rebecca Terrell

The Architecture of Jihad: Exploring the Communist-Islamic Axis

True Islam, as articulated in the Quran, demands firm adherence to Sharia Law and would result in a global Islamic caliphate featuring the total persecution of all infidels, explains Islamic expert Anni Cyrus to *The New American*’s Alex Newman on [Behind the Deep State](#). And it is coming to the United States, she warns in her new book, [The Architecture of Jihad: Inside the Ideology, Law, and Global Strategy Driving Islam’s Multi-Front Expansion](#).

Despite ostensibly being in competition with Islam, communists have created a Red-Green Axis, partnering with Muslims to destroy Western Civilization, formerly

NEW ACTION TOOL

Tabletop Scorecard Display

NEW

CONGRESSIONAL SCORECARD

HOW DID YOUR LEGISLATORS VOTE?

Order Online: www.ShopJBS.org
or call 1-800-342-6491
ShopJBS.org

known as Christendom, Cyrus, who grew up in Iran but escaped to America, explained. Ultimately, they will turn on each other, but they share an alarming goal: the complete destruction of the United States. Understanding this threat is key to pushing back on the Islamification of America, which is taking place in Texas, Minnesota, New York City, and across the entire nation.

Listen to this intriguing discussion at [TheNewAmerican.com](https://www.thenewamerican.com).

Democrats’ Stealth Assault on the Constitution: Bypassing the Electoral College to Finish the Job Begun in the 1820s

Virginia Governor Abigail Spanberger has just signed [HB 965](#), thrusting the Commonwealth into the [National Popular Vote Interstate Compact](#) (NPVIC). The move, spotlighted this week by [National Conservative](#), [Jack Danger](#), and others on X, brings Democratic-led jurisdictions to 222 electoral votes, only 48 short of the 270 needed to trigger the scheme. Once activated, every state in the pact will hand all its electoral votes to the national popular-vote winner, regardless of how its own citizens voted. No constitutional amendment. No congressional approval. Just an [interstate agreement that renders the Electoral College a hollow shell](#).

This is not reform. It is the latest chapter in a 200-year Democratic project to strip power from the states and concentrate it in party machines. The Founders designed a republic, not a pure democracy. Only the House of Representatives was to be elected directly by the people. The Senate was chosen by state legislatures. The presidency was entrusted to an [Electoral College](#) of “good and wise men” selected by those same legislatures — two layers of insulation from raw popular passion and factional intrigue. The states, not the parties, were to control the federal layer in a country explicitly named the *United STATES* of America.

That design lasted barely a generation. In the 1820s, political parties — nowhere mentioned in the Constitution — demanded the right to nominate presidential candidates and dictate how electors would vote. Historian Charles A. Beard [described the coup](#) in stark terms:

In a short time the spirit of democracy, while playing havoc with the old order in state government, made its way upward into the federal system. The framers of the Constitution... had committed the choice of presidential electors to the discretion of the state legislatures. The legislatures, in turn, greedy of power, early adopted the practice of choosing the electors themselves; but they did not enjoy it long undisturbed. Democracy, thundering at their doors, demanded that they surrender the privilege to the people... The fanciful idea of an electoral college of ‘good and wise men,’ selected without passion or partisanship by state legislatures acting as deliberative bodies, was exploded for all time; the election of the nation’s chief magistrate was committed to the tempestuous methods of democracy.

Beard, a political liberal, cheered the change. Most Americans today do not. The parties quickly became vehicles for the wealthy and powerful — an oligarchical class that discovered it could select the president more reliably than scattered state legislatures ever could. Power drained from the states to national party machines. The federal government grew unchecked. The very checks and balances the Founders embedded in the Electoral College vanished.

Virginia’s entry into the NPVIC is the logical endpoint of that erosion. Democrats know that state legislatures still retain constitutional authority to appoint electors and reclaim leverage over the presidency. The Compact is the preemptive strike: Lock in popular-vote rule now, before red-state legislatures wake up and reassert the original federalist design. It is not about “one person, one vote.” It is about ensuring that California and New York can override Virginia, Texas, or Florida forever.

Spanberger’s simultaneous move to [strip tax-exempt status](#) from the United Daughters of the Confederacy and similar groups reveals the broader cultural project: erase any lingering memory of state sovereignty and states’-rights traditions. The Constitution is being hollowed out piece by piece — first by parties in the 1820s, and now by interstate compacts in the 2020s. The goal is the same: remove the last structural barriers between the people and an unaccountable national ruling class. Unless the states reassert their plenary power under

Article II, the republic the Founders bequeathed us will cease to exist in anything but name. — Rebecca Terrell

NYMHM: News You May Have Missed

[CDC Data: U.S. Fertility Hit a New Historic Low in 2025](#)

[What's Next for Hungary After Orbán's Election Loss?](#)

[Netanyahu Says Trump Admin Reports to Him "Every Day." Kent: No-enrichment Position Killed Peace Talks.](#)

[Illegal-alien Crime is Higher Than Many Think — and is HIDDEN by Authorities](#)

[Gallego: I Knew Swalwell Was "Flirty" But Didn't Believe Allegations. Victim's Attorney: Sheriff Will Get Evidence](#)

[SCOTUS' Chiles Decision Strikes a Blow Against Homo/"Trans" Lobby — and for Freedom](#)

[Swalwell Quits Congress as New Victim Accuses Him of Rape, Strangling. Also Leaving Congress: GOP's Gonzales of Texas](#)

[Swalwell Suspends Calif. Gov. Campaign; Denies Rape, Sexual Assault Allegations](#)

[Epstein Was Advised by Elite "Fixer" to Attend Bilderberg to Revamp His Image](#)

[OpenAI Backs Bill Shielding AI Firms From Liability in Mass-harm Scenarios](#)

[Trump Posts Picture of Himself as Jesus, Deletes It After Backlash While Blaming "Fake News"](#)

[WaPo: More Than 10K Troops Headed for Persian Gulf as U.S. Blockades Strait of Hormuz](#)

[Trump Treads Lightly on China Amid Suspensions of Weapons Flow to Iran](#)

[Trump Pushes "Clean" FISA Reauthorization as Deadline Nears](#)

[Trump: U.S. Will Blockade Strait of Hormuz, Finish Off Iran Because Peace Talks Failed](#)

[Automatic Draft Registration Set to Begin in December](#)

[Melania Trump Makes Stunning Epstein Announcement, Calls on Congress to Act](#)

[Trump Rants About Carlson, Other Former Supporters: They Are "Losers," "Nut Jobs," Not MAGA](#)

[NYT: Netanyahu Lied to Trump to Provoke Iran Attack](#)

[Soviet California: School Suspended Pro-ICE Student, Abetted Vulgar, Anti-ICE Peers](#)

[Massie Floats Gubernatorial Run](#)

[MMIWG2SLGBTQQIA+: Wokeness Now Generating AI-worthy Acronyms](#)

[END]