



DOJ's Anti-Weaponization Fund Leaves Taxpayers With the Bill

The Justice Department has created a \$1.776 billion “Anti-Weaponization Fund” as part of a settlement ending President Donald Trump’s [lawsuit](#) against the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

DOJ describes in its [announcement](#) that the fund will help “hear and redress” claims of Americans “who suffered weaponization and lawfare.”

As well-documented as the weaponization of justice has become, this development leaves a central question unanswered: If the government was weaponized, who broke the law? And if no official is held responsible, why do taxpayers pay the bill?



adventtr/iStock/Getty Images Plus

The Settlement

The fund comes from *President Donald J. Trump v. Internal Revenue Service*, a case filed after Trump’s tax returns were leaked. The plaintiffs were President Trump, Donald Trump, Jr., Eric Trump, and the Trump Organization. They sued the Treasury Department and IRS in federal court in the Southern District of Florida.

Under the settlement, they will receive a formal apology, but no direct monetary payment or damages. In return, they agreed to drop the \$10 billion lawsuit with prejudice. They also agreed to withdraw two administrative claims, including claims tied to “the unlawful raid of Mar-a-Lago and the Russia-collusion hoax.”

But the settlement does not simply end the case. It creates a new federal fund ostensibly aimed at addressing past injustices.

The Fund

The Justice Department framed the new Anti-Weaponization Fund as a response to political abuse of government power:

“The machinery of government should never be weaponized against any American, and it is this Department’s intention to make right the wrongs that were previously done while ensuring this never happens again,” said Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche. “As part of this settlement, we are setting up a lawful process for victims of lawfare and weaponization to be heard and seek redress.”

Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General Trent McCotter made the same argument in broader terms:



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on May 19, 2026

The use of government power to target individuals or entities for improper and unlawful political, personal, or ideological reasons should not be tolerated by any Administration.

That is a defensible principle. Undoubtedly, tax agencies, prosecutors, and law-enforcement bodies should not become tools of factional politics.

The money will come from the newly minted “judgment fund,” describe as a “perpetual appropriation allowing DOJ to settle and pay cases.” The fund will receive \$1.776 billion.

How It Will Work

The DOJ says the fund can issue formal apologies and monetary relief. Filing a claim will be voluntary. There will be no partisan requirement to apply.

The fund will have five members appointed by the attorney general. One member will be chosen in consultation with congressional leadership. The president may remove any member, but the attorney general must choose the replacement through the same process used for the removed member.

The fund must send a quarterly report to the attorney general. The report must identify each recipient and describe the relief awarded.

The attorney general will be able to order the audits. The reports must protect private information and avoid fraud. The fund must stop processing claims no later than December 1, 2028.

Those safeguards sound orderly. They also keep the process largely inside the executive branch.

As precedent, the DOJ pointed to the [Keepseagle v. Vilsack case](#). There, the Barack Obama administration created a \$760-million settlement fund to resolve discrimination claims by Native American farmers and ranchers against the federal government. DOJ also stressed a difference: in *Keepseagle*, hundreds of millions of leftover dollars went to nonprofits and NGOs that had not submitted claims. Under the Anti-Weaponization Fund, leftover money will return to the Treasury.

A Slush Fund?

House Democrats moved swiftly to block the settlement. Ninety-three lawmakers joined an [amicus brief](#) in the Southern District of Florida. They argue that Trump is effectively settling with his own administration.

Representative Jamie Raskin (D-Md.), a ranking member on the House Judiciary Committee, [called](#) the arrangement “pure fraud and highway robbery.” He added,

No one can be both plaintiff and defendant in the same case. And no president can concoct a fake case for \$10 billion in damages against the government so he can be plaintiff and defendant and then “settle” his bogus case against himself as a judge.

He described the deal as “a racket designed to take \$1.7 billion of taxpayer dollars out of the treasury.”

Representative Richard Neal (D-Mass.) also criticized the settlement. “Trump suing the IRS was never about justice, it’s another self-enrichment scheme on the backs of hard-working taxpayers,” he said.

Matt Platkin and Norm Eisen, lawyers representing the Democrats, [stated](#),

It’s against the law for the president to in effect sue himself — and then settle for a huge



sum. The court has the power to put a stop to these shenanigans and should do so.

The Democrats also warn that the fund could benefit Trump allies, including people prosecuted after January 6. The DOJ announcement mentions no such thing.

Weaponized DOJ

The deeper problem is not just that the federal government abuses its power. That is well-known and thoroughly documented. The core problem is that the machinery enabling such abuse exists at this scale in the first place.

The DOJ and its sub-entities, including the FBI, operate on shaky constitutional ground when they function as a national police force. Indeed, most ordinary law-enforcement powers belong to the states.

Therefore, the weaponization problem cannot be fixed by another federal fund. What is painfully missing is accountability. If the machinery was weaponized, then someone weaponized it. Someone signed orders and opened files. Someone approved unlawful searches, subpoenas, audits, leaks, or prosecutions. And ordinary citizens did not target themselves for “improper and unlawful political, personal, or ideological reasons.” Government officials did.

Those are not clerical mistakes. They are grave constitutional violations. Yet the proposed remedy is not prosecution, discipline, removal, or institutional rollback. It is another taxpayer-funded mechanism run by the same federal machinery that caused the harm.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe