



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on September 27, 2019

U.S. Sends Soldiers and Weapons to “Defend” Saudi Arabia From Future Attacks

https://media.blubrry.com/1462062/mcdn.podbean.com/mf/web/9heddi/US_Sends_Soldiers_and_Weapons_to_Defend_Saudi_Arabia_From_Future_Attacks.mp3 

Podcast: Play in new window | [Download](#) ()

Subscribe: Android | RSS | More

The U.S. Department of Defense confirmed on September 26 the deployment of 200 U.S. ground troops, one Patriot missile battery, and four radar systems to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

“In light of recent attacks on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and at their invitation, Secretary of Defense Mark T. Esper announced today that the U.S. would deploy” the above listed equipment, according to a statement released by Pentagon spokesman Jonathan Hoffman.

“This deployment will augment the kingdom’s air and missile defense of critical military and civilian infrastructure. This deployment augments an already significant presence of U.S. forces in the region. The Secretary has also approved putting additional forces on Prepare To Deploy Orders (PTDO). While no decision has been made to deploy these additional forces, they will maintain a heightened state of readiness,” added Hoffman.

The “additional forces” mentioned in the memo include two additional Patriot missile batteries and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system (THAAD).

It is a highly suspect coincidence that, according to President Donald Trump and senior members of his administration, Iran attacked Saudi Arabia on September 14, just nine days after an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act was proposed that would discontinue military aid to the kingdom, as the money and materiel was being used to prosecute its war on Yemen.

The aid ordered by the president and the defense secretary will bypass such bipartisan blocking of aid to the oil-rich monarchy, as the American soldiers and weapons will be used only to defend Saudi Arabia against future attacks by Iran.

Furthermore, there seems little sense in sending money, men, and materiel to a hereditary monarchy that completely controls their country, including the \$11 billion in net oil revenue they made in 2018. For sake of reference, that’s nearly twice what Apple netted last year.

One would think that for \$11 billion the kingdom of Saudi Arabia could adequately fund the construction of weapons and an army and an air force sufficient to safeguard itself!

In a comment made during a White House meeting last week, President Trump said that he would hold off on ordering a retaliatory strike against Iran — for now.

“And it’s too bad what’s happening with Iran. It’s going to hell, doing poorly. They are practically broke. They are broke. And they could — they could solve the problem very easily. All they have to do is stop with the terror,” the president said during a press conference on September 20.

In a lengthy response to a question regarding whether he planned a military strike against Iran, President Trump told a reporter,



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on September 27, 2019

The easiest thing for me to do — and maybe it's even a natural instinct, maybe I have to hold myself back. I remember during the debates, and when I was running against Hillary and the Democrats and the media — I view them all the same; I view that partnership very much the same.

But when I was running, everybody said, "Oh, he's going to get into war. He's going to get into war. He's going to blow everybody up. He's going to get into war." Well, the easiest thing I can do — in fact, I could do it while you're here — would say, "Go ahead, fellas. Go do it." And that would be a very bad day for Iran. That's the easiest thing I could do. It's so easy.

And for all of those that say, "Oh, they should do it. It shows weakness. It shows..." Actually, in my opinion, it shows strength. Because the easiest thing I could do, "Okay, go ahead. Knock out 15 different major things in Iran." I could do that and — all set to go. It's all set to go. But I'm not looking to do that if I can.

And I think I've changed a lot of minds. People are very surprised that — and many people are extremely happy. Many people are thrilled. And many people are saying, "Oh, I wish you'd hit the hell the out of them." Well, let's see what happens. But it will take place in one minute; I could do it right here in front of you and that would be it.

There are several constitutional problems with the president's threats of using the U.S. armed forces in "knocking out 15 major things in Iran."

First, Article I of the U.S. Constitution very clearly places the authority to put American servicemen in harm's way in the hands of the representatives of the people in Congress.

Among the legislative branch's powers enumerated in Article 1 Section 8, there is granted the power "to declare war."

The Founders were adamantly against allowing the president to put forces into combat.

On Friday, August 17, 1787, during the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, one of the delegates — Pierce Butler — advocating the granting of war-making power to the president. That was a most unpopular opinion.

Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts jumped to his feet, declaring that he "never expected to hear, in a republic, a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war."

And such a prerogative was never granted in the Constitution.

In a letter penned in 1793 that is eerily timely even now, James Madison wrote that the power to declare war is "of a legislative and not an executive nature." He continued on that subject:

Those who are to conduct a war [the Executive Branch] cannot in the nature of things, be proper or safe judges, whether a war ought to be commenced, continued, or concluded. They are barred from the latter functions by a great principle in free government, analogous to that which separates the sword from the purse, or the power of executing from the power of enacting laws.

Even when, as president, Madison was on the brink of war with Great Britain, he refused to act without the permission of the people's representatives.

The United States' policy must be aimed at "avoiding all connections which might entangle it in the contest or views of other powers, and preserving a constant readiness to concur in an honorable reestablishment of peace and friendship, is a solemn question which the Constitution wisely confides to the legislative department of the government," Madison wrote.



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on September 27, 2019

Regardless of republicanism or the lack of constitutional authority, the Pentagon will proceed to carry out the unconstitutional defense of a monarchy making hundreds of millions of dollars a month.

“It is important to note these steps are a demonstration of our commitment to regional partners, and the security and stability in the Middle East,” the Pentagon spokesman declared in the Defense Department’s memorandum on the United States’ deployment of troops and weapons in defense of Saudi Arabia.

Photo of Patriot missile launch: AP Images



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.



Subscribe

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.