



Media Hit-Job Continues as Stephen Colbert Ambushes Democrat Presidential Candidate Tulsi Gabbard

US Representative Tulsi Gabbard, a Democrat running in the 2020 presidential race, has a progressive leftist domestic policy, but she is the only candidate calling for an end to US foreign wars. “Comedian” Stephen Colbert, and other talk show hosts, have ambushed her in order to smear her call for peace. Gabbard challenges the US foreign policy of military violence, the glue that holds the empire together, and she especially condemns regime change war, which has resulted in disaster in Iraq, Libya and Syria. During the interview, she called out the CIA for arming terrorists in Syria, leading Colbert to reveal himself as a tool for the military industrial complex as he tried to shut her down.

Hawaii Congresswoman and Democratic presidential candidate Tulsi Gabbard [recently appeared](#) on *The Late Show with Stephen Colbert*, where instead of the light, jokey banter about politics and who she is as a person that Democratic presidential candidates normally encounter on late night comedy programs, the show’s host solemnly ran down a list of

textbook beltway smears against Gabbard and made her defend them in front of his audience.

Normally when a Democratic Party-aligned politician appears on such a show, you can expect jokes about how stupid Trump is and how badly they're going to beat the Republicans, how they're going to help ordinary Americans, and maybe some friendly back-and-forth about where they grew up or something. Colbert had no time to waste on such things, however, because this was not an interview with a normal Democratic Party-aligned politician: this was a politician who has been loudly and consistently criticizing US foreign policy.

After briefly asking his guest who she is and why she's running for president, Colbert [jumped right into it](#) by immediately bringing up Syria and Assad, the primary line of attack employed against Gabbard by establishment propagandists in American mainstream media.

Colbert: Do you think the Iraq war was worth it?

Gabbard: No.

Colbert: Do you think that our involvement in Syria has been worth it?

Gabbard: No.

Colbert: Do you think that ISIS could have been defeated without our involvement and without our support of the local troops there?

Gabbard: There are two things we need to address in Syria. One is

a regime change war that was first launched by the United States in 2011, covertly, led by the CIA. That is a regime change war that has continued over the years, that has increased the suffering of the Syrian people, and strengthened groups like Al Qaeda and ISIS, because the CIA was using American taxpayer dollars to provide arms and training and equipment to these terrorist groups to get them to overthrow the government. So that is a regime change war that we should not have been engaging.

Colbert: So, but if it is someone like Bashar al-Assad, who gasses his own people, or who engages in war crimes against his own people, should the United States not be involved?

Gabbard: The United States should not be intervening to overthrow these dictators and these regimes that we don't like, like Assad, like Saddam Hussein, like Gaddafi, and like Kim Jong Un. There are bad people in the world, but history has shown us that every time the United States goes in and topples these dictators we don't like, trying to end up like the world's police, we end up increasing the suffering of the people in these countries. We end up increasing the loss of life, but American lives and the lives of people in these countries. We end up

undermining our own security, what to speak of the trillions of dollars of taxpayer money that's spent on these wars that we need to be using right here at home.

Like I said, this is not a normal presidential candidate. *How often do you see a guest appear on a network late night talk show and talk about the CIA arming terrorists in Syria and the fact that US military interventionism is completely disastrous?* It just doesn't happen. You can understand, then, why empire propagandist Stephen Colbert [spent the rest of the interview](#) informing his TV audience that Tulsi Gabbard is dangerous and poisonous.

[Read full article here...](#)



Nuclear Powers India and

Pakistan on Brink of War

Jake Morphonios reported India and Pakistan, two enemies that are equipped with nuclear weapons, are deploying troops, tanks and military aircraft to the border region between the two countries in preparation for war. According to scientists, if India or Pakistan were to strike each other with nuclear missiles, within two weeks, the smoke from those bombs will have spread around the entire Earth, blanketing the sky and blocking out sunlight for years.

The conflict began when a Muslim terror organization group launched a bomb attack on Kashmir, killing 40 Indian paramilitary police, provoking retaliation from Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi. On February 26th, India sent fighter jets across the Kashmir 'Line of Control', to carry out attacks against a Muslim training camp about 40 miles inside of Pakistani territory. Pakistan reported the bombs were detonated in a rural area and did not kill anyone, but claims that Indian forces on the Line of Control killed four civilians. Pakistan's Prime Minister Imran Khan responded by shooting down two of India's fighter jets. Khan has now called for negotiation instead of retaliation, yet both countries are preparing for full-scale war.



If the Venezuelan Crisis Expands into War, 8 Million Refugees Could Flood US Border

The US imposed more sanctions on Venezuela, which will create more hardship on people who are already starving. If the US becomes further entangled in overthrowing the government, eight million war refugees could seek refuge in the US. Two Florida congressmen from Florida, Darren Soto and Mario Diaz-Balart, have recklessly proposed giving Venezuelans protected status in the US that carries on indefinitely. If the US sends troops to Venezuela, they will be stationed there forever.

Republican Senator Marco Rubio sent a threatening tweet to Venezuelan President Maduro featuring two photos of former Libyan leader Moamar Gadhafi, one where he is smiling, and the other where he is covered in blood and dirt just before he was sodomized and murdered. Chaos following US intervention can be worse than a dictator, as witnessed in Libya, which has become a war-torn hellhole where slavery thrives. US foreign policy is a disaster because it enforces permanent obligations on Americans to solve temporary problems.



Trump Regime Launches Coup in Venezuela. Deep State Smiles as Globalism Grows.

This video commentary by James Corbett and Daniel McAdams is an excellent analysis of current US support of a coup in Venezuela. The insight that makes it valuable is that, although we may oppose socialism or any other variety of collectivism, and although we may desire to help the suffering people in Venezuela escape socialism, poverty, and corruption, we do not serve those objectives by interfering in the internal affairs of other governments, assassinating opposition leaders, organizing riots and revolutions, and installing puppet leaders whose only goal is power and wealth. I highly recommend this short video. -GEG

The plan will likely require military force and is supported by both the Democrats and Republicans. The US choice for a puppet leader, Juan Guaidó, is not very popular. A recent poll of Venezuelans shows that more than 80% of the people are against sanctions and other international interventions to remove President Maduro. Coup plotters have rejected talks with Maduro and his team.



Rand Paul Slams the Senate for Uniting to Defend Forever Wars in Syria and Afghanistan

Last week, US Senator Rand Paul slammed his colleagues in the Senate for supporting endless US wars in Syria and Afghanistan when they voted 68-to-23 to rebuke President Trump for saying he wanted to bring our troops home from Syria and pull out half of US forces from Afghanistan. A critic noted that the Republican-dominant Senate has a history of disappointing its base by not repealing Obamacare, not defunding Planned Parenthood, but they “fight like lions for the right to kill your son in Afghanistan.” -GEG

Senator

Rand Paul slammed his colleagues in the Senate on Thursday for refusing to help the American people but rallying together to defend our endless wars in Syria and Afghanistan.

The Senate voted [68-to-23](#) on Thursday to [rebuke President Trump for moving to bring our troops home from Syria and pull out half our forces from Afghanistan.](#)

Jesse Kelly responded to the news on Twitter writing: “This senate that can’t repeal Obamacare, defund Planned Parenthood, or pass a budget. But God help you if you want to bring our boys home. They’ll lock shields and fight like lions for the right to kill your son in Afghanistan.”



Bunch of fat, pasty, over-educated millionaires eating lobbyist-funded steak dinners as they send our best and brightest to get blown up for nothing. Makes me sick.



This senate that can’t repeal Obamacare, defund Planned Parenthood, or pass a budget. But God help you if you want to bring our boys home. They’ll lock shields and fight like lions for the right to kill your son in Afghanistan. [14.7K 2:56 PM – Jan 31, 2019](#)[Twitter Ads info and privacy](#)

Rand Paul says the US government spends \$51 billion per year in Afghanistan to build roads, bridges, hotels, etc.

[Read full article here...](#)



Democratic Elites Reunite with Neocons, and Liberals Are Becoming Far More Pro-War than Republicans

A poll shows that 49% of Americans supported President Trump's Syria withdrawal, while 33% opposed it in favor of ongoing war. The poll showed that the vast majority, 76%, of Republican and Independent voters want to end the wars while 14% of Republicans and Independents want to remain. In stark contrast, only 26% of Democrats supported peace by removing US troops, yet an overwhelming 59% of Democrats favored continuing the wars in the Middle East! In the past, Democratic voters have wildly shifted their "beliefs" based on the party affiliation of the president: during the Bush-Cheney years, liberals denounced war-on-terror tactics, such as assassinations, drones, and Guantanamo torture as moral atrocities. When Obama was elected, however, they completely changed their position – [proving once again that political rhetoric (in both parties) is primarily a tool to win votes and has little to do with morality or patriotism or upholding the Constitution. Too bad voters keep falling for the same tactics election after election.] -GEG

[Via Glenn Greenwald of The Intercept](#)

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP'S December 18 announcement that he

intends to withdraw all U.S. troops from Syria produced some isolated support in the [anti-war wings](#) of [both parties](#), but largely provoked bipartisan outrage among in Washington's reflexively pro-war establishment.

Both [GOP Sen. Lindsey Graham](#), one of the country's most reliable war supporters, and [Hillary Clinton](#), who repeatedly criticized former President Barack Obama for insufficient hawkishness, condemned Trump's decision in very similar terms, invoking standard war on terror jargon.

But while official Washington united in opposition, [new polling data](#) from Morning Consult/Politico shows that a large plurality of Americans support Trump's Syria withdrawal announcement: 49 percent support to 33 percent opposition.

That's not surprising given that Americans by a similarly large plurality agree with the proposition that "the U.S. has been engaged in too many military conflicts in places such as Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan for too long and should prioritize getting Americans out of harm's way" far more than they agree with the pro-war view that "the U.S. needs to keep troops in places such as Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan to help support our allies fight terrorism and maintain our foreign policy interests in the region."

But what is remarkable about the new polling data on Syria is that the vast bulk of support for keeping troops there comes from Democratic Party voters, while Republicans and independents overwhelming favor their removal. The numbers are stark: Of people who voted for Clinton in 2016, only 26 percent support withdrawing troops from Syria, while 59 percent oppose it. Trump voters overwhelmingly support withdraw by 76 percent to 14 percent.

A similar gap is seen among those who voted Democrat in the 2018 midterm elections (28 percent support withdrawal while 54 percent oppose it), as opposed to the widespread support for

withdrawal among 2018 GOP voters: 74 percent to 18 percent.

[Read full article here...](#)



Ron Paul: Trump's Top Advisors Say His Announcement to Withdraw from Syria Is Not Serious

After Trump made a dramatic U-turn on pulling troops from Syria, Ron Paul speculated that the President is merely a figurehead, and that the deep state continues to control foreign policy. The neocons, the media, the military-industrial complex, and the left-wing "never-Trump" people were livid when Trump announced he was pulling troops from Syria and Afghanistan. However, Senator Lindsey Graham revealed that Trump agreed to no timetables for the alleged departure. Trump's National Security Advisor, John Bolton, and his Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, explained that President Trump's statements on troop pullout were just political statements, not US policy. -GEG

I'm starting to wonder whether President Trump has any power over US foreign policy at all. Many people believe that the US

president is just a figurehead, with actual foreign policy firmly in the hands of the deep state. Trump's latest dramatic U-turn on pulling troops from Syria certainly feeds such theories.

When President Trump announced just a couple of weeks ago that the US was removing its troops from Syria and possibly reducing troops from Afghanistan, the neocons, the media, the military-industrial complex, and the left-wing "never-Trump" people were livid. They were silent when President Obama made the horrible decision to overthrow Assad in Syria and sent weapons to jihadists to do so. They never said a word when billions of dollars were committed to this immoral and dangerous "regime change" policy. They weren't interested in the rule of law when President Obama thumbed his nose at Congress and sent troops into Syria.

But when President Trump declared the obvious – that ISIS was effectively defeated and that we had no business being in Syria – these above groups in unison declared that actually bringing US troops home was a "gift to Russia." They said bringing US troops home would create instability in the regions they left. Well, is there any proof that occupation by US troops actually brings stability?

No sooner did President Trump announce our departure than his neocon advisors began walking his words back. First he had to endure a lunch with Sen. Lindsey Graham reading him the riot act, where, according to the Senator, Trump agreed to no timetables for departure. Then his National Security Advisor, John Bolton, and his Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, began to tell the world that President Trump's statements on troop pullout were just empty words, not US policy.

While Syrian Christians newly liberated from the rule of US-backed extremists celebrated Christmas for the first time in years, John Bolton dusted off the old warning to Assad that the US would attack if he "again" gassed his people. With the

Syrian president personally taking part in some of the Christmas celebrations, does anybody really believe he'd go back to his office and order a gas attack?

Bolton then claimed that the US would shift troops from Syria to Iraq to continue fighting ISIS and that the US fully backs Israeli airstrikes on Syrian territory. Did President Trump even agree to any of this?

[Read full article here...](#)



Why Did Trump Announce That ISIS Is Defeated When It Has 30,000 Fighters And Is Growing?

Jake Morphonios challenges Trump supporters to look coldly and objectively at President Trump's decision to withdraw US troops from Syria based on the claim that ISIS, with 30,000 armed fighters in Syria and Iraq, is defeated. Knowing that this challenge will trigger the anger of many, he asks viewers to withhold judgment until after he presents reasons for his own belief that the President is acting to keep control of Syrian

oil fields in the hands of the Kurds, who now are acting as the US proxy in that region. There is too much to this story to summarize, so our recommendation is to set aside 35 minutes and listen carefully to what Morphonios has to say – and judge for yourself. The significance of this issue is, as Trump, himself, would say, is HUGE. -GEG



Historic Victory! Senate Votes to Stop US Support in Saudi Arabia's War in Yemen

The resolution that expressed congressional disapproval against the US-backing of Saudi Arabia's war in Yemen [passed 56-41](#), over the objections of many establishment Republicans, but with strong support from conservatives like Senators Rand Paul and Senator Mike Lee, as well as from leftists like Senator Bernie Sanders. Rand Paul said that since he has entered public office, he has spoken out against Congress' abdication of its constitutional responsibilities in foreign policy. This is the first time Congress has invoked the War Powers Act to vote to end support for war since Vietnam. Bloomberg reported that a bipartisan group of senators say they'll try again in 2019 to enact stronger legislation to cut off arms sales to Saudi Arabia.

In a historic action, Senate has voted to end US involvement and support for the war in Yemen – the first time they have voted us out of war since Vietnam.

On Thursday, Senate voted 56-41 to pass S.J. Res. 54 and end support for Saudi Arabia's war on Yemen.

In a statement, Senator Rand Paul – a long time critic of US support for the war in Yemen – praised Senate's action.

"Today, in an historic vote, the Senate sent a clear message to Saudi Arabia that we will not turn a blind eye to their abuse of human rights, killing of dissidents and innocent Yemenis, and fueling of a humanitarian crisis. Since entering the Senate, I have spoken out against Congress' abdication of its constitutional responsibilities in foreign policy, and I have worked across the aisle to help build the bipartisan consensus that made its voice loudly heard today. I will continue working to ensure that today's victory is just the beginning of a long-awaited change in how Congress operates," Senator Paul said in a statement.

A press release from Senator Paul's office noted that over the past five years, Dr. Paul has spoken out and led multiple bipartisan efforts against U.S. involvement in Yemen. "Most recently, in November, he forced a procedural vote on his resolution that would have blocked the sale of an estimated \$300 million in high-explosive rocket artillery and associated training and support to Bahrain, a member of the Saudi-led coalition waging the war in Yemen."

[Read full article here...](#)

Additional source:

<https://www.breitbart.com/entertainment/2018/12/13/exclusive-r-and-paul-extraordinary-moment-when-senate-passed-resolution->



Senator Rand Paul Rebuked the Deep State for Secrecy and Called for Congress to Take Back Power to Declare War

Senator Rand Paul organized a press conference outside the CIA's briefing on the murder of Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi that the lawmaker was blocked from attending, even though he is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Paul said that only eight Congressmen are given intelligence information, which creates an oligarchy-like system instead of a democratic system. Paul called out the deep state and argued that, if lawmakers aren't allowed to have access to the intelligence community's conclusions, they can't provide oversight. Paul said that the Senate needs to take back foreign policy as the president lacks the authority to declare war (in Yemen) without permission from the Senate. He said that 63 Senators support a vote for a resolution

requiring President Trump to stop support for Saudi Arabia's war in Yemen.



Ron Paul Recommends Cutting Military Budget by 75% After Pentagon Fails Audit. U.S. Has Spent \$6 Trillion on Wars

A new study from Brown University estimates that the US has spent \$5.93 trillion on multiple wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Pakistan, Yemen, and other places since 9/11. This figure is much higher than official estimates because it factored in the cost of medical and disability care for soldiers, and future costs, interest on the extra money borrowed for the wars, and other unseen expenditures.

The Pentagon spent nearly a billion dollars for an audit to determine where it has spent trillions of dollars, but failed. Ron Paul says that the lost trillions have nothing to do with defense, as the money is instead used to prop up the high lifestyles of those connected to the military industrial complex. Paul says that the real problem is not waste and fraud, but the belief that the US must maintain a global military empire. He further stated that military spending could be reduced by 75% if we returned to a well-defended

republic.

[A new report from Brown University](#) is aiming to provide a close estimate of the cost of the overall cost to the US government of its myriad post-9/11 wars and assorted global wars on terror. The estimate is that \$5.933 trillion has been spent through fiscal year 2019.

This is, of course, vastly higher than official figures, owing to the Pentagon trying to oversimplify the costs into simply overseas contingency operations. It is only when one considers the cost of medical and disability care for soldiers, and future such costs, along with things like the interest on the extra money borrowed for the wars, that the true cost becomes clear.

[Read full article here...](#)

The Pentagon has finally completed its first ever audit and the results are as many of us expected. After spending nearly a billion dollars to find out what has happened to trillions in unaccounted-for spending, the long look through the books has concluded that only ten percent of all Pentagon agencies pass muster. I am surprised any of them did.

Even the Pentagon is not surprised by the failure of the audit. "We failed the audit. But we never expected to pass it," said Deputy Secretary of Defense Patrick Shanahan. Can we imagine any large US company subject to the prying eyes of the IRS being so unfazed by the discovery that its books have been so mis-handled?

As with all government programs, but especially when it comes to military spending, the failure of a program never leads to calls for funding reductions. The Pentagon's failure to properly account for the trillions of taxpayer dollars shoveled in year after year only means, they say, that we need

to send more money! Already they are claiming that with more resources – meaning money – they can fix some of the problems identified by the audit.

If you subsidize something you get much more of it, and in this case we are subsidizing Pentagon incompetence. Expect much more of it.

Outgoing chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Rep. Mac Thornberry, warned against concluding that this mis-handling trillions of dollars should make us hesitant to continue sending trillions more to the Pentagon. The failed audit “should not be used as an excuse for arbitrary cuts that reverse the progress we have begun on rebuilding our strength and readiness,” he said.

The neocons concur. Writing in the Free Beacon, editor Matthew Continetti (who happens to be Bill Kristol’s son-in-law) warns that now is “the wrong time to cut defense.”

But I agree with the young neoconservative Continetti. I would never support cutting a penny of defense. However the Pentagon’s lost trillions have nothing to do with defense. That is money propping up the high lifestyles of those connected to the military-industrial complex.

Continetti and the neocons love to throw out bogeymen like China and Russia as excuses for more military spending, but in fact they are hardly objective observers. Look at how much the military contractors spend funding the neocon publications and neocon think tanks telling us that we need more military spending! All this money is stolen from the productive economy and diverted to enrich neocon cheerleaders at our expense.

[Read full article here...](#)



After UN Court Rules in Favor of Lifting Sanctions on Iran, Pompeo Terminates Amity (Friendship) Treaty

In response to the United Nations' top court ordering the US to lift sanctions on humanitarian goods to Iran, US Secretary of State Mike Pompeo made threatening statements against Iran and Syria and he terminated the 1955 treaty of amity (friendship) with Iran. Pompeo also referenced recent gunfire on the US consulate in Basra, Iraq, saying that the Ayatollah and his henchmen support attacks on the United States, and that "Iran is the origin of the current threat to Americans in Iraq." Meanwhile, Syria received delivery of Russian S-300 anti-air defense missiles this week. -GEG

The drums of war are beating over Iran and Syria as Secretary of State Mike Pompeo on Wednesday morning responded to the United Nations' top court ordering the US to lift sanctions on "humanitarian" goods to Iran. Pompeo made a series of threatening statements targeting Iran as well as Syria, which also comes after the latter received delivery of Russian S-300 anti-air defense missiles early this week.

Pompeo said in his State Department press briefing, "I'm announcing that the United States is terminating the 1955 treaty of amity with Iran. This is a decision that is 39 years over due."

He was referencing a 1955 "friendship treaty" or so-called Treaty of Amity which had been established long before the 1979 Islamic Revolution brought the Ayatollahs to power.

In July Tehran had pulled the US before the International Court of Justice (ICJ) to demand that the UN immediately suspend economic sanctions leveled by Washington after Trump ordered US pullout of the 2015 nuclear deal and the reimposition of far-reaching rounds of sanctions targeting Iran's energy and other vital sectors.

The ICJ's ruling is a huge blow to Washington (though perhaps largely symbolic) and a diplomatic win for Iran as it unanimously ruled that Washington "shall remove by means of its choosing any impediments arising from the measures announced on May 8 to the free exportation to Iran of medicines and medical devices, food and agricultural commodities" as well as airplane parts, said judge Abdulqawi Ahmed Yusuf. The court pointed out that targeting aviation parts created the "potential to endanger civil aviation safety in Iran and the lives of its users".

The decision essentially gives UN-imprimatur and legal cover for countries and companies seeking to still do business with Iran amidst threats of punitive action by the US should they proceed. But Pompeo slammed the international court's decision as null and void and Iran's clinging to the "decades overdue" treaty "absurd" in announcing the "termination".

[Read full article here...](#)