

# Trump vs. Obama on Iran

By Cliff Kincaid

Everyone knows, or should know, that the media are full of liars who follow a "progressive" line. Unfortunately, even purported "conservatives" who get into the "mainstream media" sell out. Consider this case.

I am always on the lookout for these liars masquerading as journalists, and I found one at the Daily Mail, a crazy website featuring stories designed to generate clicks, and this one claimed that President Trump "is on the verge of securing a sweeping peace deal with Iran" that mimics the Barack Obama pact "he spent years trashing." This reporter's story appeared under the headline about Trump's "unexpected Obama-style peace proposal." Excuse me, but when did Obama ever bomb Iran and destroy its nuclear and ballistic missile production facilities?

The "Obama-style" approach was to send cash to Iran without doing anything about its military capabilities and the nature of its regime.

President Trump's war on the Islamic Republic of Iran was long overdue. On one level, it constitutes self-defense — a form of justice on behalf of American victims of Iran over the years. That includes the 1983 bombing of the U.S. Marine Barracks in Lebanon which killed 241 American military personnel. The victims also include at least 600 American soldiers murdered in the Middle East and the nearly 900 wounded.

Equally important, President Trump acted to prevent a nuclear strike on America by Iran — the world's top state sponsor of terrorism.

Obama did none of that. So how is the Trump approach in any way an "Obama-style" treatment of the problem.

In contrast to Barack Hussein Obama, President Trump acted to save America by ordering the destruction of the Iranian leadership and their nuclear and ballistic missile programs.

This is a great victory the American people can be proud of.

The record is clear: Iran has been waging war on the USA for decades, including plotting the assassination of President Trump.

Trump has acted against the regime. By any objective measure, President Trump was proven right in his decision to go to war with Iran. Obama — on the other hand — by contrast, was guilty of treason for building up Iran's nuclear and terrorist programs and activities.

The Daily Mail reporter Phillip Nieto is described as a politics reporter at the Daily Mail Online who was a summer 2020 College Fix fellow at the Daily Caller. The latter is supposed to be a "conservative" publication. I am simply incredulous, learning that this fellow Phillip Nieto once served "as the public relations chair for his local YAF chapter." YAF is a conservative youth group I belonged to in college. He has lost his way, or been seriously compromised. I don't necessarily think he's lying about Trump's proposed "peace deal" in Iran, now that I understand how young and inexperienced he is. Let's consider his story a combination of ignorance and lack of historical perspective.

To make things easier for this reporter, I consulted AI and found this:

"During the Obama administration (2009–2017), the U.S. approach to Iran was primarily defined by economic sanctions and diplomacy rather than direct, overt military conflict. While President Obama famously maintained that 'all options are on the table,' he did not launch a full-scale military invasion or a sustained bombing campaign against Iran." Does that clear things up?

The AI source also told me that the Obama administration chose to use the "credible threat of force" as leverage for the Iran Nuclear Deal, signed in 2015, and that "Obama argued that a diplomatic solution was the only way to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon without entering into another major Middle Eastern war."

But Obama had no credibility, and no attack was ever carried out.

Among the flaws: the Iran nuclear deal focused exclusively on the nuclear fuel cycle and "ignored" Iran's delivery systems, including the fact that Iran then possessed the largest ballistic missile arsenal in the Middle East.

I repeat: Obama imposed no restrictions on ballistic missile development or testing by Iran. So how is the Trump approach like Obama's? By contrast, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) says "Operation Epic Fury" targeted Iran's ballistic missile infrastructure, with estimates that 80-90% of its capabilities have been destroyed. Frankly, I am sick of the media belittling the work of the U.S. Armed Forces. Another critical fact: Iran was believed to have the largest ballistic missile inventory in the Middle East with its longest-range missiles capable of striking targets 1,240 miles away, covering all of the Middle East and parts of Europe. However, we then learned that Iran's missile capabilities were actually far more dangerous. Iran fired two intermediate-range ballistic missiles at the joint U.S.-U.K. military base on Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, demonstrating a strike range of 2,500 miles.

That made Iran's development of nuclear weapons an even more dangerous and imminent threat.

The Diego Garcia base is a key U.S. strategic outpost in the Indian Ocean and provided support for U.S. airstrikes in Afghanistan that targeted terrorist Taliban and al-Qaeda forces.

President Thomas Jefferson led America's first war against Muslim Jihadism. Without a Declaration of War, he built a navy and sent it halfway around the world to crush the Muslim Barbary Pirates. Those terrorists were waging a form of "sea Jihad" against Christian nations. Captured American crewmen were terrorized and taken to North Africa and enslaved. During this special year, the 250th anniversary of the United States, let us recognize how President Trump, like our third president, Thomas Jefferson, safeguarded our great nation from a Muslim terrorist regime's aggression, even if the Daily Mail can't or won't recognize that fact.



## Karmageddon

By Mr. 'X' ~ John Mutton  
CENTRAL EXCLUSIVE

### Two Policing Models. Two Philosophies.

#### Two Very Different Price Tags.

Two Policing Models. Two Philosophies. Two Very Different Price Tags. There is something happening across Ontario that taxpayers need to start paying very close attention to. Policing in Ontario is no longer just about policing. It has increasingly become about massive capital infrastructure empires. Across the province, police headquarters and policing campuses are becoming larger, more architecturally elaborate, more consultant-driven, and dramatically more expensive than what many other jurisdictions across Canada and the United States are building.

Meanwhile, provinces like Alberta appear to have taken a far more pragmatic and operationally focused approach. And taxpayers should be asking why. The Ontario "Police Campus" Model In Ontario, modern policing infrastructure increasingly resembles institutional corporate campuses. Large headquarters. Massive administrative wings. Architectural showcases. Integrated civic complexes. Multi-phase expansions. Endless consultant studies. New buildings replacing perfectly functional older buildings.

The result? Hundreds of millions of dollars in capital costs that ultimately land on the backs of property taxpayers. In some municipalities and regions, police infrastructure has evolved far beyond what is operationally necessary and has entered the realm of prestige infrastructure.

Taxpayers are told:

- the buildings must be state-of-the-art, - the facilities must be consolidated, - the campuses must be future-ready, - and every department must be centralized under one roof.

But few people ever ask the obvious question:

Does this actually improve policing outcomes enough to justify the cost?

Because operational policing and expensive real estate are not necessarily the same thing.

Alberta's More Practical Approach

By contrast, Alberta has historically appeared to maintain a more practical model. Not flashy. Not over-designed. Not campus-oriented. Just functional policing infrastructure.

More emphasis appears to be placed on:

- operational efficiency, - practical deployment, - adaptive reuse, - phased modernization, - and maintaining functional buildings longer.

In many Alberta communities, policing facilities still resemble what policing

facilities were traditionally intended to be:

working operational buildings.

Not monuments. And importantly, Alberta's approach often appears far closer to the American municipal model.

Across much of the United States, police departments commonly continue operating from: - upgraded legacy facilities, - industrial-style buildings, - phased retrofits, - decentralized operations, - and lower-cost modernization programs.

The emphasis is often:

"Does the building function properly?" —not— "Does the building impress people?"

That difference matters. The Cost Explosion Problem Ontario taxpayers are now living through an era where virtually every public-sector institution appears to believe it requires: - a new headquarters, - a major expansion, - a flagship campus, - or a transformational capital project. Police. Municipal administration. Libraries. Transit facilities.

Public works yards. Health facilities. Everything becomes bigger. Everything becomes more expensive. Everything becomes consultant-driven.

And taxpayers are expected to quietly absorb the consequences through: - higher property taxes, - increased debt, - development charges, - and long-term operating costs.

The problem is not policing itself.

The problem is whether Ontario has lost sight of the difference between operational necessity and capital ambition.

Bigger Buildings Do Not Automatically Mean Better Policing This is the uncomfortable conversation many politicians avoid. A larger headquarters does not necessarily reduce crime. A newer building does not automatically improve response times.

An architecturally impressive campus does not inherently make communities safer.

Good policing is ultimately about: - leadership, - deployment, - accountability, - staffing, - training, - community trust, - and operational effectiveness. Not marble floors and oversized atriums.

Taxpayers Need To Start Asking Hard Questions

Before approving another massive police capital project, Ontario taxpayers should be asking: - Can existing facilities be modernized instead? - Can phased retrofits achieve the same result? - Is consolidation actually necessary? - Are administrative expansions excessive? - Is the architectural scope reasonable? - How does this compare to Alberta or U.S. jurisdictions? - Are we building for operational need—or institutional prestige? These are not anti-police questions. They are pro-taxpayer questions. And in an era of affordability crises, exploding property taxes, and infrastructure deficits, they are questions that desperately need to be asked. Because somewhere along the way, Ontario appears to have drifted from practical policing infrastructure toward institutional empire-building.

And taxpayers are paying the bill.