

TRANSCRIPT

VC Briefing

A Job Requirement For Elective Office: Support The Constitution

Those Who Don't Must Not Serve

Tuesday, November 11, 2025

<https://victoryco.org/vc-briefing-a-job-requirement-for-elective-office-support-the-constitution-those-who-dont-must-not-serve/>

Media File: Webinar_Oath_Breaker.mp4

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

[00:00:00] **Frank Gaffney:** Welcome to the Victory Coalition webinar on the very important topic—on this Veterans Day—of the oath of office: a pledge that those in uniform have made throughout our 250-year history to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. And what that oath means—or must mean—with respect to others who are in the government of the United States in appointed positions or ones to which they are elected.

[00:01:00] Specifically: is it taken faithfully, and is it going to be honored by those who have sworn before God to uphold that very sacred commitment? The reason this is of such moment at this juncture is, of course, that we have the prospect of a man who is both a communist and an Islamist—a sharia-supremacist, a jihadist if you will—in the person of **Zohran Mamdani**, the mayor-elect of New York City, who we assume will say the words of a commitment to— I think in the particular oath of the Mayor of New York— support and uphold the Constitution of the United States. Or won't he?

[00:02:00] But even if he does, how can he possibly execute that commitment faithfully? And more to the point, how can the people of New York City—and the people across America who will assuredly be affected by what goes on there—be confident that, in that very important office, with all that New York City brings to our national economy, our security, our financial interests, and more, we'll be safeguarded against all enemies, foreign and domestic, when the man himself seems to be one of them?

This is a topic that will be explored by some of the best people in the national-security arena. I'm delighted that many of them contribute quite actively to the program of this coalition—the Victory Coalition. Some are also associated with other committees and coalitions that our Institute for the American Future sponsors. We're going to begin with one of them.

His name is **Sam Faddis**. He has, in the course of a distinguished career of public service, been an Army officer, an Assistant Attorney General in Washington State, and—of particular relevance to today's conversation—an undercover operative of the Central Intelligence Agency who, after some 20 years in the field, in his final tour at CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia, had responsibility for countering weapons-of-mass-destruction terrorism. All of which gives him, I think, the standing to speak very knowledgeably about both the importance of the oath of office, the likelihood that an individual like **Zohran Mamdani** will not take it honorably and faithfully, and the implications for both New York and the country if that is the case. Let's go to a videotape that Sam was kind enough to contribute to this program, as he's unable to be with us live at this hour.

Sam Faddis: One of the things I think the election of **Zohran Mamdani** does—or should do—is cause us to really look at what's actually happening in the country and the danger we're in.

Mamdani is a Shia Muslim—more specifically, a **Twelver**—meaning he belongs to a sect that considers we are in the end times; the apocalypse is coming and, not to put too fine a point on it, that it is their job to bring on the apocalypse to hasten the return of the **Mahdi**, the figure who will assure their victory by creating a firestorm.

He also believes in the concept of **taqiyya**, which is to some extent an element in much of Islam, but is more prominent in certain elements of Shia Islam. It's most often translated for the average American as: "it's okay to lie." Meaning: if you are Shia, you can lie about your intentions, your beliefs, your faith, etc. I think that misses the essence of the thing. If I say to you "it's okay to lie," you probably hear that in the context of lying being bad. You might think I mean: "Okay, right now in this situation it's okay to lie even though you know it's wrong." That's not really what **taqiyya**, as these folks interpret it, means.

To them, it means that it is completely legitimate—without sin, not wrong—to misrepresent who you are, your faith, your beliefs, and your intentions. It's a completely legitimate tactic. **God is endorsing it**, if you will. So, you look at a guy like Mamdani and you listen to him; he talks about what his intentions are, and the average American is still missing the point, because they're interpreting what he's saying in the context of how they think people behave. If he says these things, he must believe them; it must be true, right? If he's saying it, he intends it. Not necessarily. If you're operating on a principle that says it is completely legitimate—indeed called for—that you **misrepresent** yourself, deceiving the enemy...

And keep in mind, by the way: the enemy is not just Christians and Jews. Most Muslims on this planet are **Sunni** Muslims who don't buy into **taqiyya** in the same sense and are apostates as far as Mamdani is concerned—so they can be lied to as well. So again:

don't assume that announcements about policies and intentions are true, or that he ever intended them.

Then we overlay this weird kind of **red-green** axis we now have. Mamdani is not only a Shia Muslim and a Twelver but also a **communist**. I defy you to name a single communist regime that ever took power by democratic means—that's not how this goes—or that ever told the truth about its intentions. So, in the case of Mamdani in New York City, don't assume all you're looking at are things he intends to do via legal means, via constitutional means. Don't assume that at all. You should absolutely assume you have been lied to, that everything has been misrepresented, and that he has very different intentions.

Thank you for this really important context for this conversation. It is of surpassing importance that we're clear about Mamdani's background and proclivities—as well as the larger challenge we're facing in terms of people who, like him, will seek through elective office to gain access to our security establishment and use it, perhaps, against us.

We're going to hear next from **Dr. David Wurmser**—another frequent contributor to the Victory Coalition—who is these days the Senior Analyst and Director of the Middle East Program at the Center for Security Policy. He brings to that role a wealth of experience in senior ranks of the United States government—at the State Department, the National Security Council, and the Office of the Vice President—as well as service as a Naval Intelligence officer. Much of what we're contending with here emanates from the Middle East and is now seeking to gain access to positions of power and influence in our country—both appointed and increasingly elective, in the form now being pioneered, in a way, by **Zohran Mamdani**. Let's go to the videotape of a conversation I had with **David Wurmser** for our television program *Securing America* earlier this week.

[00:11:00] **Dr. David Wurmser:** Should we take it on faith that maybe this is just rhetoric and he took the oath of office? The problem is: you **cannot** be a communist and be faithful to the U.S. Constitution. You **cannot** be an Islamist and be faithful to the U.S. Constitution. And in my view, he is—because there's a big debate: is he communist, is he Islamist—what is he really? He's really **Third-Worldist**, which is both.

We saw that come to a great manifestation in Iran. The oath of office is to the Constitution. The Constitution is not only a document that governs relationships among departments of the United States; it also embodies certain outlooks toward **human freedom**. We have the Declaration of Independence—which informs the Constitution—it's part of a package deal. It starts with: we are endowed by our **Creator** with certain inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. So the very foundation begins with: God gave us these rights. Man didn't give them; therefore, man can't conditionally take them back. **Communism**, from its essence, kills God and says man

grants rights to those who deserve it—those who share the system's values. That's a violation right there.

The second violation is **liberty**. Neither Islamism nor communism really believes in individual human rights. They replace them with social rights or religious rights—but not the human rights that are the foundation of freedom.

The third part, the **pursuit of happiness**, emerges from earlier British documents (all the way back to Locke): life, liberty, and **property**. Property is considered part of pursuing happiness. You work hard; you enjoy the fruits of your labor and your property. Later the phrase became “pursuit of happiness,” but property was understood to be part of it. Property is right in the crosshairs of Mamdani's views.

Now, he took the oath. Does that mean he doesn't believe these things? If you're either a communist or an Islamist, the ends justify the means. Communists don't hold truth to be an absolute; if it helps communism, it is useful. In Islamism there are two problems if you're a **jihadist**:

First, **sharia** is supreme; it isn't subordinate to national law. It would be heresy to willfully submit to Western law. Second, why would he swear on the Quran? If he swears and then violates it, is he lying? **Sharia** embeds circumstances in which **lying is permissible**—one is in the name of jihad. So, if you really believe in sharia, one: you won't willfully submit to Western law; and two: you will say you do, because you're allowed to lie about that.

In Mamdani's case, he's made it very clear he's faithful to Islamic law. He might claim he can be faithful to his faith **and** take the oath, but he cannot take an oath in good faith to the U.S. Constitution and legal codes while holding those supremacist views. As a **Third-Worldist**, he has made it clear he is fundamentally assaulting the American system. Look at what he said about Daniel Penny—the subway case. He basically said Penny is the symbol of what's wrong with the West, that the robber was driven by our system. Our system is evil and must be overturned. You can't advocate that—for communism or for sharia—and take the oath in good faith.

Historically, we assumed the **vetting process** for elective office was sufficient to prevent people who seek to violate the oath from getting into sensitive positions. We can't do that anymore with the likes of **Zohran Mamdani** and others who are using elective office to get their hands on our security and safety. Quickly, to the importance of **background investigations** and **security clearances** for people getting into these jobs through the polls: the **Mayor of New York** has tremendous access to very sensitive information. New York is an epicenter of terrorist threat—huge diplomatic facilities, U.S. government facilities, Wall Street. If they're not with us, that compromises national

security immensely. And as far as clearances go—we've seen, with **Ilhan Omar**, we've got a problem.

We're going next to another prerecorded excerpt—an interview I did earlier today with **Col. Grant Newsham**, U.S. Marine Corps (ret.). A man who not only distinguished himself in uniform, but also as a Foreign Service officer in our embassy in Tokyo. He has a special focus on China; he's the author of the bestselling book ***When China Attacks: A Warning to America***. He's a frequent contributor to our programs here and to the Committee on the Present Danger: China. We're grateful, as always, for his service—past, present, and future. We've asked him to address the importance of the oath, especially to those who actually took it in connection with serving in our military. Let's go to the videotape with **Grant Newsham** now.

Col. Grant Newsham: When you take it, it's a promise that you're going to play by the rules, that you're going to defend the nation. It doesn't get any clearer than that. Most normal people, when they make a promise like this, take it seriously—and you don't break it lightly. Most people would actually **die** before breaking a promise like that. We've seen that throughout history—even in modern times.

In the U.S. military in particular, when somebody signs onto this promise to defend the Constitution from all enemies—foreign and domestic—they take it seriously. You don't see many people betray it—there's the occasional traitor—but people follow it. There's also something extra important: it's a **unifying act**. Everyone who joins—no matter background, position, rank—pledges to defend the Constitution.

It's worth asking: **why** wouldn't someone agree to this promise to defend the country we live in? Some conclusions are reasonable: maybe they don't like the United States; think it's evil; think it deserves to be destroyed. That is what you're seeing with the Mayor of New York—he's been clear about his hatred for the United States; he thinks it needs to be torn down and rebuilt. Ultimately, what you're seeing is about **power**. To get it, you tear people apart by group identity.

Rather than saying "we're all Americans who obey the Constitution," he appeals to differences—Senegalese, Yemeni, Puerto Rican—not really Americans. Once you do that, and play to resentments, it's effective at tearing a society apart. Their intention is to do it at a national level. We first saw this approach in the **Obama** administration; that's what's going on here.

No one can understand why somebody might not want to swear on a Bible or attest to something else; but if you're a citizen, you either agree to defend the country—or you don't. If you don't, you shouldn't be here. It's about that simple. This is the first time in my lifetime I've seen something this bad. It's the result of a **long march through the institutions** by Marxists—very successful in getting academia and education on board.

Civics aren't taught; most young Americans have no idea about the Constitution, our system of government—other than that it's "unjust," of course. With that audience, it's easy for a new mayor of New York to do his job.

You also see the ridiculous spectacle of people like **Chuck Schumer** and **Elizabeth Warren** trying to ride this Islamic-Marxist extremism as a tool to go after **Donald Trump**—to get power. Now it's turning on them. Ultimately, the loyalty oath is useful—just saying you have the commitment. But when somebody resists it, you have to look at what they're trying to do to us—and they've been clear.

Powerful stuff—especially how important the unifying aspect of pledging to support and defend the Constitution is within the military, and how vital it could be to the country more broadly. We're going to hear from a man who knows a lot about the constitutional republic and, particularly, the politics that are central to its future.

By virtue of long experience in government—both legislative and executive branches, including in the Office of the Vice President of the United States—he has also worked extensively in politics, serving in some **300 campaigns**, including most modern presidential ones. His name is **George Rasley**. He's also a member of our Committee on the Present Danger: China, and an invaluable contributor to much of the work we do at the Institute for the American Future. He's the managing editor of **Richard Viguerie's** splendid newsletter **ConservativeHQ**—you can find it at ConservativeHQ.com. **George**, we're grateful for your insights. The floor is yours.

George Rasley: Thank you, Frank. Since we are meeting on Veterans Day, I want to take a second to thank my late father for his service in World War II and Korea, and to honor him and his comrades who made the ultimate sacrifice.

This business of oath-taking and oath-keeping is serious. I've taken the oath as an elected public official, as a member of the Indiana state government staff, as a member of the White House staff, and as a member of the House and Senate staff. It **meant** something. It set a standard for my behavior—loyalty not just to the words of the oath, but to the Constitution and its meaning for all Americans.

Let me suggest that **Mamdani** has already broken another oath—or took it falsely—and that is the **oath of citizenship**. He is one of many elected public officials today, including members of Congress, who **claim dual citizenship**. There's no such thing for a naturalized American. Once you take the oath of U.S. citizenship, you **absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure** all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or of which you have heretofore been a subject or citizen. So you **can't** be a "dual citizen" of the United States. You are a citizen of the United States; you reject prior loyalties.

We have Members of Congress who say they are dual citizens. We have Mr. **Mamdani**, who appears to claim dual citizenship with **Uganda** (where he was born) and the United States. From my perspective, Mamdani has already broken one oath—why would he uphold a second one? If, for example, the United States were to go to war with **Iran**, would Mr. Mamdani and his fellow Twelvers—who allegedly took the oath of allegiance—defend the Constitution and render the military or non-combatant service they promised if the enemy in question is Iran? I wonder.

Thank you. What an important point—one that has gone largely unaddressed. If he becomes mayor, as **Sam Faddis** pointed out, he will have direct responsibility for the security of the people of New York—their safety, infrastructure, survival. As a Twelver with an attachment he shares with the Iranian regime to bringing on the apocalypse, the question could not be more important.

We're going to clean up at bat with a man who has done that brilliantly on previous programs: **Ken Abramowitz**. By trade, he's a highly acclaimed financial analyst specializing in healthcare. Fortunately, he has devoted his formidable intellect and persuasive powers to addressing threats we face in the United States—and to Western civilization—posed by nations, subnational entities, and groups seeking our destruction. Ken is the founder of **SaveTheWest.com**, chairman of **Citizens for National Security** in Florida, and author of ***The Multi-Front War***. Ken, we highly commend your work and invite your closing thoughts on elected officials gaining unconstrained access to sensitive information without background investigations or security clearances.

Kenneth Abramowitz: The election of **Mamdani** is a huge national embarrassment. I call it the equivalent of a **cultural 9/11**. We had a physical 9/11 almost 25 years ago; almost 10,000 people died between the event and subsequent battles in Afghanistan and Iraq. Mamdani could easily exceed that toll if left unchecked. This was a **systemic failure**: whoever naturalized him; whoever allowed him to run. Where was the FBI? Where were immigration authorities? Did the CIA have any information?

It goes back to what Frank mentioned: we don't do **national-security clearances** for people running for public office. We have to fix that—fast. Frankly, I would fix it **retrospectively**. If you can't backdate, then starting now: every official—**every**—for public office has to have a national-security clearance.

Government is responsible for protecting **life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness**. Our government didn't protect any of that here. New York City can become a **jihadi capital** of America. Property values are falling; people are fleeing. Why should government sit back and let trillions in property values collapse—forcing people to leave in anticipation of jihadi or communist rule?

Also, this will encourage **thousands** to run for office across the West—accelerating an Islamic political takeover. We have no obligation to watch that happen. The President publicly said he didn't want to get involved in the election—but he has a **direct responsibility** to protect us from all enemies, foreign and domestic. He didn't do it; he must take responsibility. In a perfect world Mamdani would be **arrested** and **deported** before taking office. There might be an uprising; then the National Guard. I would rather have a **mini civil conflict now** than a huge one later when terrorists take over schools and terrorize kids. We have to protect our kids. This is a mess equivalent to, if not larger than, 9/11; we must treat it as such. Every day we wait, it gets worse.

Ken, thank you—as always, right on message. We may differ on whether any civil war—little or big—is ever welcome, but there's no question our enemies are set on bringing it about. Ignoring that reality, and enabling them by inattention, will only let them spring it on us.

A brief Q&A: **Trevor**, why have we come to rely on elections to “vet” candidates? Isn't the problem now that open admissions of adherence to radical, anti-constitutional ideologies **appeal** to large numbers of voters—especially younger Americans—so those attachments aren't deemed disqualifying anymore?

Trevor Loudon: It is, Frank. And note: **John Brennan**, former CIA Director, admitted voting for the Communist Party in his introductory interview—and still rose to head the CIA. That shows how deep the rot is. This goes back to the **1950s**: McCarthy exposed communists; the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) went after **Nazis**, **communists**, and the **Klan**. It was bipartisan. But the Communist Party coined “**McCarthyism**” and made it a dirty word to go after communists. You could have “Communist Party” tattooed on your forehead and no one could say it without being pilloried.

Then the **Church Committee** in the 1970s decimated CIA and FBI counterintelligence. Since then we've had very little surveillance of communists. When President Trump designated **Antifa** a terrorist organization, the FBI scrambled—they had nobody inside; they didn't know who they were. Islamists then used similar tactics—**taqiyya**, **lawfare**—with help from groups like the **Southern Poverty Law Center** to make it unacceptable to criticize Islamism.

We are in a situation where there are essentially **no meaningful background checks** in much of government—certainly not for elected officials. In **California**, it's still technically illegal to be a communist and serve as a public-school teacher, yet you practically have to be one to get the job. National security and counterintelligence **skills** and **will** have largely vanished. When **Michele Bachmann** and others questioned the Muslim Brotherhood's activities a few years ago, **Republicans** were among her worst

critics. We, the public, must raise these national-security issues and demand enforcement of immigration laws, **loyalty oaths**, and **vetting**.

George Rasley: That polling you mentioned—young voters comfortable with socialism or even “communism”—sounds right. This is **Lenin’s** model: control education for a few years, and you have the youth for generations. The hard-left teachers’ unions encouraged it; administrators hired like-minded personnel. We’ve seen “waves” of socialism before—**Eugene V. Debs** got over a million votes from prison. Today we’ve had a dozen-plus openly **DSA** members in Congress at various points. This won’t fix itself. We need serious **education reform**—restore **civics**, **American history**, local school-board action, and stop federal funding that pushes left-wing curricula.

Kenneth Abramowitz: Members of Congress get elected from a population that’s been made **fat, dumb, and happy**. It’s hard to win by saying, “It’s World War III—wake up.” The only actors who can truly address this are in the **administration**. They can act publicly—send in a **SWAT** team, arrest Mamdani on charges (e.g., falsifying documents, foreign money). I’d like to see scrutiny of sub-\$200 donations—did he get tens of thousands of \$199 donations from **Qatar** or **Iran**? Or act **quietly**: send every department to scrutinize his behavior; have **ICE** do its job; enforce laws against **incitement to genocide** in mosques that preach it. Given election realities, the quieter route may prevail—but **something must be done**. This is a big deal—akin to **Constantinople** falling. The President must rise to the occasion.

That’s a fitting note to close on. Our hope is that laying out these bases for action will contribute to the impetus to do just that. One final thought: across the country, people in sensitive positions—public safety, public health, security, intelligence, law enforcement, homeland security—must be subjected to **background investigations** and **security clearances**. If elections are used to gain access to classified information and sensitive operations, those elected must be subjected to appropriate **security checks** going forward (and, ideally, retroactively for those already in access). In the absence of that, we are in **mortal peril** from enemies within.

Our thanks to all veterans who swore—without reservation—to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against **all enemies, foreign and domestic**. That same oath should be asked of every citizen—and **especially** of those who would lead us. The oath must not only be taken; it must be **faithfully fulfilled**. Anything less is unacceptable and should result in removal from office.

Thanks to our superb guests and presenters: **Sam Faddis**, **Dr. David Wurmser**, **Trevor Loudon**, **George Rasley**, **Col. Grant Newsham**, and **Ken Abramowitz**. Please share this with friends, colleagues, family, and—most especially—your representatives. Subscribe at **VictoryCoalition.org**.

