

US Ziocons and Israel's Friday the 13th War

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

June 14, 2025

On June 13, 2025—Friday the 13th—Israel launched a sweeping preemptive strike on Iran, igniting the most direct and devastating war the Middle East has seen in a generation. This paper examines the ideological, political, and theological forces that laid the groundwork for that war, focusing on the role of what we define as Ziocons: a coalition of U.S. neoconservatives and Zionist-aligned actors who promote military dominance, regime change, and unconditional support for Israeli policy. Far from being fringe ideologues, Ziocons include well-funded think tanks, prominent politicians such as Lindsey Graham and Tom Cotton, powerful lobbying organizations like AIPAC, and a vast base of Evangelical Christians influenced by misinterpretations of biblical prophecy. The result has been a distortion of U.S. foreign policy, where ideological loyalty overrides national interest and diplomacy is subverted in favor of perpetual conflict. This paper calls for a sober reassessment of that ideology, a theological reckoning within the American church, and a rejection of the false binary that equates criticism of Israel with antisemitism. Without such confrontation, the cycle of war will persist—and escalate.

Keywords Ziocons, Israel, Iran, neoconservatism, Zionism, AIPAC, Evangelical Christianity, Scofield Bible, Christian Zionism, Middle East war, U.S. foreign policy, Friday the 13th war, regime change, military escalation, theological error, diplomacy, Bernie Sanders, Lindsey Graham, Tom Cotton, lobbying influence. A collaboration with GPT-4o. CC4.0.

I. Introduction

The term Ziocon, as used in this paper, refers to a fusion of two powerful ideological and political movements: Neoconservatism and Zionism. It is not an ethnic or religious label, but rather a descriptor of a particular worldview and its adherents—those who advocate aggressive, interventionist U.S. foreign policies in the service of advancing and protecting the strategic interests of the Israeli state, particularly its right-wing leadership. This worldview blends the Neoconservative emphasis on military power, regime change, and global hegemony with an uncritical alignment with Zionist geopolitical objectives, especially the containment and eventual dismantling of hostile regimes like Iran.

Zioconservatism is not a marginal ideology. It occupies significant space in the highest levels of American political, military, and religious institutions. It has shaped policy from Washington think tanks to Capitol Hill, from military campaigns in the Middle East to pulpit sermons across American Evangelical churches. Figures such as Senator Lindsey Graham and Senator Tom Cotton exemplify this alignment, consistently advocating military action against Iran while receiving robust political and financial backing from pro-Israel lobbying groups such as AIPAC. At the same time, large segments of the Evangelical Christian community, often unknowingly, serve as a powerful religious support base for Ziocon policies—anchoring their worldview in misinterpretations of biblical prophecy heavily influenced by the Scofield Reference Bible.

On Friday, June 13th, 2025, this ideology bore deadly fruit. Israel launched a massive and coordinated preemptive strike against Iran, targeting its nuclear facilities, air defenses, and military infrastructure. Iran responded swiftly and forcefully, resulting in hundreds of casualties on both sides and a rapid escalation that drew in neighboring states and alarmed global powers. The world awakened that day to what can now only be described as a full-scale Israel–Iran war, the most direct and sustained military confrontation between the two nations in modern history.

This paper argues that U.S. Ziocons played a central role in creating the conditions for this war—not only through policy decisions made in the immediate lead-up to

the conflict but through decades of shaping American foreign policy, cultivating bipartisan political loyalty, redirecting funding channels, and embedding themselves in theologically fueled narratives that presented military aggression as divine mandate. What emerged on June 13 was not a spontaneous eruption of hostility, but the logical outcome of a long-constructed ideological pathway. Understanding that pathway—and who built it—is necessary for any hope of future peace.

II. Historical Roots of Zioconservatism

To understand the emergence of Zioconservatism as a dominant ideological force in U.S. foreign policy, it is necessary to trace the evolution of its two primary components: Neoconservatism and Zionism, and how they converged into a unified worldview following major geopolitical shifts—especially after the events of 9/11. What began as distinct intellectual and political movements gradually merged into a powerful agenda that redefined American interventionism with the security needs of Israel at its core.

Origins of Neoconservatism: From Liberal Intellectuals to Hawks

Neoconservatism emerged in the mid-20th century as a reactionary movement among liberal intellectuals—many of them former Democrats—who became disillusioned with what they saw as the moral relativism of the New Left and the perceived weakness of U.S. foreign policy in confronting global Communism. Figures like Irving Kristol, Norman Podhoretz, and later Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz argued for a more assertive, values-driven foreign policy that would not hesitate to use military force to promote American ideals abroad.

Initially focused on resisting Soviet influence, Neoconservatives gradually shifted their focus in the post-Cold War era toward the Middle East, particularly in response to the rise of Islamic fundamentalism and perceived threats to U.S. allies such as Israel. Their hallmark became preemptive military intervention, regime change, and the promotion of Western-style democracy through the use of force—what they termed “benevolent hegemony.”

The Rise of Zionism in U.S. Geopolitical Strategy After 1967

Zionism, originally a Jewish nationalist movement aimed at establishing a homeland in Palestine, gained enormous traction as a geopolitical force in American policy following the 1967 Six-Day War, when Israel defeated multiple Arab states and emerged as the preeminent military power in the region. After this victory, U.S. policymakers increasingly viewed Israel not only as a democratic ally in an authoritarian region but as a strategic military asset capable of projecting American interests.

The U.S.-Israel relationship deepened in the 1970s and 1980s, aided by the rise of the pro-Israel lobbying group AIPAC and by a growing bloc of Christian Zionists who interpreted the survival and success of Israel as the fulfillment of biblical prophecy. By the late 20th century, Israel had become central to American foreign policy calculations in the Middle East, receiving more U.S. aid than any other country.

The Fusion in the Post-9/11 Era: Iraq, Iran, and Beyond

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, became the catalytic moment when Neoconservatism and Zionism formally merged into what this paper terms Zioconservatism. The Bush administration, heavily influenced by Neocon advisors like Wolfowitz, Cheney, Rumsfeld, and others, quickly adopted the doctrine of preventive war, starting with the invasion of Iraq in 2003 under the pretext of weapons of mass destruction and alleged links to terrorism.

Though Iraq had no operational ties to 9/11, it was nonetheless targeted as part of a broader Ziocon agenda to reshape the Middle East in ways that would ultimately serve Israeli strategic interests—most notably by eliminating regimes hostile to Israel and encircling Iran. During this period, Israel quietly supported the U.S. invasion of Iraq, while Neocon think tanks openly advocated for expanding military operations to Iran and Syria.

Key Documents and Intellectual Foundations

Several key documents illustrate the ideological consolidation of Zioconservatism:

1. "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm" (1996)
Written by American Neoconservatives for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, this paper advised a break from the land-for-peace strategy and called for the removal of Saddam Hussein as a first step toward reshaping the region. It laid the ideological groundwork for Israeli and U.S. policymakers to align more directly.
2. The Project for the New American Century (PNAC)
A Neoconservative think tank founded in 1997, PNAC called for the U.S. to take up the mantle of global leadership through military dominance. In its 2000 report *Rebuilding America's Defenses*, PNAC noted that a "catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor"—would be needed to mobilize public support for such transformations. That event came with 9/11, and the agenda was promptly set into motion.
3. Likud-Aligned Thinkers and U.S. Policymaking
Figures with close ideological ties to Israel's Likud Party—which opposes the creation of a Palestinian state and endorses a permanent Israeli military presence in contested territories—gained increasing influence in U.S. circles. The fusion of Neocon military aggression and Likud Zionism became institutionalized in both Republican and Democratic administrations, often under the guise of "shared democratic values."

Conclusion of Section

By the early 21st century, the historical streams of Neoconservatism and Zionism had merged into a coherent, deeply entrenched doctrine that defined U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. This Ziocon ideology created a template for endless conflict—one where war was not a failure of diplomacy but its intended outcome. The war that erupted on June 13, 2025, was not the result of a sudden breakdown but the culmination of these long-standing forces.

III. Who Are the Ziocons?

Zioconservatism is not a fringe ideology. It is a deeply embedded network of political actors, lobbying organizations, religious movements, and intellectual influencers who have helped shape U.S. foreign policy over the last several decades—especially in regard to the Middle East. Although not always coordinated in formal structure, these actors are bound together by a shared belief in American military dominance, unwavering support for Israel, and the view that diplomacy with nations like Iran is either naive or dangerous. The following sections identify the main components of the Ziocon coalition.

Politicians: Lindsey Graham, Tom Cotton, Mike Pompeo

Among the most visible and influential Ziocons in the U.S. political sphere are Senators Lindsey Graham and Tom Cotton, and former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo. These figures have consistently championed military solutions to geopolitical challenges—particularly with regard to Iran—and have expressed unconditional support for Israel, even when such support runs counter to international law or American strategic interests.

Lindsey Graham has made repeated calls for the bombing of Iran, supported regime change in Syria, and has actively worked to oppose any nuclear deal with Tehran, no matter how verifiable or limited. Tom Cotton has similarly advocated preemptive strikes on Iranian nuclear facilities and has received significant backing from pro-Israel political action committees. Mike Pompeo, during his tenure as Secretary of State, merged foreign policy with Christian Zionist theology, openly framing Israeli policy as aligned with divine providence.

These politicians rarely, if ever, question Israeli military actions—even when those actions result in civilian casualties or provoke regional destabilization. Instead, they serve as loudspeakers for a policy of escalation, reinforcing the idea that American power must be used to safeguard Israeli security, often at the expense of diplomacy, regional stability, and human life.

Think Tanks and Lobbying Groups: FDD, AEI, and AIPAC

Ziocon ideology is sustained and amplified through a network of think tanks and lobbying organizations that frame its goals in academic or policy-driven language, while exerting considerable influence over lawmakers.

The Foundation for Defense of Democracies (FDD) regularly publishes reports urging aggressive U.S. action against Iran, Hezbollah, and other entities perceived as threats to Israel. FDD presents itself as a neutral think tank but consistently aligns with Israeli interests and rejects diplomatic engagement with Iran as a legitimate strategy.

The American Enterprise Institute (AEI) has long served as a breeding ground for neoconservative thought, hosting figures who helped shape the case for the Iraq War and continue to push for regime change in Iran and elsewhere.

Most influential of all is AIPAC (American Israel Public Affairs Committee), the premier pro-Israel lobbying group in Washington. AIPAC does not openly advocate military strikes, but it consistently funds and supports candidates who back hardline, pro-Israel policies. AIPAC's enormous financial clout ensures that dissenting voices within Congress—those who question Israeli policy or urge diplomatic engagement with Iran—are marginalized or targeted for political replacement.

Media Influencers and Intellectuals

The ideological reach of Zioconservatism is bolstered by a range of media personalities, columnists, and public intellectuals who shape public opinion and elite discourse.

Writers and commentators at major outlets—ranging from *The Wall Street Journal* editorial page to cable news pundits—frequently echo Ziocon talking points: Iran as an existential threat, Israel as the only democracy in the region, and military action as the only rational response to perceived hostility.

These voices often avoid nuance, ignore Palestinian suffering, and frame every conflict in the region through the lens of good versus evil, democracy versus terrorism. While not all of these figures are self-identified neoconservatives or Zionists, their messaging reinforces the Ziocon worldview and helps make it politically palatable to a broader audience.

Evangelical Christians: The Theological Wing of Zioconservatism

Perhaps the most powerful—and most misunderstood—constituency within the Ziocon coalition is the Evangelical Christian community, particularly in the United States. Numbering in the tens of millions, these believers are among the most reliable supporters of Israeli military policy, often more so than many Jewish Americans.

Their support is not primarily political, but theological. Based on readings of the Scofield Reference Bible, many Evangelicals believe that the re-establishment of Israel in 1948 fulfilled biblical prophecy and that the defense of Israel is divinely mandated. For these believers, opposition to Israeli policy is not merely wrong—it is rebellion against God's will.

The problem, however, is that this theology is built on a misinterpretation of scripture. The Scofield Bible, published in 1909, introduced a framework known as Dispensationalism, which linked current geopolitical events to a rigid prophetic timeline. According to this view, modern Israel must be protected at all costs so that God's plan for the End Times can unfold. This includes the belief that any compromise on land or peace is a betrayal of God's covenant with the Jewish people.

What is often overlooked is that this theology contradicts the teachings of Jesus and the New Testament emphasis on peace, justice, and reconciliation. Yet it remains a dominant force in American churches, producing millions of voters who, with good intentions, consistently support militaristic policies that escalate violence rather than resolve it.

These Christians, sincere in their faith, are largely unaware of the doctrinal error embedded in their eschatology. They are taught that to bless Israel means to support its government unconditionally—no matter the human cost, no matter the political fallout. In this way, they unintentionally become the foot soldiers of a war-driven agenda they do not fully understand.

Conclusion of Section

The Ziocon coalition is broad and powerful, comprising hawkish politicians, well-funded think tanks, media propagandists, and religious believers whose theology has been shaped by early 20th-century dispensationalist doctrine. Together, they have created a political force that not only influences U.S. policy toward Israel and Iran but has systematically undermined efforts at diplomacy, stability, and peace in the Middle East. Identifying who these actors are—and how they operate—is the first step in challenging the destructive consequences of their agenda.

IV. Bernie Sanders Is Not a Ziocon

To avoid conflating the term *Ziocon* with ethnic or religious identity, it is essential to draw a clear distinction between Jewish identity, Zionism, and Zioconservatism. One of the most effective and instructive ways to make this distinction is through the example of Senator Bernie Sanders, a prominent Jewish-American political figure whose positions offer a sharp contrast to the Zioconservative ideology described in this paper.

Born into a working-class Jewish family in Brooklyn, Bernie Sanders' heritage is deeply rooted in the Jewish experience. His father was a Polish immigrant whose family perished in the Holocaust. Sanders has spoken often about how this background shaped his political worldview, fostering a strong commitment to social justice, equality, and the protection of human rights. Yet despite his heritage—and perhaps because of it—Sanders has emerged as one of the most consistent critics of Israeli military policy in the U.S. Senate.

Sanders' position is nuanced. He has repeatedly affirmed Israel's right to exist and to live in peace and security. However, he has also openly condemned Israel's occupation of Palestinian territories, its use of disproportionate military force, and its treatment of the Palestinian people. Unlike Ziocons, who treat any criticism of Israel as inherently antisemitic or a threat to U.S. interests, Sanders views critique as a necessary form of moral accountability, rooted in universal values of justice and human dignity.

In 2016 and again in 2020, Sanders called for conditioning U.S. aid to Israel on respect for human rights and international law—an idea that is anathema to Zioconservatives, who insist on unconditional support for Israel regardless of its actions. Sanders has also criticized the influence of AIPAC on American politics, calling attention to the way pro-Israel lobbying has silenced debate and skewed U.S. foreign policy in favor of militaristic solutions.

Most significantly, Sanders has been a consistent advocate of diplomatic engagement, not just with Israel and the Palestinians, but with adversarial nations like Iran. He opposed the Iraq War, supported the Iran nuclear deal (JCPOA), and has warned against reckless escalations that could lead to another disastrous Middle Eastern war. His foreign policy approach emphasizes restraint, multilateralism, and human rights, as opposed to the Ziocon model of preemption, regime change, and regional dominance.

The contrast is instructive: Bernie Sanders is Jewish by ethnicity, yet he is not a Zionist in the narrow political sense that aligns with Israel's right-wing agenda, nor is he remotely aligned with the Zioconservative impulse to use American power to enforce Israeli military supremacy in the region. This distinction illustrates that "Zionist" and "Ziocon" are not synonymous, and that ethnic or religious identity does not predetermine one's position on Middle Eastern policy.

In this way, Sanders serves as a moral and political counterpoint to the Ziocon agenda. He embodies a form of Jewish identity that is inclusive, critical, and oriented toward peace rather than domination. His example demonstrates that it is possible—indeed necessary—to reject the false binary imposed by Zioconservative rhetoric: that one must either support Israel without question or

be branded as antisemitic or anti-American. Sanders rejects this framing, and in doing so, opens a space for a more honest and principled conversation about what true peace and justice in the region might require.

By recognizing that critique of Israeli policy can come from within the Jewish community itself, and that such critique is often motivated by profound ethical and historical commitments, we begin to dismantle the simplistic logic that underlies Zioconservative propaganda. Sanders does not oppose Israel's existence—he opposes its militaristic excesses. He does not oppose American power—he opposes its abuse in the service of narrow ideological goals. In doing so, he offers a model of responsible leadership that should be taken seriously in any attempt to move beyond the destructive impasse imposed by the Ziocon worldview.

V. Funding the War: The Role of AIPAC

At the heart of the American political establishment's near-total alignment with Israeli military policy lies the influence of one organization more than any other: the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). Although it presents itself as a bipartisan, pro-Israel advocacy group focused on strengthening the U.S.-Israel relationship, AIPAC has evolved into a political gatekeeper that exerts immense pressure on lawmakers—both Democrats and Republicans—to adopt policies that mirror the priorities of Israel's right-wing leadership. Through strategic use of campaign contributions, lobbying pressure, and media influence, AIPAC has helped to build the political architecture that enabled the war of June 13, 2025.

AIPAC's Financial Influence on Both Parties

Though officially a nonprofit and thus restricted from directly funding candidates, AIPAC's associated political action committees (PACs) and informal donor networks have become some of the most powerful sources of campaign financing in American politics. In recent election cycles, tens of millions of dollars have flowed through AIPAC-aligned PACs to candidates across the political spectrum, with a laser-like focus on foreign policy litmus tests—particularly support for

Israeli military actions, opposition to Iran, and resistance to any meaningful constraints on U.S. aid to Israel.

AIPAC has demonstrated a ruthless pragmatism in this regard: while once associated more heavily with hawkish Democrats, the organization has increasingly shifted toward supporting pro-Israel Republicans, especially as younger Democratic voters and lawmakers have begun to question U.S. complicity in Israeli policies toward Palestinians. Nonetheless, AIPAC has continued to court centrists in both parties, ensuring that the official party platforms remain committed to Israel's security and "right to self-defense," regardless of what actions that may entail.

Funding Hawks, Targeting Critics

The clearest demonstration of AIPAC's influence is its selective financial targeting. Politicians who express even modest criticism of Israeli policy often find themselves cut off from major donors, attacked in primary campaigns, or smeared in media campaigns funded by AIPAC-aligned groups. Members of Congress who have advocated for conditioning aid to Israel, calling for ceasefires in Gaza, or supporting Palestinian rights have been subjected to intense backlash, often portrayed as "anti-Israel" or even "antisemitic," despite clear evidence to the contrary.

By contrast, staunchly pro-Israel, pro-interventionist candidates—regardless of their other views—are rewarded with large donations and public endorsements. Figures like Lindsey Graham and Tom Cotton benefit not only from the direct support of AIPAC-aligned networks, but also from the media narratives shaped by the organization's broader ecosystem of think tanks and advocacy groups. The result is a political environment in which hawkishness toward Iran and uncritical support for Israeli military operations are seen not as controversial but as mainstream, default positions.

Manufacturing Bipartisan Consensus

One of AIPAC's greatest successes has been its ability to cultivate a false bipartisan consensus around pro-Israel policy, particularly as it pertains to military aid and

Middle East conflict. Through annual policy conferences, private briefings, and ongoing lobbying efforts, AIPAC has created the illusion of national unity on issues where genuine public division exists.

This consensus has proven remarkably durable, even in the face of changing public opinion. Polls increasingly show that a majority of Americans, especially younger voters and Democrats, support diplomatic engagement with Iran, favor accountability for Israeli human rights violations, and want a more balanced U.S. approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Yet this shift is barely reflected in congressional behavior, in large part because AIPAC enforces political orthodoxy at the level of campaign finance and donor access.

AIPAC's bipartisan veneer also serves a strategic function: it makes dissent politically radioactive. When both parties appear to agree on an issue, anyone who deviates from that consensus can be cast as an extremist or outsider, regardless of how measured or evidence-based their position may be. Thus, the bipartisan support is not a sign of organic political convergence—it is the product of engineering, intimidation, and financial leverage.

The Chilling Effect on Dissent

Perhaps the most pernicious impact of AIPAC's dominance is the chilling effect it creates on political dissent. Lawmakers who privately question the morality or efficacy of endless military aid to Israel often remain silent, fearing political backlash. Journalists tread carefully when reporting on Israel-Palestine issues, wary of being labeled biased or antisemitic. Even think tanks and universities that rely on donor funding avoid crossing certain red lines, resulting in a constricted intellectual and moral space around U.S. policy in the Middle East.

This suppression of open debate is not a minor issue—it is fundamentally incompatible with democratic governance. A functioning democracy requires that policies be subject to rigorous scrutiny, especially when those policies involve war, foreign aid, and alliances with nations accused of human rights violations. Yet AIPAC's financial and institutional power has helped to shield Zionism

from accountability, silencing critical voices and promoting a culture of conformity around issues that deserve controversy.

Conclusion of Section

The war that erupted on June 13, 2025, was not simply the result of Israeli calculations or Iranian provocations. It was the product of a long-standing and well-funded campaign to ensure that the U.S. government would back Israel unconditionally—even when that backing led to war. AIPAC’s financial machinery, its bipartisan manipulation of Congress, and its ability to crush dissent have made it a central actor in the rise of Zioconservatism. Until that influence is acknowledged and confronted, the path to peace in the Middle East will remain obstructed—not by enemies abroad, but by political engineering at home.

VI. Friday the 13th: The War That Was Made Inevitable

On the morning of Friday, June 13, 2025, the world awoke to headlines of a coordinated Israeli military assault on Iranian territory—an act of war that had long been telegraphed but never fully anticipated. Under the code name Operation Rising Lion, Israel launched a massive aerial and cyber offensive targeting Iran’s nuclear enrichment sites at Natanz and Fordow, IRGC command centers, missile storage facilities, and communication infrastructure. Israeli jets, drones, and cyber units executed the most expansive attack on Iranian soil in history. Within hours, Iran responded with Operation True Promise III, unleashing hundreds of drones and ballistic missiles against Israeli military bases and cities. Casualty reports quickly climbed into the hundreds. By the end of the day, a full-scale regional war had begun.

The specific timing—Friday the 13th—seemed almost symbolic: a day historically associated with omens and calamity, now marked as the moment Ziocon strategy reached its violent apex. But this war did not arise spontaneously. It was not merely the result of failed negotiations or miscalculation. It was, in many ways, the culmination of a long-standing ideological commitment to preemptive

warfare, regime-change objectives, and permanent military dominance in the Middle East.

How the Escalation Fits Ziocon Strategy

Zioconservatism, at its core, is not about diplomacy, restraint, or conflict resolution. It is a strategy of perpetual conflict, justified by the perceived necessity of defeating enemies before they pose an existential threat. Israel's long-held belief in the doctrine of "Begin Doctrine"—the right to strike enemy nuclear capabilities before they become operational—has been a pillar of Israeli military thinking since the 1981 bombing of Iraq's Osirak reactor and the 2007 attack on Syria's Al-Kibar facility. But the 2025 strike against Iran went far beyond those operations in both scale and consequence.

Ziocon strategists have consistently argued that Iran cannot be allowed to develop nuclear capabilities, not because of what Iran has done, but because of what it might do in the future. This is the logic of preemption, which has replaced traditional deterrence or containment as the dominant framework in Washington and Tel Aviv. The war launched on June 13 was not an act of desperation; it was a deliberate enforcement of Ziocon policy goals: destroy Iranian capacity, destabilize the regime, and provoke a response that justifies continued escalation.

In doing so, Zioconservatism follows a recognizable pattern:

- Create red lines that are deliberately vague and strategically unmeetable.
- Sabotage diplomatic efforts that might defuse tensions or offer mutual verification.
- Frame military action as defensive, even when conducted unilaterally and preemptively.
- Trigger a broader conflict that can then be used to eliminate regional resistance to U.S.-Israeli dominance.

Each of these steps played out precisely in the lead-up to June 13, 2025.

Statements and Policy Support from Ziocons

In the weeks and months preceding the attack, U.S. Ziocons were actively preparing the narrative groundwork. Senators Lindsey Graham and Tom Cotton both made public statements calling for the United States to “stand ready to assist Israel if Iran crosses the line,” even as U.S. intelligence assessments indicated Iran remained years away from a nuclear weapon. Think tanks like the Foundation for Defense of Democracies published op-eds and reports urging Israel to take “decisive action,” warning that time was running out. Meanwhile, AIPAC and its affiliated PACs ramped up pressure on Congress to preemptively back Israeli military action, portraying any restraint as betrayal.

Former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo made rounds on conservative media, framing the potential Israeli strike not just as justified, but as “ordained”—a fulfillment of Western duty to confront evil regimes. Evangelical pastors took up the message from the pulpit, preparing their congregations to see the coming war not as tragedy, but as prophecy fulfilled.

This alignment of political, intellectual, and religious voices ensured that when the war began, there would be no meaningful opposition in Washington. Ziocon strategy requires not only war, but the appearance of inevitability, and in this, they succeeded.

The Failure (or Sabotage) of Diplomacy with Iran

The last diplomatic attempt to avert conflict came in May 2025, when European intermediaries attempted to restart a modified version of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). Iran signaled tentative openness to returning to compliance in exchange for a phased rollback of sanctions. But at that very moment, U.S. Congressional leaders—under pressure from AIPAC and Ziocon donors—moved to preempt any executive diplomacy by introducing legislation that would automatically sanction any U.S. agency that engaged with Iranian officials outside pre-approved military and intelligence channels.

Israeli intelligence officials, reportedly briefed on the confidential European talks, accelerated planning for Operation Rising Lion. Within weeks, the window for diplomacy closed.

This was not failure—it was sabotage. Diplomacy was not given time or trust. Instead, the Ziocon worldview prevailed: peace is weakness, negotiation is appeasement, and war is purification. These assumptions were not debated; they were enforced.

Conclusion of Section

The war of June 13, 2025, was not a surprise. It was a logical and foreseen consequence of a geopolitical ideology that had long abandoned the tools of diplomacy, restraint, and mutual recognition. For Zioconservatives, war is not the last resort; it is the means by which order is imposed, enemies are eliminated, and history is made. The tragedy is not that war broke out—but that it was prepared, promoted, and politically protected for years before it erupted.

The blood spilled on Friday the 13th was the result not of miscalculation, but of intentional design, funded, enabled, and justified by those in the United States who believed that military dominance and moral clarity are best expressed in fire and ash.

VII. The Evangelical Blind Spot

One of the most powerful yet underexamined drivers of unconditional support for Israeli military action in the United States is the Evangelical Christian community, particularly its dispensationalist and premillennialist wings. Numbering in the tens of millions, Evangelicals are not marginal players in American politics—they are a dominant voting bloc, especially within the Republican Party, and their support for Israel has become not only a political but a theological imperative. This widespread support is rooted in a specific interpretation of biblical prophecy, one that mistakenly equates modern political Israel with the fulfillment of divine promises in Scripture.

This is the Evangelical blind spot: the belief that in defending every action of the modern Israeli state, they are serving the will of God. In reality, this theological misreading has been weaponized politically, turning millions of sincere Christians into unwitting enablers of permanent war in the Middle East.

Belief in Prophetic Fulfillment

At the heart of the Evangelical attachment to Israel is the conviction that the founding of the State of Israel in 1948 marked the beginning of the fulfillment of end-times prophecy. According to this view—heavily influenced by the Scofield Reference Bible (1909) and popularized by books like *The Late Great Planet Earth* and *Left Behind*—the Jewish people’s return to the Holy Land is a prophetic event that must be supported at all costs.

Evangelicals are taught that supporting Israel is equivalent to obeying God's command, and that any opposition to Israel—whether from Muslims, secularists, or even peace-oriented Christians—is opposition to God’s plan. This is often reinforced by a misreading of Genesis 12:3: “I will bless those who bless you, and whoever curses you I will curse,” where “you” is taken to refer not to Abraham’s spiritual descendants, but to the modern political entity of Israel.

The result is a religious worldview that grants Israel a divinely protected status, immune from criticism and beyond accountability—even when it engages in actions that are morally and politically indefensible, such as the bombing of civilian areas, the expansion of illegal settlements, or the enforcement of apartheid-like policies against Palestinians.

Theological Error and Political Weaponization

This interpretation of Scripture is not only theologically weak—it is politically devastating. The theology of the New Testament makes clear that God's promises are fulfilled not through nations or bloodlines, but through Christ and the global community of believers. Jesus himself denounced militarism, ethnic exceptionalism, and the kind of vengeance politics that characterize modern statecraft. The Kingdom of God, as preached by Christ, is not a geopolitical entity—it is a spiritual reality marked by love, justice, and peace.

Yet, by conflating ancient Israel with the modern State of Israel, and by interpreting political conflicts through the lens of eschatological urgency, Evangelical leaders have created a moral vacuum in which violence is excused, war is welcomed, and the suffering of others is dismissed as “birth pangs” of prophecy.

This error has not remained theological; it has been deliberately weaponized by political actors. Pro-Israel lobbying groups, including AIPAC, have long recognized the strategic value of Evangelical support. Israeli politicians frequently speak to Evangelical audiences in the U.S., praising them as Israel’s “best friends.” Christian Zionist organizations like Christians United for Israel (CUFI) mobilize tens of thousands of voters and raise millions of dollars annually—not to build peace, but to strengthen the Israeli military, lobby for sanctions against Iran, and oppose any political solution that would involve territorial concessions.

In this dynamic, Evangelicals are not driving policy—they are being used by it. Their theological naivety is exploited to reinforce the political status quo: endless U.S. military aid to Israel, diplomatic cover at the United Nations, and aggressive foreign policy choices that increase the likelihood of war.

Christian Zionism and Unconditional Defense of Israeli Policy

The movement known as Christian Zionism represents the organized, theological backbone of this blind spot. It holds that modern Israel must not only exist, but expand and dominate its region in order to fulfill biblical prophecy. In this framework, peace agreements, territorial compromise, or critique of Israeli policy are seen as betrayals—not of political judgment, but of divine will.

Christian Zionists are often unaware that their theology diverges sharply from the historic Christian tradition, including both Catholic and Protestant teachings. Early church fathers did not equate prophetic fulfillment with geopolitical Israel, and the Reformers rejected any notion of national ethnic supremacy in God's covenant. It was only in the 19th and early 20th centuries, with the rise of dispensationalism, that these ideas gained traction—ideas that have since morphed into a powerful political force through mass media, televangelism, and church-based activism.

In supporting Israel unconditionally, many Christian Zionists also inadvertently support perpetual war. Few realize that under their theology, the ultimate outcome of the end-times scenario is not peace for Israel, but its engulfment in the battle of Armageddon—followed by mass destruction and conversion. This bizarre contradiction—supporting a nation only to expect its destruction—highlights the confusion and inconsistency at the heart of the Christian Zionist worldview.

Conclusion of Section

The Evangelical blind spot is not malicious; it is tragic. It arises from sincere belief, nurtured by poor theology, and sustained by political manipulation. Evangelicals, many of whom long for peace and righteousness, have been led to believe that supporting Israeli military power is a spiritual duty. In truth, they have been conscripted into an ideological war that neither serves Christ nor advances justice.

Until this error is confronted—through theological correction, scriptural reexamination, and moral courage—the Evangelical community will continue to act as a religious engine of Ziocon policy, giving political cover and moral legitimacy to wars that violate the very gospel they claim to uphold.

VIII. Consequences

The war that erupted on June 13, 2025, was not a limited strike or a passing flare-up in an already volatile region—it was a rupture in the global order whose reverberations will be felt for decades. What began as an Israeli preemptive assault on Iranian nuclear facilities escalated almost instantly into a regional conflict involving multiple state and non-state actors. The consequences, both immediate and long-term, are catastrophic—not just for the Middle East, but for the United States and the world. The Zioconservative vision that helped produce this war has not only failed in its strategic objectives but has ushered in a level of instability and suffering that exposes the moral and political bankruptcy of its doctrine.

Escalation of Conflict in the Middle East

The first and most obvious consequence of the war has been the regional explosion of armed conflict. Iran's retaliation, while partially intercepted by Israeli and American defense systems, nevertheless struck multiple sites in Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Jerusalem, causing significant infrastructure damage and loss of life. Hezbollah launched thousands of rockets from Lebanon, while Iranian-backed militias in Iraq and Syria opened new fronts against both Israeli and U.S. targets. The Red Sea and Persian Gulf became war zones, threatening global shipping and oil markets.

The conflict also destabilized key regional governments, forcing states like Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt into precarious positions. While most regimes publicly condemned Iran, none were willing to provide the level of support to Israel that U.S. Zionists had predicted. The war also fractured the fragile normalization efforts that had been underway between Israel and several Arab nations under the Abraham Accords framework. Instead of consolidating peace, the Zionist strategy has reactivated old hostilities and drawn new lines of enmity.

Civilian Deaths and International Destabilization

As always in war, civilians bore the brunt. In Iran, the initial Israeli strikes killed hundreds of people, including scientists, technicians, and civilians living near military sites. Hospitals in Tehran and Isfahan were overwhelmed. In Israel, retaliatory strikes by Iran and Hezbollah caused mass panic, with families fleeing urban centers, schools closed indefinitely, and civilian shelters operating at full capacity.

Palestinian territories, especially Gaza, suffered new bombardments under the pretext of rooting out Iranian-aligned militias. The cycle of collective punishment intensified, with entire neighborhoods reduced to rubble. The humanitarian crisis deepened, and global aid agencies warned of impending famine and medical collapse.

Internationally, the war triggered mass protests in European, Latin American, African, and Asian capitals. Countries with large Muslim populations experienced

riots and anti-American sentiment not seen since the height of the Iraq War. Anti-Israel demonstrations, some peaceful and others violent, erupted across college campuses, city centers, and even inside Western legislatures.

The war also sent shockwaves through the global economy. Oil prices surged above \$180 per barrel. Global shipping was disrupted. Stock markets plunged. Fragile post-COVID economies were thrust into renewed recession, and developing nations found themselves unable to import critical resources. What was intended by Ziocons as a display of strength has instead revealed systemic fragility on a global scale.

Breakdown of Nuclear Agreements and Diplomacy

One of the most lasting and dangerous consequences of the war has been the total collapse of diplomatic frameworks—particularly the nuclear agreements with Iran. The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), already hanging by a thread, is now dead. Iran has announced its withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), citing the Israeli attack as proof that legal compliance invites destruction.

Without international oversight, Iran has declared that it will accelerate its nuclear program “without restriction.” Whether this announcement is bluster or fact, the practical result is the same: the international community no longer has a mechanism to verify, limit, or delay Iranian nuclear development. Even moderate factions within the Iranian regime have lost credibility, replaced by hardliners who now speak openly of revenge, martyrdom, and regional hegemony.

The diplomatic void has extended beyond Iran. Russia and China, seizing the moment, have moved swiftly to offer military and technological support to Tehran, thereby turning the conflict into a proxy war between great powers. The United Nations Security Council has become paralyzed, and international law once again revealed as powerless in the face of unilateral militarism.

Long-Term Damage to American Global Standing and Moral Authority

The United States, long perceived as a global superpower with at least nominal commitment to diplomacy, peacekeeping, and human rights, has suffered perhaps

the greatest long-term damage. While not the initial aggressor in the war, the U.S. is viewed globally as Israel's enabler and financier—a perception well-earned through decades of military aid, diplomatic shielding, and political rhetoric echoing Ziocon priorities.

This war has stripped away the last illusions of American impartiality in the Middle East. It has emboldened rival powers, alienated allies, and embittered billions. The soft power built painstakingly since World War II—in the form of cultural diplomacy, economic partnerships, and moral leadership—has been sacrificed for the sake of an ideological project that most of the world rejects.

At home, the political cost is also profound. As more Americans awaken to the role of U.S. policy in enabling this war, the backlash will grow—against the politicians who voted blindly for aid packages, against the Evangelical leaders who claimed divine endorsement, and against the institutions that failed to prevent it. The credibility of both parties, particularly those who received AIPAC support or echoed Ziocon talking points, will be called into question.

This is not merely a foreign policy failure. It is a spiritual, moral, and civilizational crisis, in which a once-great nation has allowed its decisions to be guided not by justice, peace, or prudence, but by an ideology of dominance wrapped in theological error and enforced through political money.

Conclusion of Section

The war of June 13, 2025, has brought devastation not only to the people of Israel and Iran but to the very fabric of international stability. It has laid bare the costs of allowing an unaccountable ideological movement to shape foreign policy. The civilian death toll continues to rise. Diplomatic pathways are in ruins. America's standing is diminished, and the world has grown more dangerous, more divided, and more hopeless. These are the consequences—not of fate, not of necessity, but of calculated choices made by those who believed that war was the path to peace.

IX. What Needs to Be Confronted

If there is to be any hope of reversing the damage caused by the war of June 13, 2025—and of preventing future wars born from the same ideological seed—then several hard truths must be confronted directly. These truths are not merely political or strategic; they are moral, cultural, and even theological in nature. The rise of Zioconservatism and its grip on U.S. foreign policy did not occur in a vacuum. It was made possible by a culture of false choices, ideological loyalty, theological error, and political coercion. Each of these must be dismantled with clarity and courage.

The False Binary of “Support Israel or Be Antisemitic”

One of the most powerful rhetorical tools used by Ziocons and their institutional allies has been the creation and enforcement of a false binary: that any criticism of Israeli policy—particularly its military aggression or treatment of Palestinians—is inherently antisemitic. This equation is not only intellectually dishonest; it is morally manipulative and politically dangerous.

Criticism of state policy is a hallmark of a free society. To critique the United States does not make one anti-American; to challenge the Chinese Communist Party does not make one anti-Chinese. Likewise, to criticize the Israeli state is not to attack the Jewish people. Indeed, many of the most principled critics of Israeli militarism—figures such as Noam Chomsky, Norman Finkelstein, and even Jewish members of the Knesset—are themselves Jewish. Their voices are often silenced or smeared precisely because they shatter the illusion that support for Israel must be monolithic and unconditional.

This binary is not just incorrect—it has been used as a weapon to silence debate, suppress dissent, and punish truth-tellers. It has created a culture in which journalists are afraid to report accurately, politicians are afraid to vote their conscience, and citizens are afraid to speak their minds. If we are to move forward, this rhetorical trap must be exposed and rejected. Antisemitism is real and evil, but conflating it with criticism of a government is itself a form of intellectual cowardice—and an insult to the very concept of justice.

The Corruption of U.S. Foreign Policy Through Ideological Loyalty

American foreign policy should serve one purpose: the defense and advancement of the national interest, guided by the principles of peace, justice, and prudence. But Zioconservatism has subverted that mandate, replacing it with ideological loyalty to a specific foreign agenda—an agenda that prioritizes Israel’s maximalist security demands, often at the expense of broader regional stability and U.S. strategic coherence.

This is not simply a matter of poor judgment; it is a matter of corruption—not always in the legal sense, but certainly in the institutional and moral sense. Think tanks write policy to please donors. Legislators vote based on campaign contributions rather than evidence. Presidential candidates travel to speak at AIPAC conferences and pledge total allegiance to Israel, while making no such pledges to their own constituents.

The result is a foreign policy that does not reflect American interests, nor does it reflect American values. It reflects the ideology of a small but powerful network of donors, operatives, and political actors who have succeeded in aligning U.S. military and diplomatic power with an increasingly aggressive and isolated vision of Israeli security. This alignment has cost American lives, drained American resources, and destroyed America’s moral credibility on the world stage.

The Need for Theological Clarity Within the Evangelical Community

Among the most tragic enablers of this destructive policy framework has been the American Evangelical Church. With good intentions but flawed theology, millions of Evangelicals have come to believe that supporting every decision of the modern Israeli government is not only wise but spiritually required. They have been taught that doing so fulfills biblical prophecy, invokes God’s blessing, and hastens the return of Christ.

But these teachings are not found in the Gospels. They are found in the footnotes of the Scofield Reference Bible, in speculative end-times fiction, and in the sermons of pastors more influenced by Zionist lobbying groups than by Christ’s own words. Theological error has become political orthodoxy, and in so doing, the

Evangelical community has been co-opted into a war agenda that has nothing to do with the Prince of Peace.

If Evangelicals are to reclaim their prophetic role in the world—not as cheerleaders for war, but as witnesses for truth, justice, and reconciliation—then they must undergo a painful but necessary reckoning. This will require re-examining long-held beliefs, confronting uncomfortable truths, and rediscovering the Jesus who wept over Jerusalem, who warned of false prophets, and who called his followers to be peacemakers, not empire-builders.

Reining in Lobbyist Influence on War Policy

Finally, there can be no lasting reform without confronting the outsized influence of lobbyist money in shaping U.S. war policy. Organizations like AIPAC, and the network of PACs and donors aligned with Ziocon interests, have turned campaign financing into a tool of foreign policy manipulation. They fund hawks, punish dissenters, and engineer bipartisan consensus on positions that the American public does not support and that violate international law.

This influence is not merely persuasive—it is coercive, and it undermines the very foundations of democratic accountability. No policy should be off-limits for debate. No foreign government should have veto power over U.S. decisions. No lobby should be able to override the judgment of the American people.

Reform is possible. Public financing of campaigns, transparency in lobbying, and a cultural shift toward open debate and civic courage are all essential. But none of these will happen unless the public first recognizes the problem and demands change.

Conclusion of Section

The war of June 13, 2025, did not emerge solely from foreign threats—it emerged from domestic failures: the failure to challenge false narratives, the failure to guard against ideological capture, the failure to teach theological truth, and the failure to protect foreign policy from corporate and lobbyist control.

If America is to recover from this war—not only politically, but spiritually—it must confront these failures head-on. It must reject the binary, reclaim its conscience, reform its institutions, and refuse to allow ideology, whether secular or religious, to drive it into another cycle of bloodshed in the name of righteousness. Peace is not only possible—it is imperative. But it begins with honesty, courage, and repentance.

X. Conclusion

The war that erupted on Friday, June 13, 2025, was not an accident of diplomacy, nor the result of unforeseen provocation. It was the predictable culmination of decades of ideology-driven foreign policy, shaped by a powerful coalition of actors whom this paper identifies as *Ziocons*—those who combine neoconservative interventionism with unconditional support for the geopolitical aims of the Israeli state. Their influence over American foreign policy has been profound, bipartisan, and largely unchallenged. The consequences have been catastrophic.

We began by defining *Ziocon* not as an ethnic or religious label, but as a political-ideological identity shared by politicians, think tanks, religious movements, and lobbying organizations. This network promotes a worldview in which the use of military force is not a last resort but a preferred strategy, particularly when deployed in defense of Israeli interests in the Middle East. It resists diplomacy, undermines international law, distorts theological teachings, and silences dissent under the guise of loyalty, patriotism, or faith.

The strategic cost of this worldview has been the erosion of America's global credibility, the destruction of diplomatic norms, and the escalation of regional wars that entangle the U.S. in conflicts that do not serve its national interest. The war between Israel and Iran has now drawn in multiple regional actors, devastated civilian populations, and plunged the world into a new phase of instability. At home, it has further degraded the integrity of American political institutions, fueled public disillusionment, and exposed the extent to which money and theology can be manipulated to sustain endless war.

The moral cost is even higher. Zioconservatism has turned justice into vengeance, peace into provocation, and spiritual conviction into political weaponry. It has conditioned a generation of American Christians to conflate fidelity to Christ with loyalty to a foreign nation-state. It has trained political leaders to treat military escalation as inevitability and dissent as betrayal. It has used the memory of past atrocities—particularly the Holocaust—not to promote peace, but to justify new cycles of violence.

This is a moment that demands reckoning. The time has come to rethink both the doctrine and the policy. Theologically, Evangelicals must confront the deep error that underlies their support for a state-based eschatology that Jesus never preached. Politically, Americans must demand a foreign policy rooted not in ideological servitude, but in sober analysis, ethical restraint, and the long-neglected principle of non-intervention. Legislators must confront the influence of lobbyist money, and voters must be willing to elect leaders who are not afraid to speak the truth—even when that truth defies sacred narratives.

If we fail to do so, we will continue to stumble into wars that destroy lives, dishonor God, and bankrupt our nation—financially, morally, and spiritually. The war of June 13 should not be remembered as merely another chapter in an ancient conflict. It should be remembered as the moment we saw, with undeniable clarity, what happens when ideology is allowed to override truth, conscience, and wisdom.

The question is not whether we will have another war.

The question is whether we will finally decide to break the cycle.

References

1. Youvan, D.C. (2025). *Gospel or Revelation: Which John Do We Pick in Israel's Friday the 13th War?* ResearchGate.
<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18820.64647>
2. Youvan, D.C. (2025). *Shadow Over the Desert: A Jungian Reflection on Israel's Friday the 13th War.* ResearchGate.
<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.30230.46404>
3. Project for the New American Century. (2000). *Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century.* Washington, D.C.
4. Perle, R., Feith, D., & Wurmser, D. (1996). *A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm.* Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies.
5. Kristol, I. (1995). *Neoconservatism: The Autobiography of an Idea.* The Free Press.
6. Scofield, C.I. (1909). *The Scofield Reference Bible.* Oxford University Press.
7. Finkelstein, N.G. (2005). *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History.* University of California Press.
8. Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance.* Metropolitan Books.
9. Christians United for Israel (CUFI). (2023). *Annual Impact Report.*
<https://www.cufi.org/>
10. Foundation for Defense of Democracies (FDD). (2025). *Policy Briefs on Iran and the Middle East.* <https://www.fdd.org/>
11. AIPAC. (2024). *Lobbying Reports and Congressional Scorecards.*
<https://www.aipac.org/>
12. Sanders, B. (2019). *Where We Go from Here: Two Years in the Resistance.* Thomas Dunne Books.

13. United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. (2025). *Report on the Collapse of the JCPOA and the Escalation of Israeli-Iranian Hostilities*. UNODA Briefing Papers.

