

"Take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties." — James Madison

①

James Madison, often referred to as the "Father of the Constitution," once predicted that the Bill of Rights would become mere "parchment barrier," words on paper ignored by successive generations of Americans.

How right he was.

Although Madison initially felt that the inclusion of a bill of rights in the originally ratified Constitution was unnecessary to its success, Thomas Jefferson persuaded him that "a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, & what no just government should refuse, or rest on inferences."

The Bill of Rights drafted by Madison—the first ten amendments to the Constitution—was a document so revolutionary at the time that it would come to be viewed as the epitome of American liberty. The rights of the people reflected in those ten amendments encapsulated much of Madison's views about government, the corrupting influence of power, and the need for safeguards against tyranny.

Madison's writings speak volumes to the present constitutional crisis in the country.

Read them and weep.

*"The accumulation of all powers, Legislative, Executive, and Judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."* — James Madison

*"The people are the only legitimate fountain of power, and it is from them that the constitutional charter, under which the several branches of government hold their power, is derived."* — James Madison

*"If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself."* — James Madison

*"A standing military force, with an overgrown Executive will not long be safe companions to liberty. The means of defence against foreign danger have been always the instruments of tyranny at home."* — James Madison

*"Wherever the real power in a Government lies, there is the danger of oppression."* — James Madison

*"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance: And a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives."* — James Madison

*"I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations."* — James Madison

In the years since the founders laid their lives on the line to pursue the dream of individual freedom and self-government, big government has grown bigger and the rights of the citizenry have grown smaller.

However, there are certain principles—principles that every American should know—which undergird the American system of government and form the basis of our freedoms.

The following seven principles are a good starting point for understanding what free government is really all about.

2

**First, the maxim that power corrupts is an absolute truth.** Realizing this, those who drafted the Constitution and the Bill of Rights held one principle sacrosanct: a distrust of all who hold governmental power. As James Madison proclaimed, "All men having power ought to be distrusted to a certain degree." Moreover, in questions of power, Thomas Jefferson warned, "Let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution." As such, those who drafted our founding documents would see today's government as an out-of-control, unmanageable beast.

**The second principle is that governments primarily exist to secure rights, an idea that is central to constitutionalism.** In appointing the government as the guardian of the people's rights, the people give it only certain, enumerated powers, which are laid out in a written constitution. The idea of a written constitution actualizes the two great themes of the Declaration of Independence: consent and protection of equal rights. Thus, the purpose of constitutionalism is to limit governmental power and ensure that the government performs its basic function: to preserve and protect our rights, especially our unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and our civil liberties. Unfortunately, the government today has discarded this principle and now sees itself as our master, not our servant. The obvious next step, unless we act soon, is tyranny.

**The third principle revolves around the belief that no one is above the law, not even those who make the law.** This is termed rule of law. Richard Nixon's statement, "When the President does it, that means it is not illegal," would have been an anathema to the Framers of the Constitution. If all people possess equal rights, the people who live under the laws must be allowed to participate in making those laws. By that same token, those who make the laws must live under the laws they make.

**Fourth, separation of powers ensures that no single authority is entrusted with all the powers of government.** People are not perfect, whether they are in government or out of it. As history makes clear, those in power tend to abuse it. The government is thus divided into three co-equal branches: legislative, executive and judicial. Placing all three powers in the same branch of government was considered the very definition of tyranny. The fact that the president today has dictatorial powers would have been considered an offense to every principle for which the Framers took their revolutionary stand.

**Fifth, a system of checks and balances, essential if a constitutional government is to succeed, strengthens the separation of powers and prevents legislative despotism.** Such checks and balances include dividing Congress into two houses, with different constituencies, term lengths, sizes and functions; granting the president a limited veto power over congressional legislation; and appointing an independent judiciary capable of reviewing ordinary legislation in light of the written Constitution, which is referred to as "judicial review." The Framers feared that Congress could abuse its powers and potentially emerge as the tyrannous branch because it had the power to tax. But they did not anticipate the emergence of presidential powers as they have come to dominate modern government or the inordinate influence of corporate powers on governmental decision-making. Indeed, as recent academic studies now indicate, we are now ruled by a monied oligarchy that serves itself and not "we the people."

**Sixth, representation allows the people to have a voice in government by sending elected representatives to do their bidding while avoiding the need of each and every citizen to vote on every issue considered by government.** In a country as large as the United States, it is not feasible to have direct participation in governmental affairs. Hence, we have a representative government. If the people don't agree with how their representatives are conducting themselves, they can and should vote them out. However, as the citizenry has grown lazy and been distracted by the entertainment spectacles of modern society, government bureaucrats churn out numerous laws each year resulting in average citizens being rendered lawbreakers and jailed for what used to be considered normal behavior.

**Finally, federalism is yet another constitutional device to limit the power of government by dividing power and, thus, preventing tyranny.** In America, the levels of government generally break down into federal, state and local branches (which further divide into counties and towns or cities). Because local and particular interests differ from place to place, such interests are better handled at a more intimate level by local governments, not a bureaucratic national government. Remarking on the benefits of the American tradition of local self-government in the 1830s, the French historian Alexis de Tocqueville observed: "Local institutions are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they put it within the people's reach; they teach people to appreciate its peaceful enjoyment and accustom them to make use of it. Without local institutions a nation may give itself a free government, but it has not got the spirit of liberty."

These seven vital principles have been largely forgotten in recent years, obscured by the haze of a centralized government, a citizenry that no longer thinks analytically, and schools that don't adequately teach our young people about their history and their rights.

Yet here's the rub: while Americans wander about in their brainwashed states, their "government of the people, by the people and for the people" has largely been taken away from them.

The answer: get un-brainwashed.

Learn your rights.

Stand up for the founding principles.

Make your voice and your vote count for more than just political posturing.

Never cease to vociferously protest the erosion of your freedoms at the local and national level.

Most of all, do these things today.

If we wait until the votes have all been counted or hang our hopes on our particular candidate to win and fix what's wrong with the country, "we the people" will continue to lose.

Whether we ever realize it not, the enemy is not across party lines, as they would have us believe. It has us surrounded on all sides.

Even so, we're not yet defeated.

We could still overcome our oppressors if we cared enough to join forces and launch a militant nonviolent revolution—a people's revolution that starts locally and trickles upwards—but that will take some doing.

It will mean turning our backs on the political jousting contests taking place at all levels of government and rejecting their appointed jesters as false prophets. It will mean not allowing ourselves to be corralled like cattle and branded with political labels that have no meaning anymore. It will mean recognizing that all the evils that surround us today—endless wars, drone strikes, invasive surveillance, militarized police, poverty, asset forfeiture schemes, overcriminalization, etc.—are not of our making but came about as a way to control and profit from us.

It will mean "voting with our feet" through sustained, mass civil disobedience.

Ultimately, as I make clear in my book *Battlefield America: The War on the American People* and in its fictional counterpart *The Erik Blair Diaries*, it will mean refusing to be divided, one against each other, by politics and instead uniting behind the only distinction that has ever mattered: "we the people" against tyranny.

European voters revolted against their political leaders in last week's continent-wide parliamentary votes. The result was a bombshell: right-wing parties made huge gains, shaking the existing order to its foundations and sending warning signals to voters in the US, Britain, and Canada.

France's president, Emmanuel Macron, called a surprise election in the hope of undoing the lurch to the right. Right-wing parties in Austria, Belgium, Holland, and Germany scored smashing victories over conventional middle-of-the-road parties or the left. Italy has moved firmly to the right under its attractive moderate prime minister Giorgia Meloni, whose political roots lead back to Mussolini and Italian fascism. Poland and Eastern Europe remain a question mark. Switzerland is moving right as its voters consider a ban on new immigrants. Hungary has become a bastion of what it calls 'white Europe.'

What caused this political earthquake?  
The answer is simple: immigration.

Much of the world wants to move to prosperous, easy-going Europe. The EU has become a world leader in human and animal rights and stands out for its honest legal system and general decency. The raw corruption and criminality so common in the US are not so often seen in Northern Europe. Besides, Western Europe is the paradise next door for many third worlders.

Many Europeans are outraged by the growing numbers of Africans and Asians crossing their porous borders. I've been watching this immigration tsunami for decades. Germany, still guilt-stricken over its wartime crimes and short on population, has opened its gates to mass immigration. But how can decent human beings slam the door in the face of suffering millions?

Anyone who has been to Paris lately has seen the ethnic composition of the city change from European to African and Mideastern. Immigration has brought waves of crime and street violence. Criminals – pickpockets, purse snatchers, burglars, beggars – infest all of southern Europe. The Riviera has become crime ridden. Gypsies (also known as Roma) are high on the criminality list. Many Roma hail from Romania. Police can't do much about their thievery because of lingering wartime guilt and because many criminals are under 16.

The recent parliamentary elections in Europe – that brought over 300 million to the polls – cannot be ignored. They are a salvo of protest from voters who want immigration halted. They don't want to see Europe go multicultural, multi-ethnic, lesbian, gay and third world. They want the traditional Europe of high culture, white society, and fiscal caution.

Most significant for Europe, Germany's traditional centrist parties took a beating. Chancellor Olaf Scholz's coalition just had a big scare. No wonder it did so badly. The colorless Scholz has done very little to help the economy and nothing to stop immigrants, legal and illegal. The Americans love him because he is quiet and totally obedient. Most Germans don't want their civilization thirdworlded.

Ever since 1945, Germany has been occupied by the US military. There are over 36,000 active-duty US military personnel based in Germany alone. Another 12,000 are based in Italy. All in all, the US maintains around 100,000 troops in Europe and the Mediterranean region.

These forces no longer deter a Soviet attack, as was the alleged case in decades past. NATO, the embodiment of US military and financial power, is there to dominate Europe and keep it under Washington's thumb. The recent Euro parliamentary vote could be a major first step in asserting Europe's independence.

Equally important, many Europeans have no interest in provoking war with Russia. They would prefer to trade with Moscow, not fight. Europe's new crop of right-wing leaders wants to improve relations with Russia and resume importing its natural gas. Europe has had to pay the price of America's economic war against Russia.

I extensively interviewed the founder and former leader of the rightist National Rally, ex-paratrooper Jean-Marie Le Pen. He told me: 'immigration equals invasion. Look at California. Americans took it from Mexico. Now Mexican immigrants are taking it back!' Voila!

# How Alinsky Rules

(5)

June 6, 2024

By CHRISTOPHER MANION

THE WANDERER

Two years ago, New York Gov. Kathy Hochul's website touted her signature on a "nation-leading legislative package to protect abortion and reproductive rights for all."

New York's notorious criminal prosecutors have used her legislation repeatedly to harass and intimidate pregnancy centers in New York City for saving New York babies. Gov. Hochul wants to shut them all down.

A month ago, Hochul welcomed Joe Biden and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer to Syracuse University, her alma mater, to thank them for \$6.1 billion in U.S. taxpayer funds for some boondoggle in upstate New York.

There she stood, between two of the most aggressive mass killers in American history, beaming with pride at maybe being number three.

Yet, just two weeks later, Hochul's official website promoted a major address that she delivered at a three-day summit, "From Climate Crisis to Climate Resilience," held in Rome.

In the Vatican.

Sponsored by Pope Francis.

According to her Wikipedia bio, Hochul is "the second of six children in a family of Irish Catholic descent. Hochul graduated from Syracuse University in 1980 and received a Juris Doctor from the Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law in Washington, D.C., in 1984."

She makes a mockery of her faith.

And so does Joe.

While he might or might not have played football at the Naval Academy, or been a coal miner in Pennsylvania, or been shot in Iraq (Joe lies a lot), we do know that he is Catholic. Cardinal Wilton Gregory, archbishop of Washington, confirmed that fact last month, although he added that Biden is a "cafeteria Catholic" because he "picks and chooses" what teachings of the Church he will follow.

Well, His Eminence is wielding what we might call the "light touch" regarding Joe. Because the Biden administration is the most anti-Catholic, anti-family, and murderously anti-life regime in American history.

Of course, His Eminence doesn't seem to mind that Joe receives the Eucharist at Holy Trinity in Georgetown when he's in town.

Joe's latest hit was delivered last week, when, as the *Daily Signal* reports, "Pro-life activist Heather Idoni received a sentence of 24 months in prison on Wednesday [May 22], convicted of federal conspiracy against rights and Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act charges brought by the Justice Department."

Idoni, 59, will spend two years in prison for trying to stop abortions from taking place at a Washington, D.C., area abortion clinic on Oct. 20th, 2020. She is mother to 15 children, according to LifeSiteNews, "five of whom are her biological children and ten of whom she and her husband reportedly adopted from Ukraine."

Mrs. Idoni "expects to die in prison," she told *The Epoch Times*.

What's going on here?

## Enter, Stage Left

When he was a young "community organizer" in Chicago, Barack Obama received his first grant from the Archdiocese of Chicago. Its purpose? To pay his expenses at a seminar sponsored by the Industrial Areas Foundation, an activist group founded by Saul Alinsky.

Alinsky, who died in 1972, was the author of *Rules for Radicals*. That book was required reading for the young Obama, and when he came to the Senate in 2005, Joe taught him the Senate rules while he taught Joe Saul Alinsky's rules.

Today, ~~Democrass~~ are conducting a nonstop offensive on a thousand fronts, with lawfare, executive orders, flagrant disregard for the law, flouting Supreme Court decisions, and deliant dereliction in protecting the basic rights of Americans.

Meanwhile, Black Lives Matter killers and Antifa terrorists are laughing at us as their fans march peaceful pro-lifers off to jail.

They are mocking us. They break down the doors in the predawn raid of the home of a Catholic family with eight children.

"Go ahead, try to stop us," they laugh.

They are ridiculing us.

Just like Alinsky told them to.

"The most potent weapons known to mankind are satire and ridicule," says Alinsky's Rule Number Five.

That's right. Every department, every bureau, every agent, and every government grantee has to play by Alinsky's rules.

Boys must be allowed go into girls' locker rooms. If they can't get on the boys' team, they can put on a skirt and win with the girls, taunting the crowd of outraged parents and friends of the girls who worked so hard to make it to the finals.

That's right. We're outraged, but there's nothing we can do about it. "It is almost impossible to counterattack ridicule," Alinsky's Rule Number Five continues. "Also it infuriates the opposition, who then react to your advantage."

From Catholic Joe and Catholic Kathy down to the smarmiest reprobate, they ridicule us.

Our reaction? We're helpless. And they know it.

Here arises Rule Number Four: "Make the enemy live up to their own book of rules."

Occasionally the mockery and helplessness provoke a response. The tranny's bullhorn is blaring in your face so you knock it to the ground. You're arrested for assault, the tranny isn't. The policeman whose eye is burned by a laser is arrested for throwing the Antifa thug to the ground, while the terrorists go free. The Apple Store employee has to "follow the rules" and not get involved while the gangster makes off with an entire shelf of iPads.

Sneering all the way.

We're helpless. They're mocking us. The Joe Biden Brigades are destroying our society, one principle, one virtue, one law at a time, and they're laughing at us.

And they're loving it. After all, "the sixth rule is: A good tactic is one that your people enjoy. If your people are not having a ball doing it, there is something very wrong with the tactic."

Yes, we can count on it, they're having a ball. Merrick Garland and the criminal Mayorkas to the queerest cabinet in history, they are loving it. You can almost hear Kamala Harris cackle.

But how long must we let this go on?

**When Will They Drag Out Joe?**

6

Well, let's look at Alinsky's seventh rule: "A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag."

Do you really think that the abortion lobby is going to tire of watching us all go to jail? Is the "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" crowd going to get tired of watching us quake in terror at the slightest prospect of committing a possible ThoughtCrime? Are the race hucksters going to tire of getting \$50,000 a speech for calling us all racists? Will the drag queens

tire of destroying the modesty and purity of our children?

He might have been an atheist, but Alinsky gives a grateful nod to the one who will never tire of watching evil conquer the good — as his dedication reminds us:

"Lest we forget, at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgment to the very first radical: from all our legends, mythology, and history (and who is to know where mythology leaves off and history begins —

or which is which), the first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom — Lucifer."

No, they aren't getting tired. They're having too much fun. But there's one tactic that they might decide to tweak just a tad. Not to let up or anything, just to recharge the engine.

They just might get tired of Joe. But Lucifer won't.

IN 1949, AMERICA'S TEN MOST-affluent metropolitan areas, as determined by median household income, were Detroit, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Chicago, Dayton, Akron, San Francisco, New York, and Hartford, Connecticut. Washington, D.C., was 15<sup>th</sup>, trailing Youngstown, Rochester, Buffalo, and Columbus.

This list no doubt strikes many contemporary readers as surreal—even bizarre. How could the rust-belt cities of Detroit and Cleveland ever have been richer than D.C. and New York?

In a word, manufacturing. There are many ways to redistribute wealth—the governmental subsidies of D.C. and the financial shenanigans of New York being but two examples. But there are only a handful of ways to create wealth, the most potent of which is manufacturing. Extracting the silica used to make computer chips creates a certain amount of wealth. Using that silica to manufacture computer chips creates vastly more wealth, and using those computer chips to manufacture the myriad machines and devices that use those chips creates even more wealth.

There are additional benefits to having an economy based on manufacturing. The example of silica chips shows the close connection between manufacturing and innovation. Without silica chips, there would be no Silicon Valley and all the inventions that have come from there.

You may recall President George H. W. Bush's economic adviser, Michael Boskin, perfectly embodying the stupidity of mainstream thinking on outsourcing and offshoring when he dismissed concerns about America losing its dominance in computer chips by saying that, from an economic standpoint, he saw no difference between potato chips and computer chips. To state the obvious, without potato chips, we'd simply eat different snacks; without computer chips, we would fall several rungs down the technological ladder. Boskin and "the respectable right" were as wrong about this as they've ever been about anything.

Chronicles

June/July 2024



## Rebuilding What We've Lost

The list of 1949's wealthiest cities illustrates another great benefit that flows from an economy based on manufacturing. America had just won World War II, in substantial part because America's preexisting manufacturing base located in cities ringing the Great Lakes had just drowned Germany and Japan in a mighty torrent of planes, tanks, ships, and guns. The Axis could not match the productivity of our now-denigrated Rust Belt; without it, the Allies may well have lost the war.

Like most things of value, America's manufacturing base did not come into being overnight. In a sense, America's manufacturing sector began on July 4, 1789, when Congress passed the Tariff Act of 1789, a stated purpose of which was "the encouragement and protection of manufacturers." America's manufacturing thrived behind tariff walls, particularly between 1860 and 1932.

Then we threw it all away. We convinced ourselves that manufacturing was "dirty," that the future belonged to "knowledge workers," and any problem caused by imports could be solved by retraining laid-off factory workers to be computer programmers. Corporate leaders made shareholders rich beyond the dreams of avarice to the long-term benefit of no one but our foreign competitors.

Those competitors responded to our attempt to commit economic suicide by trying to murder us first. The Japanese destroyed one American industry after another in the 1970s and 1980s, and the

Chinese picked up where the Japanese left off around the turn of this century. The result: we let the industrial Midwest rust.

Jerry Useem discusses all this in an excellent article on Boeing in the April issue of *The Atlantic* titled "Boeing and the Dark Age of American Manufacturing."

Useem details how Boeing went from being a company that made one excellent airplane after another to a company that outsourced so much of the production of the flawed and dangerous 737, including to foreign companies, that its executives could not explain to the FAA how the plane was made—because they did not know!

Briefly put, Boeing went from being a company run by engineers who were close to the manufacturing process to finance types who thought factories were icky. Boeing no longer felt any loyalty to its workers or its longtime hometown. It moved its headquarters to Chicago and tried to outsource its way to prosperity.

Fortunately, as with the issue of illegal immigration, the truth about "outsourcing" and "offshoring" is becoming clear to Americans of all demographic backgrounds and political orientations. Donald Trump also understands this, which is why he is calling for a 10-percent across-the-board tariff and tariffs of up to 65 percent against Chinese companies that are trying to eliminate American manufacturers.

The only question I have is, how many American executives are left who can run manufacturing companies the way Boeing was run in its heyday? ♦

# The Unz Review • An Alternative Media Selection

A Collection of Interesting, Important, and Controversial Perspectives Largely Excluded from the American Mainstream Media

## I am Exhausted from Watching the West Self-Destruct



PAUL CRAIG ROBERTS • MAY 6, 2024 • 1,200 WORDS

As a former postgraduate member of Merton College, Oxford University, I receive every year from Merton College a thick, well prepared report replete with color photos titled *Postmaster and the Merton Record*. The report provides a thorough report on everything associated with the college and present and past members as reported during the year. For example, undergraduate performance and prizes, publications and awards of faculty, concerts, the performance of the various sports teams, social events, reports of marriages, deaths, births, remembrances from past graduates, photographs of the college, gardens, and members, and books on the library's shelves as if to say that here at Merton we still have the timeless products of Western Civilization in print form on library shelves instead of online somewhere in the cloud. In the current issue, those still alive who attended JRR Tolkien's lectures provide their memories of this remarkable scholar of ancient languages and storyteller (*The Hobbit*, and *The Lord of the Rings*). It all reminds us that at Merton some semblance, some remnant of Britain's ancient lineage lingers still among the tower of babel England has become.

No doubt the expense and effort to which the college goes to remain in touch with past members—all of whom compose The Merton Society—has in mind bequests. Little doubt Merton graduates attribute part of their success in life to the preparation that Merton gave them. So the large expense of the preparation and distribution of this report is justified. But for my generation and perhaps the one following I wonder about the impact of the report. Clearly, for my generation the collage is no more. It is simply there only in the buildings and memories. The college is no longer a men's college. Gowns no longer exist. Merton even has female Wardens (presidents). As far as I can tell, and I am unsure, Oxford colleges are now organized like American colleges where students take courses and are graded on the course and graduate when they complete the designated course requirements.

In my day there were no courses and no course requirements. Unlike the US, a bachelor's degree was a three, not a four-year, process. A student selected a field—mathematics, science, history, literature, languages, classics, PPE (philosophy, politics, and economics—imagine an American student learning all three in three years!) and was assigned a tutor by the college. The student was handed a reading list and encouraged to attend lectures on his chosen field of study. Lectures were provided by lecturers, senior lecturers, (I am unsure if Oxford had the next rank, readers, or whether these were only at the “red brick universities”) and professors. If memory serves, in the entirety of Oxford colleges there were only two professors of economics. One was a theorist John R. Hicks, and the other, John Jewkes, was an empirical economist who was a member of Merton.

As there were no classes, the purpose of the Oxford gown was to admit you to lectures. As a student at an Oxford college it was your responsibility to prepare for the exam at the end of three years which would determine whether you got a first, a second, a pass, or a fail. A first was a pass into the City (England's Wall St) or the civil service and a successful career. The colleges didn't want any results below a second and so tutors did their best to motivate any students who might come up short on motivation.

When you stood for exams, you knew they would be sent to other universities for grading. In those days, integrity was important, and universities did not want to raise integrity questions by being accused of grading their own students easily in order to give them a push ahead. Standards and honor had to be preserved. In those days a first from Oxford or Cambridge was almost as good as being born into an aristocratic family that somehow still managed to have some money despite the dispossession of the aristocracy by the government.

Today all of this is gone, and it is very sad. My impression, I would be happy to be wrong, is that Oxford and Cambridge have been partly, not totally, placed in the role of selling entry into

⑤

the First World to sons and daughters of well-to-do Indian, African, Asian, and Middle Eastern families. At times over the years I have noticed that white males have almost disappeared from the photographs in *Postmaster*, although not in the current issue. The aristocratic class seems to have faded away, and with an Indian prime minister of Great Britain and a Muslim Mayor of London, it is unclear in whose hands the British economy rests. Jaguar, for example, once the dominate power at Le Mans and the creator of what Enzo Ferrari himself declared to be the most beautiful car ever made—the E-Type, a specimen of which resides in permanent display in the New York Museum of Modern Art—has passed through a variety of foreign owners and I am unsure where its ownership resides today.

As readers of the few accurate histories of World War II know, US President Roosevelt used the war to destroy England's leadership of the world economy and to turn the British into a satrapy of the American Empire. The greatest and most accurate of all WW II historians, David Irving, makes it clear that while Churchill was at war with Germany, Roosevelt was at war with England. It was Roosevelt who won. But don't expect any Oxford historians to say this.

Reading what I have written, it is clear that these matters have been on my mind for some time as I have been diverted from my intention, which was to remark that the important fact of which the Merton College Record has made me aware is that *as women, women have disappeared*. Today women occupy male roles. With men's roles colonized by women, there are no longer any male roles.

The Merton hockey team has more female than male members. When I was at Oxford, rugby was more violent than US football. The 11 member Merton rugby team has 4 female members.

What is my point? Nowhere in the 222 page report is that any woman in a woman's role except on the childbirth page where female Merton graduates have done the dirty on feminism and become married mothers. But there are very few of them, an insufficient number to keep Briton British.

It is astonishing to me how rapidly the Western World has collapsed compared to the long drawn-out time required for Rome to disappear. One would think that, unlike Rome under pressure from external armies, the West with no one attacking it should be able to prolong its continuing existence despite the West's lost of belief in itself.

But apparently, this is not to be.

The question of the survival of Western civilization is not raised at Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Stanford. Indeed, they all seem to want Western civilization not to continue as they have branded it racist. Nowhere is there university faculty with interest to defend truth and the continuation of Western civilization's existence.

The foundation of the Western world is the pursuit and defense of truth. When that no longer exists, neither does Western civilization.

It is of the essence of militarism that under it military men learn to despise constitutions, to sneer at parliaments, and to look with contempt on civilians.

— William Graham Sumner, *The Conquest of the United States by Spain* [1898]



# “They Died for Nothing”: America and the Myth of World War II

9

Our public memory of the Second World War we have inherited in the United States is a myth designed to propagate a political ideology.

Darrick Taylor

**T**he eightieth anniversary of the D-Day landing in Normandy during World War II has come and passed, and this will be the last commemoration for many veterans of that operation. Commentary on the yearly events held in France evinced a noticeably nostalgic quality; America’s victory in World War II and its memory might be one of the last bits of cultural heritage most Americans still share, albeit tenuously.

Reading this commentary made me think of something my father told me last year, after my grandfather passed away. My grandfather served in the U.S. Navy during World War II and used to regale my brother and me with war stories when we were children. Five years earlier, when they were discussing the subject of the soldiers who fought in World War II, my grandfather told my father that “they died for nothing.”

**Do his words shock you?** I admit to feeling shocked when my father told me this, but I shouldn’t have. Other veterans have **voiced** similar sentiments **publicly**. My grandfather, like my parents, had grown alarmed at the cultural direction of the country. Neither he nor they could comprehend something like “transgenderism.” If my grandfather thought for one moment that fighting in World War II meant creating a world where the president of the United States would **accuse** those Americans who voted for his opponents of being “fascists,” where such things as “gay marriage” and “pride month” exist, where pro-life activists are **sent to prison for praying** at abortion clinics, he never would have served in the first place.

2024

Public memory is a complicated thing; views of the present can often affect our view of the past, and World War II is no exception in that regard. For most people, World War II is about as far back as history goes in their imaginations, the *fons et origo* of the country as they understand it. Most Americans view World War II as the “good war” because the Allies defeated a regime bent on world domination. They view the men who fought it as “the Greatest Generation,” whose “selflessness and acceptance of responsibility” the country holds in “reverential awe,” as one **eulogy** for D-Day put it. This is the World War II celebrated in so many Hollywood films, among them masterpieces. It is no wonder that this is the version of World War II most people know.

June

MAGAZINE

But the actual war is one thing and our memory is another. The Western Allies’ D-Day heroics notwithstanding, it was the Red Army that defeated the Nazis, not the Americans. (I cannot recall how often people have said to me “we’d all be speaking German right now if it wasn’t for the U.S. Army,” never having the courage to correct them.) And despite the moral wide gulf that separated the United States from Axis totalitarianism, the U.S. and its allies committed horrible acts that tend to get airbrushed out of the story: the firebombing of Tokyo and Dresden, the use of the atom bomb on Nagasaki and Hiroshima, not to mention the internment of ethnic Japanese citizens on the home front. All these violated principles which the Western Allies went to war to defend.

CRISIS

“**Truth is the first casualty of war,**” and propaganda shapes the memory of any conflict, even the “good war.” During WWII, there was a marked difference, for example, in how the ordinary soldier saw the conflict and how our government leaders understood it. The historian John Morton Blum **noted** years ago that when soldiers were interviewed they indicated that they often had neither heard of nor cared about official war aims. Mostly their wish was that of all soldiers in war time: to get back home. But as one official put it, among the rank and file there was “little idealism. Most regard the war as a job to be done and there is not much willingness to discuss what we are fighting for.”

Not so with Franklin Roosevelt and his advisers. They knew exactly what the war was about. They were mostly Progressives who saw the war as an ideological struggle and a referendum on liberal democracy. The rise of dictatorships and totalitarian regimes like the Nazis in the 1930s led many to question the viability of Western democracy. For FDR, the war pitted his “New Deal” liberalism, which he claimed would make the country a place where “no one would be left out,” versus Nazism and their racist, genocidal policies. As FDR put it, “freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain and keep those rights.” For them, the war was not merely a “job to be done” but an existential battle between good and evil.

10 What of the rest of the country? In 1940, most Americans—including the leadership of the Republican party—were still averse to foreign wars. But that changed when a Democrat-turned-Republican named Wendell Willkie won the Republican nomination. Willkie was a “Woodrow Wilson liberal” and ran on a platform practically indistinct from FDR. And Roosevelt trounced him in the election. Willkie is a forgotten figure today, but his run had far-reaching consequences because Willkie helped sell the internationalist vision of Roosevelt (whom he admired) even after his defeat.

In 1942, Willkie went on a world tour extolling a Wilsonian vision of international affairs to our allies, including the Soviets. A year later, he published a book based on his travels called *One World*, in which he urged readers to embrace a vision of humanity united by the impulse to “live and grow invigorated by independence and freedom.” The book, which proved controversial (critics said he was soft on communism, and Willkie espoused what we would now call globalism), sold nearly a million copies in the first month alone. It helped educated opinion shed its aversion to foreign wars and made liberalism—at least in foreign affairs—the dominant political philosophy of American elites.

This was a crucial turning point because the Allied victory cemented the idea that civilization, liberal democracy, and liberalism were all the same thing in the minds of liberals. As historian Alan Brinkley noted, it transformed “the nature of American liberalism” and led liberals to imagine “new possibilities for progress and social justice” while alerting them to “the importance of avoiding rigid and immutable norms and institutions.” Conversely, it “pushed fear of totalitarianism...to the center of liberal thought.” This meant liberals were now on the hunt for “illiberal” elements not only abroad but at home.

**They weren’t hard to find.** Concern about how treatment of blacks in the South would be perceived globally began during the war, and the government took the first steps toward desegregating the military during World War II, culminating with its complete elimination by Truman in 1948. What most Americans do not realize is that the success of the Civil Rights movement in the ’50s and ’60s was due in large part to fears about how Southern segregation would affect the Cold War. With the advent of television, the “whole world was watching,” to paraphrase a later slogan, and the U.S. government was quite aware that the Soviet Union would use images of black protestors being beaten as propaganda in places like Africa. Such concerns were paramount for them when it came to domestic “rights” issues.

For example, in 1952, the U.S. Attorney General filed an amicus brief in *Brown v. Board of Education* which he declared that “it is in the context of the present world struggle between tyranny and freedom the problem of racial discrimination must be viewed.” Eisenhower disliked *Brown* and thought desegregation should happen organically and locally. But, in 1957, he rationalized using the National Guard to desegregate Little Rock, Arkansas, schools because “we face grave situations abroad because of the hatred that Communism bears toward a system of government based on human rights” while “our enemies are gloating over this incident.”

Concern about how domestic events affected the Cold War was the major reason for the rapid **adoption** of rights for minorities in the 1960s. Politicians tended to adopt quickly any issue that activists could frame in terms of “national security” as a result. This includes many issues currently roiling the country, like immigration. The United States began relaxing its immigration laws with the 1965 Immigration Act, which targeted Asian immigration, largely because of the Vietnam War. That war famously radicalized the Left, which in turn radicalized liberals, who have used the civil rights apparatus created in the ’60s to push the country further and further to the left over the past half century and more.

The point of this history lesson is that the transformations of American life that make World War II veterans feel their sacrifices were in vain originated with the war itself. That war turned the United States from a republican, continental empire into a global, liberal one. Some of those transformations were unintended; it is not as if FDR was pushing for transgender bathrooms in the 1940s. But once you make egalitarianism part of a global crusade, it becomes nigh impossible to stop pursuing it, at home or abroad, even if you must pursue it by illiberal means. The god of liberalism is a jealous god.

**Today, there is little left** of liberalism morally or intellectually speaking, other than the desire to keep liberal elites in power. Lest you think I exaggerate, listen to Victoria Nuland, former Assistant Secretary of State, who in a recent interview with *Politico* stated the U.S. would oppose any regime that “is inherently trying to

11

change the system that benefits us.” She was talking about Europe, Russia, and Ukraine, but she might as well have been referring to Donald Trump and his supporters. Our liberal overlords appear willing to destroy any politician, any movement, whether foreign or domestic, that threatens to “change the system that benefits us.”

What, then, did those men die for on Omaha Beach, in Okinawa, in the Ardennes Forest? When those who burned whole neighborhoods to the ground go largely unpunished; while protestors who did little more than stroll through the Congressional building are imprisoned for years on end; or when one party weaponizes the legal system to keep a presidential candidate from the opposing party from running for office, you can see why my grandfather thought his comrades sacrificed their lives in vain.

Our public memory of the Second World War we have inherited in the United States is a myth designed to propagate a political ideology. Nothing can change that. But does it mean those men died for nothing? All political ideologies are parasitic upon deeper, more meaningful loyalties—patriotism, religion, family—whose existence is rooted in human nature. Liberalism, in its utopian drive to establish “freedom” as the “supremacy of human rights everywhere” has become an engine for destroying those elemental loyalties or subverting them where they do not serve its purposes. That is a central reason so many veterans feel alienated from their country.

But this is why we need not believe those men died for nothing, even if their leaders used them to fight a war for their ideology. Ironically, at this point, such an experience is something that most Americans, left or right, share by now. As I said before, the present impacts the past, shapes our view of it. Elites who hate us and things we love may control our public memory now, yet no earthly dominion is everlasting. We can sustain an alternative memory where our loved ones died not for an ideology, but for those fundamental relationships that shape us.

This means refusing the Hollywood version of our history and doing the arduous work of keeping it ourselves. The fight to dethrone false ideologies and redeem the sacrifice of our ancestors will be long and difficult, but it is still achievable. Most importantly, it is worth fighting for. We can begin by recognizing the propaganda of our misguided leaders for what it is and reinterpreting it in the light of “permanent” things—those things we can pass on to our descendants:

*Take up our quarrel with the foe:*

*To you from failing hands we throw*

*The torch; be yours to hold it high.*

*If ye break faith with us who die*

*We shall not sleep, though poppies grow*

*In Flanders fields.*

(from “In Flanders Fields,” by John McCrae)

## Republicans for Forced Military Service

By Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

June 12, 2024

**Writes Michael Johnson:**

**Mr. Rockwell,**

**Whether it is forced military service for teenagers/young adults, a military draft OR whatever other enslavement the State dreams up for its citizens (and non-citizens), these efforts should always and appropriately include the “involuntary servitude” moniker — you know, the one found in Amendment XIII.**

**“Where is it written in the Constitution, in what section or clause is it contained, that you may take children from their parents and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battle in any war in which the folly or the wickedness of government may engage it?” — Daniel Webster**

12

## "The Train Has Left the Station and No One Can Stop It"

Posted By pcr3 On June 13, 2024 @ 5:05 am In Articles & Columns | [Comments Disabled](#)

---

Support your website

"The Train Has Left the Station and No One Can Stop It"

Paul Craig Roberts

These are the words of Serbia's President Aleksander Vucic. He ought to know. He is in the middle of it. He thinks Europe will be at war with Russia in "not more than three or four months," if that long.

President Vucic says "no one is attempting to stop the war. Nobody is speaking about peace. Peace is almost a forbidden word." <https://haltturnerradioshow.com/index.php/news-selections/world-news/president-of-serbia-we-will-have-world-war-within-3-to-4-months> <sup>[1]</sup> Scroll down to the 5 minute video.

Hungarian leader Viktor Orban has a similar view as does Slovakian president Robert Fico, who survived a recent assassination attempt.

In Western Europe, UK, and Washington everyone is talking about wider war with long range missiles used for attacks deep into Russia. Such attacks cannot revive the defeated Ukrainian military. Their purpose seems to be to provoke Russia into a retaliation that Washington can use to widen the war.

President Vucic is correct. The West is making no effort—indeed, is avoiding all effort—to defuse the dangerous situation. Instead, the West is throwing oil on fire with long range missile attacks and French troops sent into Ukraine.

It has been completely clear from day one that Putin's limited drawn-out war enabled the West to get more and more involved into the conflict to the point that the conflict now is really between the West and Russia. As President Vucic says, the West's prestige is now involved and the West cannot permit Russia to prevail.

It seems that Putin might have finally realized that the war is no longer limited to Donbas and has become a wider threat that is not subject to negotiation on terms that Russia can accept.

Now that Putin is backed into a corner with the prospect of NATO missiles striking deep into Russia, President Vucic's expectation that war is close at hand is understandable. The way matters are shaping up, the avoidance of war depends on how many provocations the Kremlin will accept and for how long. Putin needs to quickly knock Ukraine out of the war before Ukraine fills up with NATO military personnel.

Zelensky's term has expired, making him illegitimate. Russian forces should quickly take Kiev, install a new government agreeable to Ukraine as a neutral country and to the reunification of Donbas with Russia.

I don't know if Putin still has time to avoid a larger war by quickly winning the current conflict or whether Putin has been fighting on the cheap and lacks the force size to take Kiev and control the country.

If Putin has been too limited in his goal and too parsimonious with his means, he has bought himself a wider war.

**Share this page**

[2] [3] [4] [5] [6]

"Do not encroach against others or their property."

The above principle is a simple one, yet it's the basis for all criminal law. In turn, criminal law is the basis for Common Law, the legal system for English-speaking peoples and much of the rest of the world.

The idea is a simple one: If party A aggresses against party B, party B is entitled under the law to restitution or compensation to be paid by party A to party B.

Well, that seems straightforward enough. But at some point along the way, two fundamental changes have been made that don't reflect the original principle.

By Jeff Thomas

First, convicted offenders started to be ordered by the court to pay the court as punishment. Of course, the offense was not against the court, but the government of the day wanted to get in on the action. Surely, if a crime against a given party had been committed, the state was entitled to dip its beak, so to speak.

Over time, fines payable to the state became the norm. And for those who couldn't pay the state, jail time.

Along the way, another extension to the concept came into use: victimless crimes. Increasingly, laws were passed by governments to make actions unlawful when there was no harm to an individual or his property.

International Man

To wit: Recently, the State of Michigan passed law HB4474, against "hate crime" – any perceived slight against another person, verbal or otherwise. The law recognizes such disparate slurs as those critical of gender identity, religion, race, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, or even affiliation with a group. Incredibly, the law extends as far as the outlawing of unacceptable pronouns.

The punishment is imprisonment of up to two years, a fine of \$5,000, or both.

Clearly, this is a victimless crime, since no physical damage has taken place. And, to exacerbate the lack of logic, the fine is to be paid to the state, not the "injured party."

Of course, any sensible person would be shaking his head in wonder at such a development. When added to so many other changes in law that appear to be both ludicrous and often contrary to morality, he might understandably comment, "They've gone mad."

But when governments that are already habitually overreaching appear to be going mad, it's a good idea to step back and calmly examine whether there might not be a method in the madness.

On the surface, quite a few governments – most notably First World governments – have been passing a plethora of laws for which there is no victim but for which the government is the recipient of damages.

As if coincidentally, these same governments have been going in precisely the *opposite* direction with regard to crimes in which there most definitely *is* a victim.

Let's have a look at a few of those.

- **Looting of stores and other places of business**

Under the claim that the prisons are too full, governments have been determining that theft or looting that amounts to less than a given dollar amount is not prosecutable, essentially legalizing the crime of looting.

- **Destruction of property due to rioting**

Rioters are habitually arrested, only to be released without being charged. Owners of the property that the rioters have burned or otherwise destroyed are no longer entitled to restitution or compensation as they once would have been.

- **Decriminalisation of people taking up residence on public property**  
Tents may be pitched on sidewalks and in front of stores, discouraging residents from frequenting stores and destroying businesses. Concurrently, the homeless are assisted by the State in drug dependency.
- **Loss of bodily rights**  
Laws that call for forced vaccinations are blanket laws that allow a government the authority to control whatever goes into the body, whether medical or nutritional.
- **Systematic elimination of parental rights**  
Parental rights are being removed from parents to allow school authorities and medical professionals to dictate what they wish to physically do to children, free from prosecution. In addition, pedophilia is in the process of becoming decriminalised.
- **Civil Asset Forfeiture**  
Police and other authorities have, since 2008, been legally allowed to stop people on foot or in a vehicle, or to conduct warrantless raids on homes. If evidence is found that suggests the *possibility* of a crime, the authorities may seize any and all assets that they find, regardless of whether or not the assets may be connected to the possible crime. The authorities are not obligated to ever bring charges against the individual, making it impossible for him to be granted a hearing. This allows the authorities to permanently hold the assets taken or to dispose of them, the proceeds to be absorbed by the authority in question.

The above is only a sampling. The reader will have others to add to the list.

So, if we assume that the changes that are taking place are not madness, nor a collection of random but illogical changes in how the law is applied, what we begin to see here is, indeed, a method in what appears on the surface to be madness.

What we're seeing is that the original concept of law – that of protecting the individual from encroachment against himself or his property – is being eliminated.

On the other hand, laws that are victimless and laws that provide punishment by the state and call for penalties to be awarded to the state are very much on the rise.

What we have here is a growing trend; if we follow it to its logical conclusion, that will result in laws that benefit the state being the *only* laws.

Let's put that another way: The individual has no rights. Only the state has rights. In the future, the only crimes will be crimes against the state.

Let that last sentence sink in for a bit.

Historically, freedom is lost when a nation becomes complacent enough to give it up *willingly*. Much of the First World is precisely at that tipping point now. The question is whether those people who once enjoyed liberty will now push their heads in the sand and pretend that the most basic freedoms are not now being lost.

*"Dictatorship naturally arises out of democracy, and the most aggravated form of tyranny and slavery out of the most extreme liberty."* – Socrates

Reprinted with permission from *International Man*.

Tyrants, conquerors, and dictators of every breed disarm their subjects in order to dominate and exploit them. It's an iron law of history.

– Stephen P. Halbrook, "Recalling the Tragic History of Gun Control" [2019]

## The Trump Convictions Reveal a Broken Justice System

15

The use of the courts for political ends is not new, but the Biden administration's persecution of the pro-life movement and now Donald Trump has further undermined my confidence in a system so vulnerable to the prejudices of practitioners.

By Msgr. Richard C. Antall

Crisis Magazine

June 4, 2024

**The day that the former president** was convicted of 34 felonies was the anniversary of the execution of St. Joan of Arc. She had been convicted by the judicial system of her time for an alleged series of crimes even though the reason she was on trial was about politics. Her victories were her real offenses against the system. She paid the price for challenging the powers that be of her time. In the arc of history, her loss was really a victory over her accusers whose machinations made her both a heroine and a saint.

Chesterton was once upbraided for supposedly lacking faith in the judicial system. He remarked that his skepticism had to do with the fact that the founder of his religion had had a bad experience with the legal structures of his time.

The indefatigable Alan Dershowitz would not have the same premise as Chesterton but said that the trial of the ex-president was a disgrace that made the old phrase "banana republic" come to his restless mind. The legal maneuvers of the opponents of President Trump may seem to his opponents the end of his extraordinary political career, but they have only to look at the president of Brazil to know that criminal conviction does not necessarily prevent reelection by the people. It would be hard to imagine two more ideologically diverse politicians than Lula da Silva and Mr. Trump, but the former's trajectory from, as *The New York Times* described it, "the presidency to prison and back," cannot be ruled out as impossible for the latter.

**The celebration of the verdict** by political partisans might not be so prolonged. Sir Robert Walpole made a very pithy comment about the conflict between Spain and Great Britain that was later known as the War of Jenkins' Ear. "They may ring their bells now," said the British Prime Minister, "before long they will be wringing their hands."

Perhaps it is my pastor's perspective that makes me think that. I know many persons who have been on the wrong side of the law, both literally and in its working out in personal circumstances. Dickens' Mr. Bumble (in *Oliver Twist*), who concluded that "the law was an ass—an idiot" because it presumed a wife was under the control of her husband, would not have a hard time convincing some of my faithful who "caught" cases and then succumbed to the despair involved in plea deals. The law seems to show favorites more frequently than not.

One of my parishioners explained he had spent two years in prison for a DUI when others get off with lighter sentences and told me that it was because his lawyer was only a "public pretender." I do not mean to disparage a whole class of professionals by the *bon mot*, but I have seen for myself the aggressive nature of prosecutors who will do anything to keep their statistics of convictions high and public defenders who have been assigned so many cases that their first acquaintance with their client is in the hallway of the courtroom minutes before a hearing.

While I am not particularly fond of the aphorism that a pastor should have the same odor as his sheep, and despite the fact that I have admired some lawyers and judges I have met, I have a certain skepticism about courts and verdicts, probably a contagion I picked up from some of my faithful. Twice in recent years I have been called to jury duty and have waited around legal bullpens enough to be a bit disenchanted with some glimpses of the men and women handling the ropes and pulleys behind the proverbial wizard's curtain in the Emerald City of legal pretension.

16

**This is not just personal sympathy.** I am no scholar of the law, but judicial decisions often seem to be edicts that are no way near transparently just. *Roe v. Wade* long ago taught me that judges can be egregiously wrong. The use of the courts for political ends is not new, of course, but the Biden administration's persecution of the pro-life movement has further undermined my confidence in a system so vulnerable to the prejudices of practitioners. I have always been a bit put off by the metaphor of blindness as characteristic of the working of the vast legal ecosystem. In El Salvador, there is an imposing public statue of a naked lady blindfolded holding the scales of justice, an ambiguous symbol for me, because—well, I really don't want to go into that right now.

Will the enemies of the once and would-be future president prevail by means of the courts to destroy his candidacy? Is disliking a politician enough reason to endorse a course of action that is so brazenly partisan? The justice system itself can be the victim of "politics as legal soap opera."

I am reminded of what Robert Bolt makes Thomas More say in his play *A Man for All Seasons* about the law not being "an instrument of any kind. The law is a causeway, which, so long as he keeps to it, a citizen may walk safely." In the New York "show trials" of Mr. Trump, we see the instrumentalization of the law for political purposes. No citizen can feel safe walking on a crooked causeway with as many potholes as one of our inner-city thoroughfares.

The day before the verdict in New York, a young man told me that he had passed six months in jail for a crime he did not commit to which he had pled guilty on the advice of his public defender. That man will not likely hold it against Trump that a kangaroo court sided against him and for his political opponents. The Democrats should be aware that they may have gone a bridge too far on their tar and feathering project. Many people have a lingering suspicion that the deck has been stacked against them at various times in their lives, and they can identify with someone who claims the same. I don't think Mr. Trump will end up canonized like St. Joan, but he might find himself back in the White House, which will be a most painful irony for some.

# Lost Masterpiece Of Christ On Display

June 6, 2024

By PETER PINEDO THE WANDERER

WASHINGTON, D.C. (CNA) — A lost masterpiece by Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio was recently rediscovered and is now on display in what experts are calling "one of the greatest discoveries in the history of art."

Titled "Ecce Homo" ("Behold the Man"), the painting was created between 1605 and 1609 and depicts the moment Pontius Pilate presented the scourged Jesus Christ to the crowds ahead of his crucifixion.

According to the Museo del Prado, the renowned museum in Madrid, Spain, where the piece is being displayed, "Ecce Homo" is "one of the most valuable old master artworks in the world."

Long believed by its previous private owners to be the work of a student of Baroque artist José de Ribera, the painting resurfaced in 2021 when it was being sold for just \$1,600 at an art auction in Madrid.

Shortly before it was set to be sold, art experts raised suspicions that it could be a Caravaggio. The Spanish Ministry of Culture intervened to stop the sale so that experts could investigate further.

According to the Museo del

Prado, the painting underwent an in-depth diagnostic investigation led by Claudio Falcucci, a nuclear engineer famous for his scientific techniques in the study and conservation of significant cultural artifacts.

The painting then underwent a process of restoration. The Museo del Prado said that after intense study and restoration, "four of the most authoritative experts on Caravaggio and Baroque painting" all "share the same passionate certainty: that 'Ecce Homo' is a masterpiece by the Italian artist."

The painting is believed to have previously been a part of the private collection of Spanish and Portuguese King Philip IV and is one of just 60 known works by the famed Italian master. According to the BBC, it is valued at nearly \$40 million.

Considered one of the most influential artists of the Baroque period, Caravaggio is known for his dramatic use of light and shadows and for depicting biblical and mythic scenes in emotion-filled, almost theatrical, fashion. Many of his paintings, such as "The Calling of St. Matthew," "Supper at Emmaus," "The Incredulity of St. Thomas," and many others are some of the most

recognized and beloved works of religious art to this day.

"Ecce Homo" shows a scourged Christ in the center of the painting with Pilate and a soldier on either side of him. Christ is draped in a vivid crimson cloak and holds a scepter with a crown of thorns on his head.

Despite bright red blood dripping from his crown, Jesus has a serene countenance while Pilate and the soldier have a look of alarm on their faces. The painting exhibits Caravaggio's famous use of light and shadow while the clothing, skin, and hair in the painting showcase his mastery of texture.

The particular moment of the Passion narrative portrayed by this painting holds a special significance for Catholics because Pilate's "Ecce Homo" calls to mind John the Baptist's proclamation in *John* 1:29: "Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world."

John's proclamation is echoed by the priest celebrant when he elevates the Holy Eucharist at one of the most crucial moments of the Mass.

The masterpiece will be on display from May 28th through Oct. 13th.