

# Doing the Math: UC Faculty Call for the Return to Standardized Testing After Shocking Decline in Skills

May 28, 2026

B

Years ago, I wrote a column denouncing the decision of the University of California system to drop standardized testing in the cause of greater racial diversity. Now, hundreds of UC mathematics faculty have called for a return to such testing after reports showing a thirtyfold increase in students with math skills below high school level.

As written earlier, the University of California system was an early supporter of this disastrous move. It was heralded as a way to preserve diversity after voters in California repeatedly rejected race-based admissions and the Supreme Court appeared ready to bar such practices (commonly proven with reference to standardized test differentials among applicants).

Now, many professors in the California system have come to the same conclusion as some of us who denounced the move years ago. They have witnessed the drop in academic skills and abilities among incoming students.

These tests not only have the most significant predictive value for performance but also play an important role in the advancement of minority students. Former University of California President Janet Napolitano, however, overrode those conclusions.

Napolitano responded to such criticism with a Standardized Testing Task Force in 2019. Many people expected the task force to recommend the cessation of standardized testing. The task force did find that 59 percent of high school graduates were Latino, African-American or Native American but only 37 percent were admitted as UC freshman students. The Task Force did not find standardized testing to be unreliable or call for its abandonment, however.

Instead, its final report concluded that "At UC, test scores are currently better predictors of first-year GPA than high school grade point average (HSGPA), and about as good at predicting first-year retention, [University] GPA, and graduation."

Not only that, it found: "Further, the amount of variance in student outcomes explained by test scores has increased since 2007 ... Test scores are predictive for all demographic groups and disciplines ... In fact, test scores are better predictors of success for students who are Underrepresented Minority Students (URMs), who are first generation, or whose families are low-income." In other words, test scores remain the best indicator for continued performance in college.

June 1, 2026

JCRMC PACKET

By Jonathan Turley

JonathanTurley.org

LewRockwell.com

2

That clearly was not the result Napolitano or some others wanted. So, she simply announced a cessation of the use of such scores in admissions. The system would go to a "test-blind" system until it developed its own test.

Ending standardized testing had an obvious secondary purpose: to frustrate new legal challenges to the use of race in college admissions. Last November, Californians rejected a resolution to restore affirmative action in college admissions.

We have also seen the dismal decline in standards at elite universities like Harvard, where faculty have been compelled to teach high school-level math classes to students.

Various schools have now reversed this ridiculous move pushed by faculty and administrators in the cause of racial diversity. The proponents of the change, such as Napolitano, have said little after they decimated the academic integrity and standing of their schools.

The UC faculty cited the UC San Diego Senate–Administration Workgroup on Admissions report, which found that 70 percent of these students are performing below a middle-school level.

Like Harvard, faculty are now teaching high-school-level math.

The declining performance reflects the failure of our public schools, which have also lowered graduation standards. The top-spending public school districts are also some of the worst-performing districts.

Instead of addressing the failure to educate kids in these communities, the push was to eliminate testing itself. As I wrote in 2021, "The deficiencies will remain — but the ability to expose them will be gone." Those deficiencies are not evident in applications and admissions, but they are clearly manifesting themselves in classes.

---

And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed — if all records told the same tale — then the lie passed into history and became truth. 'Who controls the past' ran the Party slogan, 'controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.'

— George Orwell, 1984 [1948]



We believe, as Christians, that human history is not just a series of meaningless, random events; rather, we are part of a Larger Story. So, are we in the End?

**I**t used to be that apocalyptic talk was relegated to the fringes of society. But a recent study indicates that about a third of Americans believe we're living in the End Times. In March, Putin's Kremlin announced that we were in the Last Days, with the current war simmering in the Middle East; and Peter Theil, from Palantir, has been holding a series of discussions about the Antichrist. Catholics, too, are sounding the alarm: Fr. Chad Ripperger, Catholic author Mark Mallett, and many other sane and holy individuals are indicating that world events might be drawing toward a dramatic climax.

Are we in the "end times"? That is a question that has been asked in every age. We believe, as Christians, that human history is not just a series of meaningless, random events; rather, we are part of a Larger Story—one that is being written by God and is accomplishing His purposes. Every story has a Beginning (Creation and the Fall), a Middle (Christ's Incarnation and Paschal Mystery), and an End (Christ's triumphal return). So, are we in the End?

We are certainly well past the middle—about 2,000 years past the middle—which is about how far Abraham was from Christ, historically. The question that no one knows is how close we are to the end. It could be a year, five years, a hundred years, a thousand years. In my personal opinion, it will not happen in my lifetime.

But "the end" is not just a moment, it is a process. In a sense, one could trace the beginning of "the end" back to the 1400s with the rise of the Renaissance, a system that began to take the attention off of God and put it back on man, seeing the creature without a relation to the Creator.

Thinking of ourselves in "the end" is, to me, just situating ourselves in the Larger Story. We talk about the mundane and the boring nature of our everyday lives—and certainly all of our lives are full of mundane, boring things. But they are not unimportant things.

Many years ago, my sister and I went to go see the first *Lord of the Rings* together in the movie theater. We were driving home and gazing into a brilliant sunset when she sighed deeply and said, "Oh, I wish life could be like that! An epic quest, a thrilling adventure!" I've often used that quote in talks that I've given because I think it was a profound insight into the human heart.

Human beings want to know that their life is not just a random chance accident, that our presence here on this planet isn't just unnoticed and unimportant. This desire of the human heart was placed there by God because we *do* play an irreplaceable role in a grand epic—the epic of Salvation History. So those mundane, boring tasks, when seen through that lens, take on monumental significance.

Consider: when a mother cleans a dirty diaper or makes dinner for her kids, she is taking care of the physical needs of an immortal soul who will someday spend eternity as an eternal triumph of glory or an everlasting tragedy of horror. These immortal souls in your house will someday either advance the Kingdom of God here on earth, taking back ground for the King, or they will participate in the Kingdom's further destruction. All of the mundane tasks that we do have ramifications in history and into eternity. We are part of an epic tale, a battle between good and evil, which is fought in every soul, in every home, in every nation, in every age.

And so I do find it spiritually helpful to be aware of what role we might be playing at this critical juncture in history. One thing that such reflections have taught me is how much of the stuff I worry about on a daily basis won't matter in the grand scheme of things. That traffic jam, that jaywalker, that worry about money—will it matter if the end is near? After all, whether or not the end of the world is near, the end of *my* world is near and guaranteed. Apocalyptic thinking is just *memento mori* writ large. It helps me to remember that life is bigger than my petty worries and that I have to focus on the truly important things—being ready for when Christ comes for me.

**When I became a priest**, one thing that struck me deeply is how much our liturgy talks about Christ's Second Coming. I never really noticed it until I started celebrating Mass, but all of the Eucharistic prayers and the Memorial Acclamations—and even much of the New Testament—is all about awaiting His return. We are an eschatological people, always looking for the culmination of all things.

In a sense, Christ's death on the Cross was an incomplete redemption—not that He has to add anything to it, but sin continues to multiply even with the tremendous outpouring of grace. The Cross allowed us to be reconciled to God *if we respond to the grace*—but He has not yet exercised His full dominion over creation. The dominion is His, but He awaits the fulfillment of all things in order to display His full might and power. That is why the Church has cried in every age, “Maranatha! Come, Lord Jesus!” As Catholics, we are all longing for that day when His redemption will be complete, when “the last enemy to be destroyed is death” (1 Corinthians 15:26).

As we await that final victory, Christ calls us to be vigilant and to observe the signs of the times. Every age has had to wrestle with the question, “Is the end near?” Our age is no different. And so prophets, and wise men, and those who have the mind of Christ would do well to continue to discern that question.

I do think there are some fundamental differences between our age and the ages past (stay tuned for Part 2), but every person in every age is called to discern wisely the signs of the times. Although we can't draw any solid conclusions yet, we should always prayerfully consider the evidence in geopolitics and the philosophical winds that blow. I think it can be quite helpful, spiritually. Consider the number of times we are called in Scripture to be vigilant, watchful, keeping our spiritual eyes open—it's a constant theme in the New Testament.

**Rather than taking us away** from the duties of our state in life, consideration of “the end” can help us to perform our duties with more diligence, knowing that if we are half-hearted or sleepy, the Bridegroom will return and leave those foolish virgins outside. If I (wrongly) believe that my life is just full of boring, meaningless things, or that Christ's coming is so delayed that I will always have time to repent and draw close to Him, then He will arrive like a thief in the night. This is true not just for each individual but for the world as well. Is the Church ready? Is the world ready? If not, what do we need to do to prepare ourselves for His coming?

Recently, someone asked me, “Didn't every age think they were in the End Times? What makes this age different from every other age?” I thought that was a very good question—one that deserved a response.

I do think that there are fundamental differences between life as we see it now in the 21st century versus life throughout history. It's not simply a matter of “more sin” or different kinds of sin; there was always lust, greed, violence, and even drugs throughout history. Various cultures have been equally depraved. Atheism has been around for a long time. The devaluation of human life dates back to Cain and Abel. So, it's not just a matter of “sex, drugs, and rock & roll” being the defining factor of our age.

No, I think there are philosophical and anthropological trends which are far more prevalent that make this a profoundly unique time in human history. Here are some of the differences:

**Globalization.** Never before in human history has the world been as small as it is today. I can send an email to someone in India in a matter of seconds. An event that happened in Australia might be posted online in minutes for the rest of the world to see. For the first time in human history, we truly live in a global village. This is important because it means the exportation of ideologies can happen at a rapid rate. Popes Benedict and Francis both warned against an “ideological colonization”: first-world countries that are sending out their ideologies to developing and third-world countries. (For a humorous take on this, see the music video by Rammstein called “Amerika.”)

**Technology and Mass Media.** Never before in human history has mass media been able to so thoroughly shape and form a culture. From radio, to television, to the Internet, the ability to form minds and souls has been concentrated in the hands of a few elite. For millennia prior, cultures were passed down through communities. One grew up listening to the stories of grandparents, to witnessing the histories of your

town, to being a part of celebrations and grieving rituals and the whole gamut of human life filtered through a community. Now, however, culture is self-defined through one's media consumption. One chooses what culture to imbibe. This becomes problematic when cultural values are exported through the mass media (this ideological colonization again).

Never before could a person born and raised in a certain culture seek out a completely different set of ideals through the mass media. This is why parents, despite raising their kids in the Catholic Faith, watch their children jettison the Faith: because the young have often willingly chosen a culture through the technological mass media that is at odds with how they have been raised. No longer are parents and other adults the main influential factors on a young person's cultural, intellectual, and moral development, as had been the case for the vast majority of human history; now souls are formed through technology and mass media.

In addition, we view the world through the lens of the screen. There is a dearth of interaction with the "stuff" of the world (dirt, plants, humans, tools, etc.). Now most interaction is through a device. This has fundamentally changed the way we relate—the way we receive and form culture and the way we interact with the world.

**Scientism & Secular Humanism.** Closely related to technology is the undying belief that science holds the answers to all of life's problems and that scientific truth is the only truth that exists. Very few people examine the philosophical, anthropological, and spiritual implications of suffering or problems. They just want it gone, through science. There is a belief that there is no need to turn to a deity but to turn, instead, to human beings for answers and solutions. This is the first time in human history that man has been so exalted.

**Rate of Change.** Sociologist Zygmunt Bauman coined the term "Liquid Modernity" to describe the rapid rate of change in our culture, technology, and society. Five hundred years ago, if someone saw three or four life-changing inventions in their lifetime, it would have been significant. But consider how many changes have occurred in my short lifespan of four decades: the internet, cell phones, AI, medical advances; I even have a "smart refrigerator" that connects to an app on my phone. And it's not only technology. Cultural phenomena that would have been unthinkable in my teen years, such as gay marriage or the transgender movement, have quickly become the law of the land. The rate of change continues to accelerate and shows no sign of stopping.

**Relativism.** Throughout human history, truth has been seen as something worth fighting for and dying for. I think of the bitter fights—which sometimes ended in bloodshed, exile, and imprisonment—during the Arian controversy, which debated whether or not Jesus was truly divine; or the Crusades; or the wars of religion during the Protestant Reformation. There has always, in every culture, been a belief that truth was knowable, that it was important, and that one should seek it. For the first time in human history, however, truth is seen by many as a subjective experience. "Live your truth," as one member of the transgender community put it. No longer is there any idea that truth exists in reality; rather, all truth is subjective and therefore cannot be scrutinized by others as to its actual correspondence with reality.

**Irreligion/Thorough Secularism.** The tribesmen of the Amazon, the aborigines in the desert, the high Anglican in the cathedral, the barbarian in the Norse lands—all cultures of all times have had some sort of religion. Whether it was the polytheism of the Greeks and Romans, or the Persian Zoroastrians, or the ancestor-worship of ancient China, every culture (from the Latin *cultus*, meaning "worship") was based upon adoration of a transcendent deity/deities. But for the first time in history, we are forming a culture that is purposely irreligious. Religion is often scorned, seen as illogical or superstitious, and viewed as something passé. There is a concerted effort to build a world that is completely secular, which has never been done in human history before.

**Sheer Magnitude of Sin.** Even in the most barbaric days of the ancient Mayan empire, they were still not able to slaughter the 600,000-plus babies killed each year in America alone through abortion. A teenage boy can see more sexually explicit images in one hour than even the most hedonistic Roman emperor would see in his lifetime. There is a sense in which those sins which have always existed have now reached a commonality to which we have become numb.

I believe that our modern age is one that is indeed different from every other age. We have abandoned the idea of God and replaced man in His stead. This expresses itself in the way we see Truth (subjective to man's perception), the way we solve problems (man's power, through science, can end all suffering), the way in which we have crafted a society without God.

Indeed, the seeds of this have been planted all the way back centuries ago, from the Renaissance, to the Industrial Revolution, to Communism. But in the past 70-100 years we have seen a rapid growth and a full flowering of these seeds. For this reason, I believe that we truly are living in unprecedented times. Where will this end? Where will this lead? I do not know. But God knows, and my trust is in Him.

## Image-Bearers in the New World

Today in Christian History

### Sublimis Deus (1537)

◀ June 2, 1537 ▶

On June 2, 1537, Pope Paul III issued the papal bull *Sublimis Deus*, addressing the upheaval unfolding in the Americas after Spain's conquests in the Caribbean, Mexico, and Peru. The bull declared that the indigenous peoples of the Americas are truly human, endowed with rational souls, capable of receiving the faith, and therefore must not be deprived of liberty or property. It condemned their enslavement and warned that those who reduced them to bondage acted contrary to Christian teaching. The bull insisted that conversion must come through preaching, instruction, and holy example rather than coercion.

### Bartolomé de las Casas and the Cry of Conscience

A key voice behind this moment was Bartolomé de las Casas, a Dominican friar who had witnessed abuses tied to forced labor systems and violent conquest. He pleaded that the Church speak plainly: these peoples were neighbors, not tools. His advocacy, joined by others alarmed by reports from Hispaniola, New Spain, and beyond, pressed Rome to respond. His courage illustrates the duty to defend the weak, even when it challenges powerful interests.

### Biblical Witness and Human Dignity

The bull aligned with the biblical truth that all people bear God's image and must be treated accordingly. "So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them" (Genesis 1:27). And the command to love one's neighbor is not limited by ethnicity, language, or nation: "Love your neighbor as yourself" (Leviticus 19:18). Such truths require more than words; they call for repentance, restraint, and mercy.

### Legacy: A Call to Faithful Justice

*Sublimis Deus* was often resisted, bypassed, or ignored in colonial practice, where profit and fear frequently overruled conscience. Yet it stands as a lasting witness that genuine faith must produce justice and compassion. It reminds Christians that evangelism is inseparable from integrity—that the gospel is to be carried by truthfulness, protection of the vulnerable, and the steady courage to honor the dignity God grants to every person.

SEE ACTUAL TEXT ON pg. 14



# Ticonderoga

*A Legend of the West Highlands*



7

THIS is the tale of the man  
Who heard a word in the night  
In the land of the heathery hills,  
In the days of the feud and the fight.  
By the sides of the rainy sea,  
Where never a stranger came,  
On the awful lips of the dead,  
He heard the outlandish name.  
It sang in his sleeping ears,  
It hummed in his waking head:  
The name—Ticonderoga,  
The utterance of the dead.

ON the loch-sides of Appin,  
When the mist blew from the sea,  
A Stewart stood with a Cameron:  
An angry man was he.  
The blood beat in his ears,  
The blood ran hot to his head,  
The mist blew from the sea,  
And there was the Cameron dead.  
“O, what have I done to my friend,  
O, what have I done to mysel’,  
That he should be cold and dead,  
And I in the danger of all?  
Nothing but danger about me,  
Danger behind and before,  
Death at wait in the heather  
In Appin and Mamore,  
Hate at all of the ferries  
And death at each of the fords,  
Camerons priming gunlocks  
And Camerons sharpening swords.”

But this was a man of counsel,  
This was a man of a score,  
There dwelt no pawkier Stewart  
In Appin or Mamore.  
He looked on the blowing mist,  
He looked on the awful dead,  
And there came a smile on his face  
And there slipped a thought in his head.

Out over cairn and moss,  
Out over scrog and scaur,  
He ran as runs the clansman  
That bears the cross of war.  
His heart beat in his body,  
His hair clove to his face,  
When he came at last in the gloaming  
To the dead man’s brother’s place.

The east was white with the moon,  
The west with the sun was red,  
And there, in the house-doorway,  
Stood the brother of the dead.

“I have slain a man to my danger,  
I have slain a man to my death.  
I put my soul in your hands,”  
The panting Stewart saith.  
“I lay it bare in your hands,  
For I know your hands are leal;  
And be you my targe and bulwark  
From the bullet and the steel.”

Then up and spoke the Cameron,  
And gave him his hand again:  
“There shall never a man in Scotland  
Set faith in me in vain;  
And whatever man you have slaughtered,  
Of whatever name or line,  
By my sword and yonder mountain,  
I make your quarrel mine.  
I bid you in to my fireside,  
I share with you house and hall;  
It stands upon my honour  
To see you safe from all.”

It fell in the time of midnight,  
When the fox barked in the den  
And the plaids were over the faces  
In all the houses of men,  
That as the living Cameron  
Lay sleepless on his bed,  
Out of the night and the other world,  
Came in to him the dead.

“My blood is on the heather,  
My bones are on the hill;  
There is joy in the home of ravens  
That the young shall eat their fill.  
My blood is poured in the dust,  
My soul is spilled in the air;  
And the man that has undone me  
Sleeps in my brother’s care.”

“I’m wae for your death, my brother,  
But if all of my house were dead,  
I couldnae withdraw the plighted hand,  
Nor break the word once said.”

8  
"O, what shall I say to our father,  
In the place to which I fare?  
O, what shall I say to our mother,  
Who greets to see me there?  
And to all the kindly Camerons  
That have lived and died long-syne—  
Is this the word you send them,  
Fause-hearted brother mine?"

"It's neither fear nor duty,  
It's neither quick nor dead  
Shall gar me withdraw the plighted hand,  
Or break the word once said."

Thrice in the time of midnight,  
When the fox barked in the den,  
And the plaids were over the faces  
In all the houses of men,  
Thrice as the living Cameron  
Lay sleepless on his bed,  
Out of the night and the other world  
Came in to him the dead,  
And cried to him for vengeance  
On the man that laid him low;  
And thrice the living Cameron  
Told the dead Cameron, no.

"Thrice have you seen me, brother,  
But now shall see me no more,  
Till you meet your angry fathers  
Upon the farther shore.  
Thrice have I spoken, and now,  
Before the cock be heard,  
I take my leave for ever  
With the naming of a word.  
It shall sing in your sleeping ears,  
It shall hum in your waking head,  
The name—Ticonderoga,  
And the warning of the dead."

Now when the night was over  
And the time of people's fears,  
The Cameron walked abroad,  
And the word was in his ears.  
"Many a name I know,  
But never a name like this;  
O, where shall I find a skilly man  
Shall tell me what it is?"  
With many a man he counselled  
Of high and low degree,  
With the herdsmen on the mountains  
And the fishers of the sea.  
And he came and went unwearied,  
And read the books of yore,  
And the runes that were written of old  
On stones upon the moor.

And many a name he was told,  
But never the name of his fears—  
Never, in east or west,  
The name that rang in his ears:  
Names of men and of clans;  
Names for the grass and the tree,  
For the smallest tarn in the mountains,  
The smallest reef in the sea:  
Names for the high and low,  
The names of the craig and the flat;  
But in all the land of Scotland,  
Never a name like that.

AND now there was speech in the south,  
And a man of the south that was wise,  
A periwig'd lord of London,  
Called on the clans to rise.  
And the riders rode, and the summons  
Came to the western shore,  
To the land of the sea and the heather,  
To Appin and Mamore.  
It called on all to gather  
From every scrog and scaur,  
That loved their fathers' tartan  
And the ancient game of war.

And down the watery valley  
And up the windy hill,  
Once more, as in the olden,  
The pipes were sounding shrill;  
Again in highland sunshine  
The naked steel was bright;  
And the lads, once more in tartan  
Went forth again to fight.

"O, why should I dwell here  
With a weird upon my life,  
When the clansmen shout for battle  
And the war-swords clash in strife?  
I cannae joy at feast,  
I cannae sleep in bed,  
For the wonder of the word  
And the warning of the dead.  
It sings in my sleeping ears,  
It hums in my waking head,  
The name—Ticonderoga,  
The utterance of the dead.  
Then up, and with the fighting men  
To march away from here,  
Till the cry of the great war-pipe  
Shall drown it in my ear!"

Where flew King George's ensign  
The plaided soldiers went:  
They drew the sword in Germany,  
In Flanders pitched the tent.

The bells of foreign cities  
 Rang far across the plain:  
 They passed the happy Rhine,  
 They drank the rapid Main.  
 Through Asiatic jungles  
 The Tartans filed their way,  
 And the neighing of the war-pipes  
 Struck terror in Cathay.

“Many a name have I heard,” he thought,  
 “In all the tongues of men,  
 Full many a name both here and there.  
 Full many both now and then.  
 When I was at home in my father’s house  
 In the land of the naked knee,  
 Between the eagles that fly in the lift  
 And the herrings that swim in the sea,  
 And now that I am a captain-man  
 With a braw cockade in my hat—  
 Many a name have I heard,” he thought,  
 “But never a name like that.”

THERE fell a war in a woody place,  
 Lay far across the sea,  
 A war of the march in the mirk midnight  
 And the shot from behind the tree,  
 The shaven head and the painted face,  
 The silent foot in the wood,  
 In a land of a strange, outlandish tongue  
 That was hard to be understood.

It fell about the gloaming  
 The general stood with his staff,  
 He stood and he looked east and west  
 With little mind to laugh.  
 “Far have I been and much have I seen,  
 And kent both gain and loss,  
 But here we have woods on every hand  
 And a kittle water to cross.  
 Far have I been and much have I seen,  
 But never the beat of this;  
 And there’s one must go down to that waterside  
 To see how deep it is.”

It fell in the dusk of the night  
 When unco things betide,  
 The skilly captain, the Cameron,  
 Went down to that waterside.

Canny and soft the captain went;  
 And a man of the woody land,  
 With the shaven head and the painted face,  
 Went down at his right hand.  
 It fell in the quiet night,  
 There was never a sound to ken;  
 But all of the woods to the right and the left  
 Lay filled with the painted men.

“Far have I been and much have I seen,  
 Both as a man and boy,  
 But never have I set forth a foot  
 On so perilous an employ.”  
 It fell in the dusk of the night  
 When unco things betide,  
 That he was aware of a captain-man  
 Drew near to the waterside.  
 He was aware of his coming  
 Down in the gloaming alone;  
 And he looked in the face of the man  
 And lo! the face was his own.  
 “This is my weird,” he said,  
 “And now I ken the worst;  
 For many shall fall the morn,  
 But I shall fall with the first.  
 O, you of the outland tongue,  
 You of the painted face,  
 This is the place of my death;  
 Can you tell me the name of the place?”  
 “Since the Frenchmen have been here  
 They have called it Sault-Marie;  
 But that is a name for priests,  
 And not for you and me.  
 It went by another word,”  
 Quoth he of the shaven head:  
 “It was called Ticonderoga  
 In the days of the great dead.”

And it fell on the morrow’s morning,  
 In the fiercest of the fight,  
 That the Cameron bit the dust  
 As he foretold at night;  
 And far from the hills of heather  
 Far from the isles of the sea,  
 He sleeps in the place of the name  
 As it was doomed to be.

THE BATTLE OF FORT TICONDEROGA

July 8<sup>th</sup>, 1758



# Even 'The Demons Leave' — Divine Revelation On The Sin Of Sodomy

16

God "cannot bless sin," declared the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Therefore, those in the Catholic clergy, if they want to remain Catholic, do not have the authority to bless gay unions — period.

The Vatican CDF argues that such unions are not part of God's plan and that any sacramental recognition of them could be confused with marriage. In the eyes of many, it appears to have gone in direct opposition to the famous "Who am I to judge?" of Pope Francis years ago. The "pilgrimage" of 1,000 sodomites in Rome caused utmost scandal, especially because Pope Leo said nothing about it.

The "German Church" (instead of the Church in Germany) is highly displeased. Unfortunately, the land converted by St. Boniface became famous in history for having produced the likes of Luther, Marx, and Hitler. Today it is another Marx, but this time he is a cardinal.

Francis DeBernardo, executive director of New Ways Ministry, which defends the acceptance of active homosexuals in the Church, predicted the Vatican position would be ignored, including by some Catholic clergy. Already he has been proven correct.

"Catholic people recognize the holiness of the love between committed same-sex couples and recognize this love as divinely inspired and divinely supported and thus meets the standard to be blessed," he said.

But this spin affirms the heresy of sodomy in direct opposition to the Church of Jesus Christ, whose teaching explains love properly ordered as a lifelong union between one man and one woman — a reflection of Christ and the Church.

spect for sodomites "cannot lead in any way to approval of homosexual behavior or to legal recognition of homosexual unions."

In doing so, the Vatican reasoned then, the blessing would not only condone "deviant behavior," but create an equivalence to marriage, which — again — the Church holds is an indissoluble union between man and woman.

Thus, the Vatican left nothing on the table for further discussion. The door has been slammed shut on the gay agenda, to the misery and anguish of those who, like Fr. James Martin S.J. and his ilk, wanted to have the Church of God accepting sins against nature. S.J. no longer means Society of Jesus, as in the good old days, but just Sodomites of Judas.

## Clear Catholic Teaching

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, in paragraph 2357, states, "Basing itself on Sacred Scripture, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity, [1 Cor. 6:15–20] tradition has always declared that homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered [Gen. 19:1–29; Rom. 1:24–27; 1 Tim. 1:10]. They are contrary to the natural law. They close the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved."

The *Courage International Apostolate* exists precisely to help those with deviant orientations to recover their normal sexuality or to remain in a life of chasti-

ty, which is the norm for everyone, in order to gradually and resolutely approach Christian perfection.

"They will be done on earth as it is in Heaven" is the prayer that Christians regularly say. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, based on Sacred Scripture, clearly states that there are sins that "cry to Heaven for vengeance," and are therefore against the will of God. They include murder, sodomy, oppression of the poor and defrauding a worker of his wages. Each of these is considered especially egregious to God. While there were, until recently, civil legal restrictions on all four, the first two in particular have been losing battles in the courts for at least half a century, with sodomy making huge legal advances in both Ireland and the United States.

But just how bad is sodomy, really? If you listen to those sympathetic to people in homosexual relationships, you'd be led to believe it's just a little harmless affection between people who are "in love." So, on the scale of the serious sins, where does sodomy fall?

St. Peter Damian, a Doctor of the Church, wrote extensively on the issue of homosexuality, especially among the decadent clergy of his time. His most famous writing is his lengthy treatise, Letter 31, *The Book of Gomorrah (Liber Gomorrhianus)*, which contains the most extensive treatment and condemnation by any Church Father of clerical pederasty and homosexual practices.

Another Doctor of the Church, St. Catherine of Siena, writes of sodomy — which also contaminated part of the clergy in her time — citing God's words to her:

Of course, every person must be treated with dignity and respect, but sodomy is and remains "intrinsically disordered." Marriage is part of God's plan and is intended for the sake of creating new life. You could call it "Genesis ideology" instead of gender ideology, if the word "ideology" did not have bad connotations.

Since sodomite unions aren't intended to be part of God's plan, they cannot be blessed by the Church, the Vatican declared. God "does not and cannot bless sin."

"Who am I to judge?"

On the other hand, Pope Francis has endorsed providing sodomite couples with legal protections in same-sex unions in the civil sphere, but not within the Church. Those comments were made during a 2019 interview with a Mexican broadcaster, Televisa, but were censored by the Vatican until they appeared in a documentary.

He was referring to the stance he took when he was archbishop of Buenos Aires. At

the time, Argentine lawmakers were considering approving sodomite "marriage," which the Catholic Church naturally opposes. Then-Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio supported providing legal protections for sodomites in

"stable unions" through a so-called law of civil cohabitation. Francis told Televisa: "Homosexual people have the right to be in a family. They are children of God."

The problem is that sodomites do not make a family. They may have "unions" or "partnerships," or "two-person associations," but never a family.

In 2003, the same Vatican office issued a similar decree, saying that the Church's re-

"They not only fail from resisting this frailty [of fallen human nature] ... but do even worse as they commit the cursed sin against nature. Like the blind and stupid having dimmed the light of the understanding, they do not recognize the disease and misery in which they find themselves. For this not only causes Me nausea, but displeases even the demons themselves, whom these miserable creatures have chosen as their lords.

"For Me, this sin against nature is so abominable that, for it alone, five cities were submerged, by virtue of the judgment of My divine justice, which could no longer bear them ... It [this sin] is disagreeable to the demon, not because evil displeases them and they find pleasure in good, but because their nature is angelic and thus is repulsed upon seeing such an enormous sin being committed. It is true that it is the demons who hit the sinner with the poisoned arrow of lust, but when a man carries out such a sinful act, the demons leave."

Imagine that: The sin of sodomy is so unnatural that it is even repellent to the very demons who tempt men to engage in it.

People having same-sex attraction — especially because of the propaganda and the recruitment tirelessly done by the sodomite lobby and the complicit silence or even support of the decadent clergy of our time (*horresco referens!*) — need help from everyone concerned with the salvation of souls. But those who indulge in the sin against nature cannot and will not be supported by any true Catholic among the laity or clergy.

www.RaymonddeSouza.com

THE WANDERER

# A Nation of Suspects

(11)

by Andrew P. Napolitano | May 29, 2026 | 0 Comments

Some of the recent legal challenges to the use of surveillance by the Department of Homeland Security upon Americans have resulted in the revelation of truly terrifying behavior by the government, in direct defiance of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution. We now know that the federal government spies on innocent Americans without suspicion and without warrants.

The spying seems to fall into several categories. The National Security Agency, which is in the Department of Defense, employs about 60,000 domestic spies. These are the folks who want us to believe that they go through the trouble of making applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court for warrants to spy on foreigners.

Actually, from time to time they do go to this court, but their travels there — where judges are frisked upon entering and leaving the courthouse by the NSA agents who appear before them — serve as fig leaves for their massive warrantless spying on Americans. The FISA Court is unconstitutional because it issues warrants based on probable cause of communicating with a foreign person, rather than on probable cause of crime as the Fourth Amendment requires.

The courts have ruled consistently since the 1960s that spying — surveillance, as the feds call it — is a search, and the capture of data from a surveillance is a seizure.

The Fourth Amendment protects all persons in America — not just Americans — from warrantless searches and seizures of their “persons, houses, papers, and effects.” There are some well-recognized exceptions to this constitutional baseline, such as evidence that will quickly vanish or be seriously degraded, but those exceptions do not apply here as the NSA captures in real time all keystrokes on all digital devices and all fiber optic data transmitted into, out of and within the United States.

The judges of the FISA Court surely know that the Department of Justice lawyers and NSA agents who appear before them are going through a charade, and the court has been made a part of it. The charade is the pretense that all spying is done pursuant to the warrants that FISA Court judges issue. Former NSA agents have revealed publicly that this is hardly the case.

Nevertheless, the lowered standard from probable cause of crime to probable cause of communicating to a foreign person was crafted by Congress — in another of its many moments heedless of the Constitution. After a few years of this, the FISA Court began to issue warrants for spying on the Americans who communicate with foreigners, out to the sixth degree. A sixth grader can do the math, as this leads to hundreds of millions of Americans whose communications are captured.

A second category of spying is employed by the DHS. The DHS — now a 250,000-person strong federal police department nowhere countenanced by the Constitution — has sophisticated software that can read fingerprints at 15 feet and irises at 15 inches. So, if you wave goodbye or good riddance to an ICE agent, and he holds up his mobile phone, and you are in the federal system for any benign reason, he has captured your bank, health, legal and commercial records on the spot. If he talks to you in your car and is within 15 inches of your face, he can capture the same data.

12  
As if all this were not enough, the feds and local police use a device called a Stingray, which mimics the signal sent to all mobile devices as if the device were being used to communicate. But the communication is just one way, as the Stingray will tell the government where the person possessing the mobile device is at any given moment. This, too, is a seizure of private personal information — the contents of the computer chip in your mobile device — which the Fourth Amendment characterizes as an “effect.”

And then there is the FBI, which now uses zero-click software. This permits agents without warrants or even approval of their superiors to engage in computer hacking without having to trick the hacked victim into clicking on a link. Computer hacking is a felony.

All of this surveillance is unconstitutional, dangerous and commonplace. It consists in the use of surveillance and law enforcement tools without articulable suspicion.

For 600 years, articulable suspicion — the lowest evidentiary standard we have — has been the baseline for all government behavior that targets an individual. Articulable suspicion is the fact-based ability to state why a person — not a group — should be targeted and for what crime. This is the same standard that must be met when police stop someone in public.

Anything less than articulable suspicion is a fishing expedition; stated differently, a general warrant. General warrants — which were used by British agents on American colonists — permitted the agents to stop anyone, to search anywhere and to seize anything without articulable suspicion. The Fourth Amendment outlawed them.

How did we get from a Constitution that assumes that the individual is sovereign, our rights are natural and inalienable, and the government may only legally do what the governed have affirmatively authorized it to do to where we are today? The answer is fear. Fear is the great tool for authoritarians — fear of foreigners, fear of war, fear of crime, fear of drugs, fear of terror. When people are afraid, they will allow the government to take liberty in return for a promise of safety.

Of course, liberty once surrendered is never returned. But liberty is individual, not collective. You can surrender your liberty and your neighbors can surrender theirs, but none of you can surrender mine. These values are what animated Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration and James Madison in the Bill of Rights. Those animations seem like ancient history today. On the eve of America’s 250th anniversary, the Founders would not recognize this country of no values where everyone is a suspect.

**If you liked this article, please support Antiwar.com.  
We are 100% reader-supported.**

*Andrew P. Napolitano, a former judge of the Superior Court of New Jersey, is the senior judicial analyst at Fox News Channel. Judge Napolitano has written seven books on the US Constitution. The most recent is Suicide Pact: The Radical Expansion of Presidential Powers and the Lethal Threat to American Liberty. To find out more about Judge Napolitano and to read features by other Creators Syndicate writers and cartoonists, visit [www.creators.com](http://www.creators.com). COPYRIGHT 2025 ANDREW P. NAPOLITANO – DISTRIBUTED BY CREATORS.COM*

# Republicans and Democrats Are Not the Root Cause of Big Spending and Big Debt

13

During the administrations of Democrats Barack Obama and Joe Biden, how many times did we hear about how Republicans were the answer to those big-spending Democrats who were bankrupting our country with their out-of-control federal spending and debt? Almost continuously! If only American voters would put those fiscally responsible Republicans in charge of both houses of Congress and the presidency, we were repeatedly told, fiscal responsibility would return to the federal government.

What a bunch of hooey. As we learn time and time again, when it comes to big spending and big debt, the Republicans are just as bad as Democrats, if not worse. During President Trump's first term in office, when Republicans also controlled both houses of Congress, the federal debt increased by almost \$8 trillion. That's trillion, with a "t."

When Trump took office in 2024, the federal debt stood at around \$36 trillion. The Republicans, once again, control both houses of Congress. Two years later, the federal debt stands at more than \$39 trillion. Of course, the amount of debt is growing exponentially every day.

By **Jacob G. Hornberger**

*May 22, 2026*

Let's face it: It doesn't really matter whether Democrats or Republicans are in charge. The big spending and the big debt will continue to grow, whether it's on welfare, warfare, regulation, or control. There are always projects, programs, wars, conflicts, regulations, and controls on which to spend money. As we have seen, both Republicans and Democrats always find ways to spend and borrow ever-increasing amounts of money.

Oh, I think it's worth pointing out that the federal government's debt does not include "unfunded" welfare programs, such as Social Security and Medicare. When one adds those to the federal debt, the total is a staggering \$107.9 trillion.

But the fact is that neither Republicans nor Democrats are the root cause of America's fiscal woes. Instead, the root cause is a systemic one — the welfare-warfare state, regulated-managed economy system, and national-security state system that have come to characterize our nation.

As we have seen ever since America was converted to a welfare state and a national-security state, welfare and warfare are extremely expensive. The same goes for the regulated-managed economy way of life, the never-ending drug war, the massive immigration police state, and foreign aid. It is all very expensive.

The pipe dream of statisticians, of course, is that it's possible to make this statist system fiscally sound.

Good luck with that! If they haven't made it fiscally sound after almost 100 years, what are the chances that they'll make it so today?

14

They'll never do it. So long as Americans choose to continue this dysfunctional way of life, federal spending and debt will continue to soar, regardless of whether Democrats or Republicans are in charge.

This is where the soul-searching has to take place among the American people. Do Americans want to continue this statist way of life that is leading them to the destruction of their freedom and economic well-being? Or do they want to put America back on the right road — the road built on our nation's sound founding principles of the free market, voluntary charity, and a limited-government republic — the road to peace, prosperity, and harmony — and, yes, the road to fiscal responsibility?

*Reprinted with permission from The Future of Freedom Foundation.*

**His Holiness Pope Paul III**  
May 29, 1537

**Sublimus Dei**

**New Advent**

*Paul III Pope. To all faithful Christians to whom this writing may come, health in Christ our Lord and the apostolic benediction.*

THE SUBLIME GOD so loved the human race that He created man in such wise that he might participate, not only in the good that other creatures enjoy, but endowed him with capacity to attain to the inaccessible and invisible Supreme Good and behold it face to face; and since man, according to the testimony of the sacred scriptures, has been created to enjoy eternal life and happiness, which none may obtain save through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, it is necessary that he should possess the nature and faculties enabling him to receive that faith; and that whoever is thus endowed should be capable of receiving that same faith. Nor is it credible that any one should possess so little understanding as to desire the faith and yet be destitute of the most necessary faculty to enable him to receive it. Hence Christ, who is the Truth itself, that has never failed and can never fail, said to the preachers of the faith whom He chose for that office 'Go ye and teach all nations.' He said all, without exception, for all are capable of receiving the doctrines of the faith.

The enemy of the human race, who opposes all good deeds in order to bring men to destruction, beholding and envying this, invented a means never before heard of, by which he might hinder the preaching of God's word of Salvation to the people: he inspired his satellites who, to please him, have not hesitated to publish abroad that the Indians of the West and the South, and other people of whom We have recent knowledge should be treated as dumb brutes created for our service, pretending that they are incapable of receiving the Catholic Faith.

We, who, though unworthy, exercise on earth the power of our Lord and seek with all our might to bring those sheep of His flock who are outside into the fold committed to our charge, consider, however, that the Indians are truly men and that they are not only capable of understanding the Catholic Faith but, according to our information, they desire exceedingly to receive it. Desiring to provide ample remedy for these evils, We define and declare by these Our letters, or by any translation thereof signed by any notary public and sealed with the seal of any ecclesiastical dignitary, to which the same credit shall be given as to the originals, that, notwithstanding whatever may have been or may be said to the contrary, the said Indians and all other people who may later be discovered by Christians, are by no means to be deprived of their liberty or the possession of their property, even though they be outside the faith of Jesus Christ; and that they may and should, freely and legitimately, enjoy their liberty and the possession of their property; nor should they be in any way enslaved; should the contrary happen, it shall be null and have no effect.

By virtue of Our apostolic authority We define and declare by these present letters, or by any translation thereof signed by any notary public and sealed with the seal of any ecclesiastical dignitary, which shall thus command the same obedience as the originals, that the said Indians and other peoples should be converted to the faith of Jesus Christ by preaching the word of God and by the example of good and holy living.

**Copyright © 2026 by New Advent LLC. Dedicated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.**

**CONTACT US | ADVERTISE WITH NEW ADVENT**

# The Nuclear Lie at the Center of U.S. Foreign Policy

JOSHUA SCHEER • MAY 19, 2026

15



"HUH, WOULD YOU LOOK AT THAT, PAMMY - THERE WE WERE, ALL WORKED UP ABOUT IRAN GETTING A NUCLEAR WEAPON WHEN WE SHOULD HAVE BEEN MORE WORRIED ABOUT ISRAEL SINCE THEY ARE A NON-SIGNATORY TO THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY AND HAVE A SECRET ARSENAL OF WARHEADS THEY'VE STOCKPILED WITHOUT THE RESTRICTIVE PROHIBITIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THEY'RE CURRENTLY BEING LED BY A GENOCIDAL FAR-RIGHT ULTRA-NATIONALIST THEOCRATIC MASS-MURDERING RACIST IMPERIALIST THUG."

***"One country is sanctioned, threatened, bombed, and demonized over the fear of nuclear weapons. The other already has them — and the world is expected to look away."***

Mr. Fish's cartoon stuck in my head because it cuts straight through the insanity of the entire conversation. One country already has nuclear weapons and the world is told not to talk about it, while another country that still doesn't have them is treated like an immediate threat to civilization. The more I sat with the image, the more I started digging into the history underneath it — and the hypocrisy only got harder to ignore.

For decades we've been told to panic about the country that *doesn't* have nuclear weapons while pretending not to notice the country that actually does. Iran gets sanctions, assassinations, bombings, and endless media hysteria over what it *might* someday build. Israel sits on an undeclared nuclear arsenal outside the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the political/media class acts like everyone is supposed to politely shut the hell up about it.

Mr. Fish's cartoon cuts through that theater with a sledgehammer.

Israel has never officially acknowledged its nuclear weapons program, yet experts and watchdog groups estimate it possesses roughly 90 nuclear [warheads](#) and maintains one of the most secretive nuclear infrastructures on Earth. Unlike Iran, Israel is not a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and international inspectors have never had full access to the Dimona facility believed to anchor its nuclear program.

The [roots](#) of Israel's nuclear program stretch back decades. The Israel Atomic Energy Commission was established in 1952, and its first chairman, Ernst David Bergmann, openly argued that nuclear weapons would ensure "that we shall never again be led as lambs to the slaughter," according to the Jewish Virtual Library. As with so much of Israel's national security doctrine, the trauma and memory of the Holocaust were invoked as a central justification for building and maintaining the program.

Documents show that as far back as [1968](#), the CIA had already informed President Lyndon B. Johnson that Israel either possessed nuclear weapons or was on the verge of developing them. But instead of confronting the issue publicly, Washington chose silence. President Richard Nixon later struck a secret understanding with Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir: Israel would neither officially acknowledge nor test its nuclear arsenal, and in return, the U.S. would back off demands for inspections and oversight. From that point on, one of the world's worst-kept secrets became official policy — don't ask, don't tell.

16

They weren't guessing. Even reporting from the 1970s pointed to what U.S. intelligence already knew. As The New York Times later revealed, the CIA disclosed in a 1974 assessment that Israel had already developed nuclear weapons — partly using uranium obtained “by clandestine means.”

Meanwhile, Iran — despite years of sanctions, assassinations, cyberwarfare, and bombing campaigns — remains under constant international scrutiny precisely because it is formally inside the nonproliferation framework. Even members of the U.S. Congress have begun openly questioning the contradiction, warning that America's policy of “official ambiguity” around Israel's arsenal makes any coherent nonproliferation policy nearly impossible.

That's the uncomfortable truth sitting underneath the mushroom cloud in Mr. Fish's illustration: the issue has never simply been nuclear weapons. It has always been about who is allowed to have power, who is allowed to threaten annihilation, and whose violence is treated as “security” instead of extremism.

The cartoon's suburban couple staring calmly into apocalypse captures the moral numbness at the center of the debate. Entire populations have been conditioned to panic over hypothetical weapons programs while accepting real arsenals, real occupations, and real mass death as background noise. The danger isn't only the bomb — it's the normalization of permanent double standards enforced through military dominance and political silence.

The Council on Foreign Relations **directly** undercuts the claim that Iran is an imminent nuclear threat. CFR writes that “many foreign policy experts warn that a nuclear-armed Iran would destabilize the Middle East and nearby regions,” and argues that Israel viewed Iran's potential possession of nuclear weapons as a “major, perhaps existential, threat” — a fear used to justify Israel's June 2025 attacks on Iranian nuclear and military facilities, followed by the joint U.S.-Israeli strikes in February 2026.

But even CFR acknowledges a critical fact often buried beneath the war rhetoric: *Iran does not currently possess a nuclear weapon*. The organization notes that while Iran has the scientific knowledge and infrastructure to potentially build one fast, there is no confirmed evidence that its leadership has decided to do so.

Adding to that reality, the claim that Iran posed an imminent nuclear threat sharply conflicts with decades of U.S. intelligence **assessments**. The 2007 U.S. National Intelligence Estimate concluded that Iran halted its structured nuclear weapons program in 2003. Successive American intelligence officials — including former CIA Director William Burns — have repeatedly stated that Iran had not made the decision to build a nuclear bomb. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors, including former chief Mohamed ElBaradei, likewise reported finding no evidence of an active Iranian nuclear weapons program.

Even Trump's own Director of National Intelligence, Tulsi Gabbard, recently **contradicted** the administration's escalation narrative. In Senate testimony, Gabbard stated that Iran had not rebuilt a nuclear weapons program after the 2025 strikes — directly undercutting claims used to justify continued confrontation and military escalation.

She months later changed of position came after Donald Trump publicly **claimed** she was “wrong” and insisted U.S. intelligence showed Iran had amassed a “tremendous amount of material” and could build a nuclear weapon “within months.” Of course what has been stated here over and over again **Iran doesn't have a nuclear weapon**.

The lie, of course, is that Israel is not treated as a legitimate nuclear and existential threat while Iran — which still does not possess a nuclear weapon — is framed as the ultimate danger. This, of course, is the same logic that has fueled decades of endless war: the claim that Iran *could* build a weapon someday is treated as justification for permanent aggression today. Yet Iran still does not possess a nuclear weapon — and one reason may be obvious: countries like North Korea learned that once you *do* obtain one, you become untouchable, while nations without them remain at the mercy of the empire's next target.

Within the last week, members of Congress have started asking the same **question** — because who can't see what's right in front of our faces anymore? As lawmakers pressed the State Department for transparency over Israel's undeclared nuclear arsenal, the hypocrisy at the center of U.S. foreign policy became increasingly difficult to ignore.

In a letter sent to Secretary of State Marco Rubio, Democratic lawmakers pointed directly to the U.S.-Israel war on Iran as evidence that greater clarity is urgently needed.

“Congress has a constitutional responsibility to be fully informed about the nuclear balance in the Middle East, the risk of escalation by any party to this conflict, and the administration's planning and contingencies for such scenarios,” the letter, signed by 30 members of Congress, stated. “We do not believe we have received that information.”

The lawmakers also warned that maintaining “official ambiguity” around one state's nuclear capabilities while threatening war over another's makes genuine nonproliferation impossible in the Middle East.

“A policy of official ambiguity about the nuclear capabilities of one party to this conflict makes coherent nonproliferation policy in the Middle East impossible,” the letter stated, “for Iran, for Saudi Arabia, and for every other state in the region making decisions based on their perceptions of the capabilities of their neighbours.”

“This initiative is taking place against the backdrop of the US-Israeli war of aggression against Iran,” said Josh Ruebner of the Institute for Middle East Understanding Policy Project. “One of Trump's goals for ending this war involves negotiations to lift sanctions against Iran in exchange for an Iranian commitment not to develop nuclear weapons.”

“Members of Congress are right to question why Israel's development of nuclear weapons gets a free pass while we're trying to prevent Iran from acquiring them,” Ruebner added.

Of course, throughout the 1970s and ever since, Israeli officials have maintained the same carefully worded **line**: “Israel will not be the first country to introduce nuclear weapons to the Middle East.” It's a statement built on ambiguity — one that allowed everyone to pretend not to see what was already obvious.

But now, as the world edges closer to what increasingly feels like a third world war and the Doomsday Clock sits **nearer** to midnight than ever before, the real question is no longer whether these weapons exist. The question is when — and under what leadership — they could be used.

That fear becomes even more dangerous under a U.S. president whose mental fitness has become a serious public concern, and who has repeatedly used apocalyptic rhetoric about “blown off the face of the earth” Because if Israel is treated as an undeclared nuclear power beyond accountability, the United States remains the ultimate nuclear superpower — the empire standing behind it with the largest arsenal on Earth.

Remember how all of this started — with an Mr. Fish cartoon forcing us to stare directly at the hypocrisy and madness surrounding nuclear weapons, war, and empire. Thanks for making people think. And here's his work: [The Independent Ink Archive](#)

*(Republished from [Scheerpost](#) by permission of author or representative)*

18

## Marco Rubio: The Neocons' Golden Boy

by Josh Bazzle | May 28, 2026 | News | 0 Comments

Marco Rubio has increasingly been pushed by the neocons to become the 2028 presidential nominee, and they seemingly view him as their “golden boy” who will keep the wheels of the war machine turning. But I’m always interested in the why. Let’s take a journey.

To understand Rubio’s hawkish foreign policy, you first have to understand his background. Rubio’s parents were Cuban immigrants who fled Cuba before Fidel Castro took power, but the sting of the communist takeover still had an immense impact on his family. His grandfather played an especially significant role in shaping Rubio’s worldview. In an interview with *The Washington Post*, Rubio said his grandfather described “how communism destroyed lives in Cuba and how the United States had a unique role to play in the world as the enforcer of freedom.” (*Marco Rubio’s Cold War*). To put it simply, the idea of the United States acting as the world’s policeman was instilled in Rubio at a very young age, and that mentality has only intensified throughout his political career.

Rubio has built a reputation as one of the most consistently hawkish Republicans in modern politics. Over the years, he has backed countless U.S. interventions and aggressive foreign policy measures, including support for the overthrow of Muammar Gaddafi in Libya, the removal of Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela, economic sanctions against the Chinese Communist Party, continued aid to Ukraine, and hardline measures against Iran. That is one hell of a résumé, and it tells you everything you need to know about Rubio. In fact, he has become such a foreign policy fixture that many Americans have likely forgotten about his domestic positions altogether. Rubio represents the classic interventionist mindset, and if it were up to him, the administration would likely push even harder to fulfill its self-appointed mission of policing the world – a strategy that has repeatedly failed and consistently ended in disaster. History has not been kind to that approach.

With all of this in mind, it becomes crystal clear why Rubio is being pushed so aggressively for 2028. He will give the establishment exactly what it wants. Analysts have described Rubio as “rebooting the neocons for the MAGA era.” If Rubio seeks the Republican nomination in 2028 – which I believe he will – he will undoubtedly receive enormous backing from the war class. The shadiest PACs, the most aggressive foreign lobbying groups, and individuals with massive financial interests tied to defense contractors and global conflicts will all line up behind him. He is the neoconservative golden boy, and they will do everything possible to put him in the White House.

It is absolutely crucial that Americans understand that a Marco Rubio presidency would be disastrous for the United States, particularly when it comes to foreign policy. I would encourage voters to follow the money trail when Rubio inevitably announces his campaign – it will tell them everything they need to know. Hopefully, it will give Americans the opportunity to reject the endless foreign entanglements that have wreaked havoc on this country for decades. Americans have had enough, and I hope they make that clear at the ballot box as the 2028 election rapidly approaches.

*To learn more about Josh, visit [joshbazzle.com](http://joshbazzle.com).*

**If you liked this article, please support [Antiwar.com](http://Antiwar.com).  
We are 100% reader-supported.**

## Has President Trump Committed High Treason?

PAUL CRAIG ROBERTS • MAY 28, 2026 • 1,000 WORDS

19

Let's examine the case.

In the oath of office taken in the swearing in of a president, the about-to-be-president swears allegiance to the U.S. Constitution and promises to defend it against enemies at home and abroad. In other words, enemies of the Constitution are enemies of the United States. (Today the Constitution's enemies includes university law schools in the United States.)

If you asked what is the United States, some would say it is an idea; others would say it is a geographical territory. But these definitions apply to all countries and thus define none. The correct answer is that the United States is the Constitution.

The Constitution defines the form of government, the powers of the various branches, the distribution of powers between state governments and the federal government, the rights of citizens and the protection of those rights, and it defines the process of changing the Constitution, that is, of changing the United States. Without the Constitution the United States would be a different country.

It is not an election that makes a person the president. It is the person's vow to defend the United States by defending the Constitution. If an elected president refused the vow at the swearing in ceremony, he could not be confirmed in office as president. When a president-to-be swears an oath to the Constitution he swears an oath to the United States.

The most important parts of the Constitution are the Amendments, the Bill of Rights that had to be incorporated into the Constitution in order to gain its acceptance by all of the founding states. The Bill of Rights protects the citizens from government limiting their rights and committing violence or retribution against them for actions protected by the Constitution.

The principle right is free speech. It is the First Amendment, because without free speech it is impossible for citizens to hold government accountable for violation of the other protections from, and limits on, government power.

Trump's affinity for Zionist Israel has led him into an act that violates his oath of office and possibly caused him to commit high treason against the United States.

Trump has created by executive order what in effect is a Sedition Act for Israel that prohibits United States citizens from using their First Amendment right to criticize Israel for the genocide of Palestine, the rape and torture of Palestinian prisoners, the destruction of Palestinian homes, villages, and olive groves by Israeli settlers who blatantly steal Palestinian land, assassinations of foreign leaders, undue influence over the U.S. legislative and executive branches, state governments, media, finance, and education, and wars of aggression against Middle Eastern countries. U.S. critics of Israel are not even permitted to complain about the Jewish Anti-defamation League's slander, libel and defamation of them. For an American to complain of being defamed by Zionists is to risk punishment for anti-semitism.

To state it plainly, Trump and his acting attorney general have given priority to protecting Israel, a foreign government, over the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. Clearly, this means that Trump and his accommodating acting attorney general are serving a foreign interest by suspending without any right or authority to do so, the First Amendment rights guaranteed to U.S. citizens by the U.S. Constitution.

This puts Trump at odds with his vow to protect the U.S. Constitution and invalidates his swearing-in as president of the United States. Trump has issued an edict that his obliging attorney general has accepted that subordinates the U.S. Constitution to Israel.

On May 19, the acting Attorney General of the United States issued this statement:

② “President Trump has made clear that this administration will not tolerate antisemitism [defined as any criticism of Israel and Jews], and the Department of Justice is committed to implement that directive. This national tour is an important step in ensuring communities across the country know the federal government stands ready to work with them to confront antisemitic threats, protect public safety, and uphold civil rights.”

Notice that according to Trump’s attorney general “upholding civil rights” means deep-sixing the First Amendment that protects U. S. Citizens’ free speech rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

As Trump and his attorney general have come out against the First Amendment, they have come out against the US Constitution and, thereby, against the United States. In other words, both seem to be guilty of high treason.

For Trump and his attorney general to rule for Israel against American citizen’s First Amendment rights and the US Constitution that protects these rights calls into question who Trump and his attorney general represent.

It seems certain the President Trump’s willingness to sacrifice the U.S. Constitution to protecting Israel from words of criticism indicates that he has committed high treason in order to serve foreign interests, which would seem to make Trump an enemy of the U.S. Constitution and thereby an enemy of the United States.

If my reasoning is correct, why shouldn’t President Trump be arrested and put on trial for high treason against the United States?

Why did not Trump’s acting attorney general, who happens to be Trump’s personal defense attorney, warn Trump that he was stepping onto treasonous ground? Is a person who aids and abets the president in the possible commission of high treason fit to be attorney general of the United States?

Paul Craig Roberts was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan administration, associate editor and columnist for the Wall Street Journal, Business Week’s first outside columnist, columnist for the Scripps Howard News Service, contributor to the editorial page of the Los Angeles Times, and columnist for the main French and Italian newspapers, and for Creators Syndicate in Los Angeles. He served in numerous academic appointments in US universities and was appointed to the William E. Simon Chair for Political Economy at Georgetown University’s Center for Strategic and International Studies where his colleagues were Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, James R. Schlesinger (one of his former professors), and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Adm. Thomas Moorer. His article, “How the Law Was Lost,” was published in the January 1999 *Cardozo Law Review*.

*(Republished from paulcraigroberts by permission of author or representative)*

If they can get you asking the wrong questions, they don't have to worry about the answers.

—Thomas Pynchon