

Four Forgotten Heroes of True England



Joseph Pearce

Starting just 30 years after the Crucifixion, Catholic England produced remarkable figures, including lesser-known luminaries like Bishop Robert Grosseteste, who pioneered the scientific method.

September 6, 2025

In my book *Faith of Our Fathers: A History of True England*, I sought to present a panoramic overview of two thousand years of English history, from the first century to the 21st century. Its premise was that “true England” was the England which had remained true to Truth Himself, Jesus Christ, and to His Mystical Body, the Catholic Church.

From the arrival of the first Christian missionaries around the year 63—only 30 years after the Crucifixion—to today, the history of true England continues to inspire faith in the promise of Christ that the gates of Hell will not prevail against His Church, nor against those who remain faithful to His Church. In this sense, true England is a land of heroes. Let’s focus on four of those heroes whom every true Englishman should know.

In 735, the year in which St. Bede died in northern England, another great English scholar was born, also in the north of England. This was Alcuin, who was destined to be the most influential scholar of the eighth century. The first 40 years of his life were devoted to scholarship and to the building of the great library at York. Such was his reputation across the whole of Christendom that he was asked by Charlemagne to help spread Christian learning to the Franks. He left England in 782 and settled in Aachen, in what is now Germany.

Charlemagne bestowed three abbeys upon Alcuin, each of which became a great center of scholarship. Specifically, Alcuin set about raising the standards for the copying of manuscripts, which was such a crucial task in the days before printing, as well as increasing the amount of copying being done. Thanks to his diligence, libraries gradually grew up all over Charlemagne’s realm, laying the foundations for Christian scholarship for centuries to come.

Moving to the 13th century, we find England in a time of political crisis. It is 1215, and King John’s tyrannical rule has led to a rebellion of his own barons. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton, acting as mediator between the king and his restless subjects, hearkened back to Anglo-Saxon England in the years before the Norman Conquest, and specifically to the reign of St. Edward the Confessor, as the practical political model for a just solution to the conflict.

Archbishop Langton helped to draft the Magna Carta, which limited the power of the monarchy and laid the foundations for the English legal system. When King John signed this foundational historical document, albeit very reluctantly, it was Archbishop Langton who was the first witness to sign it after him. Such was the archbishop’s pivotal role in this historic event that the political philosopher Ernest Baker described Stephen Langton as the “father of English liberty.” Furthermore, considering the importance and influence of the Magna Carta on the political thought of America’s Founding Fathers, it could be argued that this great English Catholic was also the “father of American liberty” or, in any event, that his labors were a source of significant inspiration to those who forged the founding of the United States.

A contemporary of Stephen Langton is Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln from 1235 until his death in 1253, who was one of the greatest scholars of his age. Although his role as a statesman gained him fame and even notoriety, he deserves to be remembered primarily as a scholastic philosopher, theologian, and scientist. He lectured at Oxford on the Psalter, the Pauline epistles, Genesis, and possibly on Isaiah, Daniel, and Sirach. He disputed with his contemporaries on the theological nature of truth and the efficacy of the Mosaic Law, and wrote commentaries on Aristotle’s *Physics* and the first commentary in the West of Aristotle’s *Posterior Analytics*. Also significant is his work on Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite’s *Celestial Hierarchy*, which he translated from Greek into Latin and on which he wrote a commentary.

Sept 8, 2025

PACKET

JCRMC

It is, however, as a pioneer in the physical sciences that Robert Grosseteste should perhaps be honored most, his life and work offering further proof that modern science stands on the shoulders of Catholic scholars. He was an original thinker in the scientific method and, as such, is an instrumental figure in the history of science. He concluded, following in the tradition of Boethius, that mathematics was the highest of all sciences on the basis that every natural science ultimately depended on mathematics. He also laid the foundations for the science of optics with his groundbreaking treatises *De Luce (On Light)* and *De Colore (On Color)*. The former work was the first attempt to describe the heavens in terms of a single set of physical laws, four centuries before Isaac Newton proposed gravity and seven centuries before the Catholic priest and physicist Fr. Georges Lemaître proposed the Big Bang theory.

Upon his death, Robert Grosseteste was widely revered as a saint, with miracles being reported at his shrine; but he has never been canonized.

The final words on this great and neglected Englishman should be reserved for the tribute to his legacy to be found on his tomb in Lincoln Cathedral:

He was a man of learning and an inspiration to scholars, a wise administrator whilst a true shepherd of his flock, ever concerned to lead them to Christ in whose service he strove to temper justice with mercy, hating the sin while loving the sinner, not sparing the rod though cherishing the weak.

Robert Grosseteste was an old man, in his early 80s, when he died. Almost three hundred years later, in 1539, another English hero of Christendom would die at the ripe old age of 78. Whereas Grosseteste would die peacefully in his bed, Abbot Richard Whiting and two other monks would be dragged on a hurdle to Glastonbury Tor, the hill overlooking the abbey of which he would be the last abbot. He and the two other monks were then hanged, disembowelled, beheaded, and quartered.

The abbot's head was stuck on a pike above the entrance to the abbey for all to see. The quartered remainder of his corpse was boiled in pitch and then displayed in the nearby towns of Wells, Bath, Ilchester and Bridgewater. The "crime" for which Abbot Whiting was executed in this slow and barbarous fashion was his refusal to surrender Glastonbury Abbey to the king.

The king's henchman, Thomas Cromwell, serving as judge and jury ahead of any trial, wrote that "the Abbot of Glaston [is] to be tried at Glaston and also executed there with his accomplices." It is not known whether any fallacy of a trial was ever actually held, but the preordained sentence was carried out as Cromwell had stipulated.

Abbot Richard Whiting was beatified by Pope Leo XIII in 1895. Sixty years later, in July 1955, the Marian shrine at Glastonbury was finally restored after its destruction by Henry VIII in the year of Abbot Whiting's martyrdom more than four hundred years earlier. The apostolic delegate, Archbishop O'Hara, blessed the new statue of Our Lady of Glastonbury, which was then formally enshrined in the new church which had been built to house it.

Many of the pilgrims who attended the restoration of the Queen of Glastonbury to England's oldest Marian shrine made the customary ascent of the Tor, the hill that dominates the surrounding landscape, to pray for the intercession of Blessed Richard Whiting. "How greatly would that holy Martyr have rejoiced to see that day," wrote the Catholic historian H.M. Gillett, who added that "one may be sure that it is by his prayers in heaven that this restoration has been brought about."

It is regrettable that these four forgotten English heroes are not known or recognized by their fellow countrymen. Yet, as H.M. Gillett reminds us, their praises are being sung in Heaven, the only place where any sort of praise ultimately matters. They are resting in the peace of Christ. May Christ be praised!

'Viva Cristo Rey': Father Sedano led the faithful witness of the Cristeros

On September 7, 1927, Father Gumersindo Sedano y Palencia refused to compromise his faith and was martyred during a time of great persecution against the Church in Mexico.

Punish one, teach a hundred. – Anonymous

(LifeSiteNews) — With his neck roped to a heavy branch on the eucalyptus tree, the priest's corpse — on display — was to serve as a lesson to others.

Soldiers ordered photographers to snap shots of the dead cleric — with his head at an unnatural bend, clothing spattered with blood, and his bare toes resting gently, barely touching the dirt. Photos were to be published in the regime's nationwide propaganda rags to spread fear, as per the Bolshevik way.

Such was the execution and cruel degradation of Father Gumersindo Sedano y Palencia, on September 7, 1927, during a time of great persecution against the Catholic Church in Mexico.

A member of the Colima clergy and chaplain to the Cristero War's Liberation Movement in the Jalisco regions of Tuxpan and Tamazula de Gorgiano, Sedano had traveled to the town of Ciudad Guzman to pick up some supplies and to tend to some matters. An overnight trip, he received a warm welcome in a home that had also given refuge to five Cristero soldiers.

At the same time, local federal soldiers were looking for Cristero General Dionisio Eduardo Ochoa Santana (1900-27), a Cristiada leader who had slipped into town — accompanied by some of his soldiers — to meet with Javier Heredia, chief representative of the Special War Committee of the National League for the Defense of Religious Liberty, the national organization acting as the brains behind the religious rebellion.

During the search for Ochoa, soldiers received a tip from a meddling old woman looking for financial reward. She had spotted the presence of a group of Cristeros at a certain residence, she confided, and happily rattled off the address and the whereabouts of those Christian rebels.

Following her lead, the next day, September 7, 1927, a truckload of federal soldiers arrived at the specified location and stormed inside the building. But there was no Ochoa. He had already snuck out of town, undetected, hours earlier, in the dark, presumably back to Cristero War headquarters in the hills of the Colima Volcano.

Undeterred, the troops rounded up Sedano along with the five Cristero soldiers, herded the six Catholics into a truck and headed for the barracks based in the Ciudad Guzman Train Station at the corner of what is currently known as Avenida Arquitecto Pedro Ramirez Vazquez and Calzada Madero y Carranza.

A certain Captain Urbina waited for them.

Along the route, Sedano held his rosary and prayed out loud, occasionally shouting exclamations and pious chants with great emotion that chafed his captors.

"Viva Cristo Rey! Viva Santa Maria de Guadalupe! Viva el Papa! Sacred Heart, you will reign! Mexico will always be yours!" he cried out.

The more he cheered, the more he irritated the soldiers, who attempted to silence him. But the more they tried, the louder he yelled.

When passing by Saint Joseph Cathedral, he called out to the patron saint of the church: "Saint Joseph, my Patriarch, to whom this church is dedicated, moments before dying for Christ, I greet you and invoke you. In a few moments, I will see you in Heaven!"

Attracting the attention of onlookers, he hollered to them: "I am a priest, and I am going to die for Christ. Long live Christ the King! Come, and see how Christians die!"

At the Ciudad Guzman train station, Captain Urbina walked out and greeted the arrivals, as the priest continued to pray aloud and holler exclamations.

"Shut up!" Urbina ordered.

"As long as I'm alive, I will not stop shouting," the priest responded, adding, "Viva Cristo Rey!"

"Shut up, coward!" the enraged Urbina demanded.

"We Catholics are not cowards," Sedano calmly answered. "And you yourselves have the proof. When they apprehended us, if these men with me didn't fire, it's because they didn't have Mausers. Provide us with weapons, and you'll have proof of the heroism of the Liberators. You are the cowards! You can kill us immediately; we are ready to die! Long live Christ the King!"

Enraged, Urbina drew his pistol and shot the priest, who collapsed in the back of the truck, murmuring, "Viva Cristo Rey, Viva Cristo Rey, Viva Cristo Rey," as his five companions were also promptly executed.

With a rope tied around his neck, Sedano was hauled off the truck and dragged nearby to one of the thick, aged eucalyptus trees. Soldiers attempted to string him up, but the first branch snapped, and his body dropped to the ground. A second attempt also failed. Finally, on the third try, soldiers succeeded in hanging the priest, with his bare feet still touching the ground, as the federal troops laughed and jeered.

Also hanged post-mortem – the priest's five companions, soaked in blood, with crucifixes hanging from their necks, dangling on the ends of their ropes, some from telephone poles, others from eucalyptus trees.

But the federal soldiers didn't stop there. To create an even more gruesome public execution exhibition for photographers and to terrorize locals into submission, the corpses of five Callista soldiers killed in battle were hauled in, stripped of their uniforms and hanged beside their enemy combatants, to give the impression of 10 Cristeros.

General Jesus Maria Ferreira Knappe (1889-1938), federal chief of the Jalisco military zone, received a telegram that he immediately forwarded to Mexican President Plutarco Elias Calles (born Francisco Plutarco Elias Campuzano, 1877-1945) about the executions:

"I am honored to inform you that at this moment I have just apprehended Father Sedano, having shot him with five other fanatics. The bodies are on display at the Ciudad Guzman Station."

Dehumanized, the priest's lifeless body remained tethered to his hanging tree. Around his knees, a large piece of paper with six scrawled words: "This is the priest Fr. Sedano," to serve as a lesson. Indeed, it did.

Miscellanea and facts came from the following:

"El Martir de Ciudad Guzman," by Anonymous.

"Los Cristeros del Volcan de Colima: Escenas de le Luche por le Libertad Religiosa en Mexico 1926-1929, Tomo I," by Spectator, pen name of Father Enrique de Jesus Ochoa.

"Mejico Cristero Historia de la ACJM 1925 a 1931," by Antonio Rius Facius.

The Land That Hath No Music

Chronicles

People rooted in their native culture sing;
multiculturalists do not sing, but shout political slogans.

SOMETIMES I TAKE A GUILTY DELIGHT in noting that the people of our time who most have "multiculturalism" on their lips detest culture in their souls.

How could it be otherwise? To belong to a culture is to cultivate a way of life that is like the soil beneath your feet and the skies overhead. You honor it, as you honor your mother and father, not because you believe it is perfect, as they are not perfect, but because it is yours. Such honor is not a political decision, like voting for a candidate. It is mingled with gratitude and love. It is essential to a truly human education, one that builds up and nourishes the soul. At its height, it can bring you, if not into the divine, at least in view of its horizon. But the multiculturalist treats these things with scorn, as of no political use.

Put it this way. What you love, even in sorrow, moves you to sing. But no one sings about a political party, unless it is an advertising jingle scrambled up for the occasion, soon and thankfully forgotten. Imagine misty-eyed Republicans gathering at a fireside to sing, "Get on the raft with Taft, boys!" To hear "Stalinu Slava!" "Glory to Stalin!" a bombastic chorale by Dmitri Shostakovich, is to be embarrassed for the sake of secular man, exalting a murderous thug as a god—or compelled to pretend to do so, under threat of state disapproval, penury, imprisonment, exile, or death.

The multiculturalist shouts because he is a political player. His shouting is irritable because he secretly envies those who *do* have a culture, and who therefore sing. If he is a teacher or professor, the last thing he wants to find in his students is love for their native land: her history, her heroes, her folkways, her songs, her religious faith. His job is to debunk all that. He is like Milton's Satan, who, "Late fallen from heaven himself, is plotting now / The fall of others from like state of bliss." He does not love Nanking, but he sure does hate Nashville.

People rooted in their native culture sing because singing is what lovers do. Let me illustrate with an anecdote related by a man who did love many cultures, including his own, and who did sing. He is Henry Edward Krehbiel, writing in *Afro-American Folksongs* (1914), the first book ever written on that music. In his introduction, Krehbiel aimed to show the power of music to convey a people's most profound experiences of love and sorrow, of gratitude and longing. In 1758, an English army had landed in Brittany and was on the march. These troops, made up of Welshmen, were "singing a national air, when all at once the Bretons of the French army stopped short in amazement. The air their enemies were singing was one which

every day may be heard sounding over the hearths of Brittany."

The Bretons, fellow Celts with the Welsh, stood electrified, Krehbiel wrote. "They gave way to a sudden enthusiasm, and joined in the same patriotic refrain. The Welsh, in their turn, stood motionless in their ranks. On both sides officers gave the command to fire" but it was no use. "A common emotion was too strong for discipline; the weapons fell from their hands, and the descendants from the ancient Celts renewed upon the battlefield the fraternal ties which had formerly united their fathers."

Music can awaken ancestral ties and unite people who would otherwise be ripping each other apart with bayonets. Nor was it just *any* music that brought the Welsh and the Bretons together. It was *theirs*. Sacred music, for those who share the same faith in God, has all the greater power to do the same. Therefore, the multiculturalist, battenning on antagonism, will not be found inviting people to sing hymns regardless of their political views. I turn to another illustration, more powerful than that of the Welsh and the Bretons, since it had a wider chasm to bridge.

It was 1950, in a Manhattan apartment. The singer and actress Ethel Waters had come there to demand changes to the character Berenice, whom she was going to play in the Broadway production of *The Member of the Wedding*. She appealed directly to the author, Carson McCullers. Waters was black, the daughter of a girl raped at age 13; she had grown up in miserable poverty. She was also a baptized Catholic who never lost her Christian faith, despite her morally checkered decades in show business. McCullers was a white woman from a middle-class family; she had led her own checkered life, and she had no faith at all. She had conceived of Berenice as big, atheistic, and foul-mouthed, and Waters was there to throw her considerable weight against that creature of hopelessness.

Berenice and the two white children at the center of the play were supposed to sing a song they had made up. But Waters thought it absurd to represent a Georgia maid singing a song nobody in Georgia had ever heard of. She wanted instead the gospel song, "His Eye Is on the Sparrow." Here is its refrain:

I sing because I'm happy,
I sing because I'm free,
For His eye is on the sparrow,
And I know He watches me.

It is *not* a sprightly, happy-go-lucky song. Its mood is of confidence welling up amidst sorrow. Waters sang it to McCullers and her friends, moving that atheist

to tears. McCullers gladly conceded, and Waters, Julie Harris, and the small boy, Brandon DeWilde, went on to make the play a smashing success both on Broadway and on screen in the 1952 film.

You cannot fully appreciate that gospel song unless you hear, in your soul, the Scripture that inspired it. Jesus tells his disciples that they will be persecuted, but they are not to fear. They are to place all their trust in the Father. From the Gospel of Matthew:

Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall to the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows.

To embrace that teaching and to celebrate it in song is to incorporate yourself into the culture-nurturing power of a faith that has spanned 20 centuries and all the world. And that is the least we can say about it.

What inspired the writer of the lyrics, Civilla Martin, is also pertinent. She and her husband were visiting a couple in Elmira, New York, the Doolittles, "true saints of God," as Martin described them. The wife was bedridden. The husband had to get back and forth from home to work in a wheelchair. Yet they were not disgruntled or angry. When Martin asked Mrs. Doolittle about their hopefulness, the bedridden woman replied, "His eye is on the sparrow, and I know He watches me." That simple reply, wrote Martin, gripped her and her husband's hearts and set their imaginations afire. Hence the song, which Ethel Waters took to *her* heart, making it known throughout the world when she accompanied Billy Graham on his crusades.

How grubby, by comparison, seem the political concerns of the multiculturalist, as if some apparatchik had stolen up on a few comrades singing love songs, and in his impatience had knocked the bread and wine off the table, hollering that they had more important work to do. But what is more important, even in an earthly sense, than to build the soul?

I turn to Krehbiel again, in his day the most influential critic of music in America, as music editor of *The New York Tribune* in the 1880s till his death in 1923. I am looking at Volume 19 of *The Century Magazine*. Krehbiel was a frequent contributor to that monthly, commenting on the works of European composers, many of whom he championed when they were relatively unknown here, such as Wagner and Tchaikovsky. He sometimes traveled to the places where their music had taken root, to hear it in its cultural motherland.

The article I am reading is "Chinese Music." It is accompanied by scores for five melodies, one of them, "The Jasmine Flower," given with lyrics in Chinese and English. Krehbiel describes the simplicity

of the Chinese pentatonic scale, asking his readers to consider what it might be like to range freely over the black keys of a piano. He presents the Chinese language also as fundamentally musical. The Chinese distinguish words by music, so that they "will quicker recognize a difference of a tone in the pitch of a word than such a vowel change as from short *e* to short *i*, the consonants remaining the same." To their ears, the power of music is bound up with the power of language, with man's attempt to see the truth and to convey what he has seen.

If so, then good music is indispensable to a moral and human education. Krehbiel cites the ancient Chinese emperor Chun (ca. 2300 B.C.), on how to bring up the youths of the governing class:

Teach [them] that through thy care they may become just, mild, and wise; firm, without severity; upholding the dignity and pride of their station without vanity or assumption. Express these doctrines in poems, that they may be sung to appropriate melodies accompanied by the music of instruments. Let the music follow the sense of the words; let it be simple and ingenuous, for vain, empty, and effeminate music is to be condemned. Music is the expression of the soul's emotion; if the soul of the musician be virtuous, his music will be full of nobility and will unite the souls of men with the spirits of heaven.

Imagine the principal of an American high school, urging his assembled faculty to ground their instruction in music, to affirm the comely moral order to which virtuous music raises the human heart. His enemies would be recording his speech on their phones to get him fired. His friends would be thunderstruck, wondering whether he had lost his mind. He might as well be speaking to them in Chinese.

Or Greek. For Plato, too, as Krehbiel knows, insisted that true education is musical, meaning also that it is religious. Thus Krehbiel relates Chun's understanding of the soul-forming power of music to the "lyrico-dramatic composition" of Wagner and his operas, and to ancient Greek drama, which "was religious in its essence," springing "directly from the emotional part of man." So my imaginary principal would find powerful allies in ancient China and in Greece, and in the magnanimous Felix Mendelssohn, who, when he first heard Allegri's *Miserere* chanted in the Sistine Chapel, said he had experienced the very soul of music. Mozart, Bach, Beethoven—they too would all understand.

I fear that Chun's wisdom would find no better reception from our college professors than from our schoolteachers. How many among them read Plato? Who wants to listen to Mendelssohn? Let alone to Mrs.

Doolittle, singing the song she inspired Mrs. Martin to write, the song that Ethel Waters loved so dearly. When you scoff at moral, metaphysical, and religious truth, what remains for you to impart? Scientific information, perhaps; utilitarian skills; political directives. Hence the professoriate's notorious jargon: ugly prose for ugly souls, to disguise bad faith and ignorance.

Krehbiel wrote for wiser hearts than theirs. He assumes that his readers know a little about Aeschylus and Sophocles, and about Plato's views of music and education. He assumes their familiarity with current classical music. He praises the work of Jean Joseph Marie Amiot, a Jesuit priest who lived in China from 1750 to 1794, author of *Memoires concernant l'histoire, les sciences, les arts, les moeurs, les usages, des Chinois*, whose sixth volume of 17 is devoted to Chinese music. Krehbiel grew up speaking English and German, and he later taught himself four other languages while dabbling in many more. He does not insult his readers by translating that French title.

"But," I hear the surly objection, "Krehbiel was writing for elites." No, he wasn't. *The New York Tribune* was a newspaper, after all, and *The Century* was the most popular magazine in America. But he did enjoy a unique advantage. In his day, the old world appeared to be opening into new glory, made possible by the power of the Industrial Revolution, while the destructive forces of that same revolution were still mainly subterranean, unfelt. Suddenly, anyone with a few years of school could go to a local library and read Shakespeare or Longfellow's translation of Dante. Some of my copies of *The Century* come from the library of an iron mining company in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. Innumerable people with access to a piano could order sheet music and learn to play Beethoven, or those Chinese airs whose scores Krehbiel included in his article. Not only *could* they do so; it was taken for granted that they *would*. The phonograph would bring excellent music, popular and classical, to millions more who could not play it.

What about the opportunity to encounter another culture? Suddenly, there were new means for doing that, too. Folk music, folk art, and folk tales had been elevated to worthy objects of study by scholars such as the Brothers Grimm, who had built up their muscles on the classics, and whose knowledge of language, literature, and art was encyclopedic. When that impetus was combined with new and quick and convenient means of travel, with the proliferation of newspapers and popular magazines, with photography and lithography, and with the first recording devices, all bets were off.

Krehbiel participated in that cultural enterprise too, promoting the work of Antonín Dvořák, the Slavic genius who brought American folk music to the world, just as he himself aimed to bring, for exam-

ple, Finnish music to America. Even what moved him to write his book on Afro-American songs suggests that brief overlap of two forms of life.

Over the years, Krehbiel had written some articles on those songs for the *Tribune*. These, he said, "had been clipped from the newspaper, placed in envelopes and indexed in several public libraries, and many requests came to [him] from librarians and students that they be republished in book-form." Thus, we see librarians and their patrons so interested in a profoundly cultural project that they went out of their way to disseminate knowledge about it and to ask for more. The public library: a hallowed place where what had been the privilege of the wealthy or the highly educated was made available to millions.

I don't know whether Krehbiel, who directed a church choir in Cincinnati when he was a teenage boy, lost the specifically Christian faith he had been brought up in. Of the broadly religious impetus of his work, there can be no question. When he read the words of Père Amiot, he must have felt as the Bretons did when they heard the Welshmen. Amiot, attempting to convey what music meant for his Chinese hosts, recalled that among "the ancient sages, who adopted music as the subject of their deepest meditations, and made it into the object of their most serious work, there were some who clearly wrote of a principle upon which they built a science regarded as a universal, a science of all other sciences." Music with no felt connection with the order of heaven was, to the Chinese, a jangle of noise, incomprehensible, and degrading to the soul.

But that is where we are now. And the multiculturalists among us? In any genuine culture the world has known, they would be regarded as disappointing creatures, homeless, ill-educated, ill-bred, stunted in the soul. They have made themselves into political tools, and in the oncoming battle between humanity and the data-sifting, nothing-knowing, all-engorging machine, they will prove worse than useless. As for the rest of us, we must do what no people have ever had to do before. We must treat ourselves as if our brains and souls have been ravaged and left barren. We must then make ourselves into beings for whom the stories I have told would seem matters of course. We must learn, as if from the beginning, to tend and to love the land of our birth, to bend the knee to God above, and to sing.

Anthony Esolen is a distinguished professor of humanities at Thales College, a translator of Dante, and author of many books. He and his wife, Debra, publish an online magazine about language, poetry, hymns, classic films, and popular music, called Word and Song. August 2025

How Two Vague Words Were Used to Gut the Entire Constitution

"...do we live under a limited or an unlimited government?"

To you, that question probably sounds naive because the answer feels obvious. But in 1792, Thomas Jefferson saw it as the moment of truth.

Alexander Hamilton had just laid out his vision for the "general welfare" clause. His answer was simple. *"The power... is ...indefinite."*

To Jefferson and his allies, this was a scam. A complete betrayal of the constitutional system that was adopted.

The clash over the meaning of these two words – general Welfare – set the stage for what became the largest government in history.

HAMILTON: WITHOUT LIMITS

To begin this story, we first need to go back to December 5, 1791.

Alexander Hamilton just published his now-famous *Report on the Subject of Manufactures*. His goal was to stretch the "general Welfare" clause so far that it would authorize virtually unlimited power.

"the power to raise money is plenary, and indefinite; and the objects to which it may be appropriated are no less comprehensive, than the payment of the public debts and the providing for the common defence and 'general Welfare.'"

Hamilton admitted to only three exceptions. Taxes must be uniform across the Union. Direct taxes must be apportioned by census. And no export taxes from any state. Beyond that? Nothing.

"The phrase is as comprehensive as any that could have been used; because it was not fit that the constitutional authority of the Union, to appropriate its revenues should have been restricted within narrower limits than the 'General Welfare.'"

Hamilton pushed the point even further, insisting that "general welfare" was so broad it couldn't be defined.

"...and because this necessarily embraces a vast variety of particulars, which are susceptible neither of specification nor of definition."

That takes us directly to the text of the Constitution, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE ARTICLES

To understand the full context of this debate, we need to go back to July 1775, at the height of the American Revolution.

A year before the Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Franklin submitted his proposed plan for Articles of Confederation to the Continental Congress. It never came to a formal vote, but Franklin circulated copies among delegates to spark discussion on how to structure a union – something he had been pushing since his Albany Plan of 1754.



One of those copies survives today with Thomas Jefferson's handwritten notes in the margins. On the last page, Jefferson zeroed in on a phrase that would haunt debates for decades.

"qu. what 'their mutual and general welfare' means. There should be no vague terms in an instrument of this kind. It's objects should be precisely and determinately fixed."

Jefferson's concern was simple but profound. A constitutional charter could not leave room for elastic words that politicians might twist to justify limitless power.

When the Articles of Confederation were finally adopted a few years later, the phrase "general welfare" appeared twice – including this provision in Article VIII:

"All charges of war, and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defence or general welfare, and allowed by the united states in congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several states."

MADISON: ENUMERATION QUALIFIES

Even there, the phrase served only as a heading to specific, limited purposes – not as an open-ended grant of power. That was exactly how James Madison understood it. When Hamilton tried to turn general welfare into a blank check, Madison called it a distortion that flipped the Constitution on its head.

"With respect to the words 'General welfare' I have always regarded them as qualified by the detail of powers connected with them. To take them in a literal and unlimited sense, would be a metamorphosis of the Constitution into a character, which there is a host of proofs was not contemplated by its Creators."

Madison – who co-authored the *Federalist Papers* with Hamilton and John Jay – had already confronted this line of attack during the ratification debates. Some opponents of the Constitution argued that the "general welfare" wording amounted to an unlimited grant of power:

"It has been urged and echoed, that the power 'to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States,' amounts to an unlimited commission to exercise every power which may be alleged to be necessary for the common defense or general welfare."

He mocked the claim as so absurd that it only proved how low his critics had to stoop to find fault with the plan.

"No stronger proof could be given of the distress under which these writers labor for objections, than their stooping to such a misconstruction."

Madison stressed that the clause wasn't a separate delegation of power at all. To drive the point home, he even pointed to the punctuation – noting that the list of enumerated powers followed immediately in the same sentence.

"But what color can the objection have, when a specification of the objects alluded to by these general terms immediately follows, and is not even separated by a longer pause than a semicolon?"

He pressed the obvious question: why enumerate powers at all if the first phrase already gave everything?

"For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power?"

And he explained the widely-accepted logic of using broad language, then narrowing it with detail.

"Nothing is more natural nor common than first to use a general phrase, and then to explain and qualify it by a recital of particulars."

HAMILTON: SUBSIDIES AS THE VEHICLE

That brings us back to Hamilton in 1791. He was proposing this broad view of general welfare as a justification for federal bounties. Today we'd call them subsidies or corporate welfare.

In short, Hamilton wanted to tax imports so he could funnel the money through government to favored industries like coal, wool, glass, and cotton.

"The true way to conciliate these two interests, is to lay a duty on foreign manufactures of the material, the growth of which is desired to be encouraged, and to apply the produce of that duty by way of bounty, either upon the production of the material itself or upon its manufacture at home or upon both."

He knew opponents would object that no power was enumerated for government cash handouts to any industry. So Hamilton invented a new constitutional foundation: Congress would decide how much power Congress would have.

"It is therefore of necessity left to the discretion of the National Legislature, to pronounce, upon the objects, which concern the general Welfare, and for which under that description, an appropriation of money is requisite and proper."

MADISON AND JEFFERSON: LIMITED MEANS LIMITED

Just over a month later, Madison fired back. Accept Hamilton's view, and the entire point of a Constitution with delegated powers was finished.

"If Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and will promote the general welfare, the Government is no longer a limited one possessing enumerated powers, but an indefinite one subject to particular exceptions."

Madison drove the point home by tying it back to the Articles of Confederation. The phrase "general welfare" had been carried over into the Constitution for a reason: everyone already understood it as nothing more than a reference to expenses tied to the specified powers.

It was intentionally chosen because it was less likely than any other wording to be twisted. And yet now, Madison warned, Hamilton was doing exactly that – turning the phrase into the very kind of blank check Madison himself had ridiculed Anti-Federalists for claiming during ratification.

"It is to be remarked that the phrase out of which this doctrine is elaborated, is copied from the old articles of Confederation, where it was always understood as nothing more than a general caption to the specified powers, and it is a fact that it was preferred in the new instrument for that very reason as less liable than any other to misconstruction."

When President Washington asked his for opinions on Hamilton's plan, Jefferson came down hard. He pointed out that whenever government takes it upon itself to pick winners and losers, it seizes money from some and hands it to the chosen few. And abuse isn't just likely, it's almost guaranteed.

"Bounties have in some instances been a successful instrument for the introd'n. of new and useful manufactures. But the use of them has been found almost inseparable from abuse."

And that, Jefferson noted, is exactly why the Constitution never delegated such a power to the federal government.

"The power of dispensing them has not been delegated by the Constn. to the Genl. govm't. It remains with the state govm'ts. whose local information renders them competent judges of the particular arts and manufactures for which circumstances have matured them."

In short? Hamilton's plan was 100% unconstitutional.

THE FIRST TEST: COD FISHERIES

Meanwhile in Congress, the first real test came. A bill to "encourage" cod fisheries was seen by opponents as a federal subsidy in practice – and Madison ripped into it on the House floor.

"If Congress can apply money indefinitely to the general welfare, and are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their own hands; they may establish teachers in every state, county, and parish, and pay them out of the public treasury;"

And that was only the beginning. Madison warned it could pull in nearly everything — education, welfare, even local roads – all under the banner of "general welfare."

"they may take into their own hands the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the union; they may assume the provision for the poor; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post roads;"

Sounds familiar, doesn't it? But to Madison, these were extreme hypotheticals – the furthest stretch of abuse he could imagine. To us, they're the daily reality of federal power.

The result, he warned, would be federal control and federal funding of everything.

"in short, every thing, from the highest object of state legislation, down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress; for every object I have mentioned would admit the application of money, and might be called, if Congress pleased, provisions for the general welfare."

THEY WEREN'T ALONE

William Branch Giles also flatly rejected any federal bounty power as totally unconstitutional.

"in no part of the Constitution could he, in express terms, find a power given to Congress to grant bounties on occupations: the power is neither directly granted, nor (by any reasonable construction that he could give) annexed to any other specified in the Constitution."

Giles was a staunch Anti-Federalist, so his opponents could easily brush him off. But not Hugh Williamson of North Carolina. He was a Framer at the Philadelphia Convention and a strong Federalist supporter of the Constitution during the ratification debates.

His warning was brutal: it wouldn't stop with fishermen getting subsidies. In fact, it would never stop.

"Establish the doctrine of bounties; set aside that part of the Constitution which requires equal taxes, and demands similar distributions; destroy this barrier – and it is not a few fishermen that will enter, claiming ten or twelve thousand dollars but all manner of persons; people of every trade and occupation may enter in at the breach, until they have eaten up the bread of our children."

What he called the road to ruin is the reality we live under: every industry demanding its share of federal spoils.

JEFFERSON: THE MOMENT OF TRUTH

By the end of February 1792, Jefferson finally had his meeting with President Washington. In his memoranda of that conversation, he wrote that Hamilton's proposal had brought matters to a head.

"They had now brought forward a proposition, far beyond every one ever yet advanced, and to which the eyes of many were turned, as the decision which was to let us know whether we live under a limited or an unlimited government."

For Jefferson, Hamilton's plan wasn't really about aiding manufacturers at all. It was a deliberate pretext.

"He asked me to what proposition I alluded?—I answered to that in the Report on manufactures which, under colour of giving bounties for the encouragement of particular manufactures,"

The cover story was bounties for manufacturing. The reality was a doctrine of limitless power.

"...meant to establish the doctrine that the power given by the Constitution to collect taxes to provide for the general welfare of the U.S. permitted Congress to take every thing under their management which they should deem for the public welfare, and which is susceptible of the application of money"

THE ANTI-FEDERALIST WARNING

Jefferson nailed it in 1775 when he called general welfare a dangerously vague term. During the ratification debates of 1787-88, Anti-Federalists like Brutus gave the same warning.

"I would ask those, who reason thus, to define what ideas are included under the terms, to provide for the common defence and general welfare? Are these terms definite, and will they be understood in the same manner, and to apply to the same cases by every one?"

In his 6th essay, he predicted general welfare would be twisted exactly how Hamilton did it just a few years later.

"No one will pretend they will. It will then be matter of opinion, what tends to the general welfare; and the Congress will be the only judges in the matter."

An indefinite and vague term like general welfare? Brutus knew – every faction could twist it to support whatever they want.

"To provide for the general welfare, is an abstract proposition, which mankind differ in the explanation of, as much as they do on any political or moral proposition that can be proposed; the most opposite measures may be pursued by different parties..."

And Brutus warned that the vagueness was the real danger – you could never know if people were honestly misreading it as a limit on power, or deliberately twisting it to grab more.

"It is as absurd to say, that the power of Congress is limited by these general expressions, 'to provide for the common safety, and general welfare,' as it would be to say, that it would be limited, had the constitution said they should have power to lay taxes, &c. at will and pleasure."

"...and both may profess, that they have in view the general welfare; and both sides may be honest in their professions, or both may have sinister views."

In his view, calling that a limit on power was laughable. He predicted it would end with no limits at all.



Department of War?

by Ron Paul | Sep 3, 2025 | 0 Comments

Last week President Trump took steps to re-name the Department of Defense the “Department of War.” The President explained his rationale for the name change: “It used to be called the Department of War and it had a stronger sound. We want defense, but we want offense too... As Department of War we won everything... and I think we... have to go back to that.”

At first it sounds like a terrible idea. A “Department of War” may well make war more likely – the “stronger sound” may embolden the US government to take us into even more wars. There would no longer be any need for the pretext that we take the nation to war to defend this country and its interests – and only as a last resort.

As Clinton Administration official Madeleine Albright famously asked of Joint Chiefs Chairman Colin Powell when she was pushing for US war in the Balkans, “What’s the point of having this superb military that you’re always talking about if we can’t use it?”

So yes, that is a real danger. But at the same time, the US has been at war nearly constantly since the end of World War II, so it’s not like the “Defense Department” has been in any way a defensive department.

With that in mind, returning the Department of Defense to the Department of War, which is how it started, may not be such a bad idea after all – as long as we can be honest about the rest of the terms around our warmaking.

If we return to a “War Department,” then we should also return to the Constitutional requirement that any military activity engaged in by that department short of defending against an imminent attack on the US requires a Congressional declaration of war. That was the practice followed when it was called the War Department and we should return to it.

Dropping the notion that we have a “Defense Department” would free us from the charade that our massive military spending budget was anything but a war budget. No more “defense appropriations” bills in Congress. Let’s call them “war appropriations” bills. Let the American people understand what so much of their hard-earned money is being taken to support. It’s not “defense.” It’s “war.” And none of it has benefited the American people.

Trump misunderstands one very important thing in his stated desire to return to a “War Department,” however. A tougher sounding name did not win the wars. Before the name change, which happened after the infamous National Security Act of 1947 that created the CIA and the permanent national security state, we won wars because for the most part we followed the Constitution and had a Congressional declaration of war. That way the war had a beginning and end and a clear set of goals. Since World War II the United States has not declared war even though it has been in a continuous state of war. It is no coincidence that none of these “wars” have been won. From 1950 Korea to 2025 Yemen and everything in between.

So go ahead and change it back to the “Department of War.” But let’s also stop pretending that maintaining the global US military empire is “defense.” It’s not.

The news that the Reconciliation Monument will be restored to the Arlington National Cemetery should be welcomed as an opportunity to reiterate the importance of peace, and to set aside historical grievances. The monument signifies steps towards reconciliation between North and South that were taken at the turn of the twentieth century, when both sides set out to move beyond the previous era of sectional hatred and fratricidal war. It explicitly invokes peace in the words of Isaiah inscribed upon it: "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks." It was intended, after a troubled and violent Reconstruction Era, to embrace the new spirit of fraternity that was reflected in the "reunions of the Blue and the Grey." Writing in 1948, Major C. A. Phillips, of the US Marine Corps describes the location of the memorial, and the poetic words of a Confederate chaplain—the Reverend Randolph Harrison McKim—which pay tribute to the fallen:

Still inside the wall, the visitor continues through the well kept grounds to Jackson Circle where stands the magnificent bronze monument erected by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Surrounded by the headstones of nearly five hundred graves of Confederate veterans as well as some of their wives, the inscription on the base of the monument attests the simple creed of soldier dead everywhere:

Not for fame or reward,
Not for place or rank,
Not lured by ambition or goaded by necessity, But in simple obedience to duty,
As they understood it,
These men suffered all,
Sacrificed all,
Dared all—and died.

The point of reconciliation is not to relitigate the war or attempt to glorify it, but to look ahead to peace. As Charles Adams has pointed out in his book *When in the Course of Human Events*, the seeds of war are often sown in the ashes of previous wars. If people fail to learn from history and instead double down on the same claims and counterclaims that previously led to deadly conflict, or if they seek to humiliate and mock the once-vanquished—taunting them and destroying their war memorials—that leads, not to peace, but to what Adams calls "a cold war of bitterness." Adams argues that, "Wars have seldom been justified, and as the years and centuries pass, war looks increasingly foolish." Reconciliation is the commonsense approach—to let bygones be bygones, and to settle disagreement by diplomacy, not by denunciation and diatribe.

It is therefore disconcerting to see some liberals now dismissing the importance of reconciliation. Having removed the Reconciliation Monument from Arlington in 2023, they are now furious that it is to be restored. They reject the idea of reconciliation altogether. Preoccupied as they are with virtue-signaling about the perceived evils of centuries past, they fulminate about the causes of the war using the vitriolic language of nineteenth century Radical Republicans. They glorify the military triumph of North over South, and even celebrate the burning of the South and the suffering of Southern civilians. Britannica reports:

After seizing Atlanta, Union Maj. Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman embarked on a scorched-earth campaign intended to cripple the South's war-making capacity and wound the Confederate psyche... Sherman's 37-day campaign is remembered as one of the most successful examples of "total war," and its psychological effects persisted in the postbellum South.

Far from regretting incidents of war crimes or acknowledging post-war reconciliation, Sherman's admirers argue that more should have been done to punish the "traitors" who had the temerity to secede from the Union. One hundred sixty years after the war, they are still angry that Confederates were not, in their opinion, sufficiently punished. An opinion piece in the New York Times laments the fact that Confederate leaders died as free men. The writer seems to be unaware that the causes of this war are contested by historians, and relies entirely on the partisan interpretation advanced by the Marxist historian Eric Foner, whom he cites with approval,

Jefferson Davis, the president of the Confederacy and the commander in chief of forces that killed more than 360,000 American troops, died a free man. Robert E. Lee, the commander of the Army of Northern Virginia, died a free man as well. Alexander Stephens, the Confederate vice president, whose "cornerstone" speech defined the secessionist cause, served five terms in Congress after the war and also died a free man. Nor was this trio an exception. Other, less prominent Confederates were also able to escape any real punishment. Most of the leaders of the deadliest insurrection in American history died free men...

The writer contrasts the war to the alleged "insurrection" of January 6, suggesting that contemporary politics can be understood by analogy to the war. He describes President Trump as getting away with insurrection "unchastened and unrestrained," just like the Confederate leaders. But there is nothing to be gained by interminably perpetuating the hostilities of the nineteenth century in this way, especially since many of those who are most determined to invoke the conflict in contemporary political debate seem to know very little about the war and simply use it as a proxy for grievances relating to what they call "systemic racism." It is almost as if the war merely supplies them with convenient ammunition for their political arguments about the need for government interventions designed to crush "white supremacy" by vesting more money and power in the race hustlers. Republicans, too, often invoke the war as a way of criticizing their political opponents, frequently comparing today's communist Democrats to the conservative Southern Democrats of the nineteenth century.

As Ludwig von Mises emphasizes in *Liberalism: The Classical Tradition*, peace is not just a matter of convenience or an optional extra—it is essential to civilization and to human flourishing. This does not mean that war memorials should be torn down and everyone should try to forget that the war ever happened. On the contrary, erasing history only makes future hostilities more likely as people forget the lessons of the past. Further, the memory of ties that bind people together matters. Mises observes that, "Heroic deeds performed in such a war by those fighting for their freedom and their lives are entirely praiseworthy, and one rightly extols the manliness and courage of such fighters." We remember the fallen not in order to endorse the waging of war—with all the attendant loss of life and human suffering—but to remember the courage and sacrifice of those who stood in defense of a just cause. A just war, as Murray Rothbard defined it, is one fought in defense. He regarded both the Revolutionary War and the War for Southern Independence as just wars,

My own view of war can be put simply: a just war exists when a people tries to ward off the threat of coercive domination by another people, or to overthrow an already-existing domination... There have been only two wars in American history that were, in my view, assuredly and unquestionably proper and just; not only that, the opposing side waged a war that was clearly and notably unjust. Why? Because we did not have to question whether a threat against our liberty and property was clear or present; in both of these wars, Americans were trying to rid themselves of an unwanted domination by another people. And in both cases, the other side ferociously tried to maintain their coercive rule over Americans. In each case, one side — "our side" if you will — was notably just, the other side — "their side" — unjust.

Honoring memorials to the fallen is part of history, and history should not be erased. But this does not justify harking back to old wars as a framework for contemporary political discourse. Reconciliation and peace should be the standard.

The Zionist Experiment Is Over

By Chuck Baldwin

Chuck Baldwin Live

September 6, 2025

Contrary to the assertions of Scofield-duped Christian Zionist evangelicals, God gave NO everlasting unconditional promise of national perpetuity to the Old Covenant nation of Israel. God's promises of blessings to Old Covenant Israel were conditional to Israel's obedience to God.

An unconditional everlasting promise was given to the man Abraham. And this promise was fulfilled in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. (Galatians 3:16, 28, 29) But to the nation of Old Covenant Israel was no such promise given.

In my third Prophecy Message from Romans 11, I provided much Scripture that delineated the differences between the unconditional everlasting **seed** promise given to Abraham (fulfilled in Christ) and the conditional **land** promise given to the Old Covenant nation of Israel—a covenant that Israel broke—and God then cursed Israel and took the land away from them **forever**.

Prophecy Message Three is entitled **God's Chosen People**, and we have that message in both a **DVD** and **PDF** format.

Moses, the man through whom God gave Israel its conditional covenant, made it crystal clear to the nation just how conditional God's covenant was to them.

But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee:

The LORD shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke, in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly; because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me.

The LORD shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies: and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth.

Thy sons and thy daughters *shall be* given unto another people.

And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword, among all nations whither the LORD shall lead thee.

Thou shalt beget sons and daughters, but thou shalt not enjoy them; for they shall go into captivity.

Moreover all these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded thee:

And they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed for ever.

Because thou servedst not the LORD thy God with joyfulness, and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all *things*;

Therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies which the LORD shall send against thee, in hunger, and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all *things*: and he shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck, until he have destroyed thee.

And it shall come to pass, *that* as the LORD rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the LORD will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it.

(See Deuteronomy 28:15 – 68)

In these and many other passages of Scripture, God promised to remove the children of Israel from the promised land (Canaan) **forever**, because of their disobedience. In this chapter in Deuteronomy, Moses predicted the destruction of Israel by the Assyrians, the destruction of Judah by the Babylonians and the destruction of the Judahite remnant by the Romans.

In short, Old Covenant Israel violated its covenant with God, and God did what Moses declared He would do: He expelled them from the promised land and destroyed their nation **forever**. The Israelis in Palestine today are NOT Biblical Israelites; they are NOT the biological descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; and they are NOT God's chosen people.

The Israelis are the children of Japheth, not Shem, as are the rest of the Eastern Europeans from which they descended. They have ZERO God-given land covenant in Palestine. They have ZERO promise of national perpetuity from God; there is ZERO promise from God for anyone who attempts to bless, assist, aid or support the Zionist state.

In truth, from its very inception in 1948, the State of Israel has proven itself to be a devilish, murderous, barbaric people—a plague of racism, hatred, **ethnic cleansing**, war and genocide upon the world. And the more the United States has entangled itself economically, militarily, morally and spiritually with Israel, the more America has invoked the curse of God upon it to the point that today America is little more than a vassal state of the most vile, wicked and bloodthirsty country on the planet.

And after two years of supporting Israel's maniacal genocide in Gaza, the people of the entire world hold both Israel and the United States in utter contempt. And for good reason. America's financial and military support for Israel's crimes against humanity in Palestine are contemptible.

Donald Trump has proven himself to be as much or more of a lackey for Israel as Joe Biden. He is the one man in the world that has the capability to put an end to Israel's slaughter of innocents in Gaza and the West Bank, but he refuses to do it. As with almost the entire Congress in Washington, D.C., Trump is nothing more than a pimp for Israel. They are all bought and paid for by the Israel lobby. They are the worst kind of prostitutes. They make street walkers look like Sunday School teachers by comparison.

But, ladies and gentlemen, Israel is doing more than murdering hundreds of thousands of innocents; it is expediting its own destruction. Israel has passed the point of no return. Its collapse is certain—and probably imminent.

As it always does, the Western media ignored it, but Yemen's Houthis delivered a devastating missile attack against Israel, after Israel assassinated Yemen's civilian prime minister and 12 of his cabinet members.

Here is a **YouTube technical analysis from Conflict Skies & Steel** of the attack:

Today we are witnessing a historic escalation in the Middle East that is shaking the foundations of regional security. Yemen's Houthis have launched a daring strike against Israel, targeting the heart of Tel Aviv with a combination of long-range missiles and advanced drones.

This is not just a headline, it is a demonstration of reach, precision and the growing boldness of non-state actors in the modern battlefield. The world is now watching closely as the Houthis challenge one of the most technologically advanced nations in the region, sending a clear and shocking message to Israel and its allies.

Tel Aviv, a city known for its bustling economy and dense population, is now under fire with emergency sirens blaring and streets evacuated in panic. Smoke rises from multiple districts, while Israel's air defense systems scramble to intercept incoming threats.

The scale of this attack is unlike anything seen in recent years, highlighting a new phase in asymmetric warfare, where precision and surprise trump sheer size and

phase in asymmetric warfare, where precision and surprise trump sheer size and firepower. Citizens report sudden explosions, shaking windows and streets filled with confusion, a stark reminder that modern conflict can reach civilian centers with devastating speed.

The Iron Dome has successfully neutralized a large portion of the attack, but gaps in coverage were exposed, demonstrating that even the most sophisticated defense networks are not infallible.

Streets once crowded with civilians now appear deserted, as emergency sirens and warnings drive people into shelters. This attack is remarkable for its precision, with missiles targeting strategic locations rather than random destruction, showcasing the Houthis' intelligence and tactical planning.

For Israel, this is a psychological blow as much as a physical one. The population's sense of security is shaken, and the government must quickly reassess its defensive posture.

Conflict Skies and Steel [YouTube Channel] has been closely analyzing the data, and what stands out is the speed, coordination and audacity of this operation, reflecting a level of sophistication that goes far beyond what many had expected from Houthi capabilities.

The interior of this operation, though brief in visible details, tells a story of meticulous planning and technological evolution. The Houthis appear to have synchronized multiple missile launches with drone operations to overwhelm Israel's defenses. Open-source satellite imagery suggests that launch sites were strategically positioned and camouflaged deep inside Yemeni territory. Real-time intelligence likely guided the drones to ensure maximum accuracy. The operation reflects a calculated approach, balancing the need for impact with operational security to avoid exposing critical assets.

Even with limited resources compared to a conventional army, the Houthis demonstrated that precision, timing and adaptability are force multipliers capable of challenging the world's strongest defenses.

Performance of the strike has been extraordinary. Missiles reportedly traveled over 100 to 200 kilometers, demonstrating a significant extension of Houthi range capabilities. The simultaneous use of drones adds an unpredictable element, complicating interception strategies.

The attack successfully stressed Israel's air defense systems, creating gaps that allowed some missiles to reach their targets. Analysts are evaluating the types of missiles used, with indications of modified scud variants and precision-guided munitions.

Drones provided real-time reconnaissance, potentially allowing operators to adjust trajectories mid-flight. This combination of missiles and UOV highlights the Houthis' ingenuity, blending traditional long-range attacks with modern drone technology to create a complex battlefield problem.

The unique selling points of this Houthi operation are clear and remarkable.

First, the ability to strike Tel Aviv from Yemen demonstrates a significant leap in operational reach and capability.

Second, the synchronized use of multiple weapons systems, including missiles and drones, showcases an integrated approach rarely seen from non-state actors.

Third, the psychological impact on both Israel and the international community is immense, sending a signal that the Houthis can operate far beyond their traditional theater of conflict.

In conclusion, Yemen's Houthi strike on Tel Aviv is both shocking and strategically

significant. It exposes vulnerabilities in advanced air defense systems, demonstrates the evolution of non-state actors into formidable military threats and emphasizes the psychological and political dimensions of modern warfare.

Civilians are facing unprecedented threats, militaries are forced to reconsider their strategies and analysts are left re-evaluating the assumptions of regional power dynamics.

Israel is hemorrhaging economically, militarily, culturally, politically, psychologically, emotionally and internationally.

The Zionist experiment is over.

Almost every country in the world sees Israel for the satanic monster that it is, and they are enraged. The only major government in the world that remains unconditionally supportive of Israel is the United States—and among the population of the U.S., opposition to Israel is two to one. And Donald Trump's favorability rating is now **worse** than was Joe Biden's—mainly due to his sycophantic support for Israel.

Geopolitical, academic, military and intelligence experts such as Col. Douglas Macgregor, Col. Lawrence Wilkerson, Major Scott Ritter, Professor Jeffrey Sachs, Professor John Mearsheimer, intelligence officers Larry Johnson, Ray McGovern and Phil Giraldi are unanimous in the opinion that Israel's collapse will come sooner than later.

Netanyahu and his fellow fascists in Israel are possessed with the intention of slaughtering or removing all 2 million Palestinians in Gaza. They really do intend to turn Gaza into Trump's *Riviera of the Middle East*. Then, they fully intend to ethnically cleanse the West Bank. Then, they intend to conquer Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Iran. Then, they intend to liquidate the Palestinians and Arabs in Jordan and Eastern Egypt (including Cairo) and seize those land areas, including a large segment of Saudi Arabia.

But their devilish designs for a *Greater Israel* are falling apart. The little country of Yemen is showing the world that Israel—even with the military support of the United States—is ripe for destruction. After decades of missile attacks from Saudi Arabia and the United States (under both Biden and Trump) the Houthis are still standing toe-to-toe against Israel with much mental acumen and military aptitude.

If Israel is stunned and frightened by Yemen, wait until they attack Iran again and see what happens. Plus, the money-worshipping Arab states in the Persian Gulf that have sat back like scared little pussycats and done NOTHING to help their Arab brethren in Palestine know that history is going to forever shine the light of truth on the Arab monarchies for the moneygrubbing cowards they are, while the Houthis will go down in history as the brave little David who stood courageously against the Zionist Goliath—and won.

Israelis by the thousands are fleeing the country. They know the nation is on its last legs. Netanyahu knows his only hope for staying out of prison (or maybe even staying alive) is to keep Israel at war. He doesn't care one whit how many innocent people he kills, as long as it keeps him in power. He is a demon-possessed madman. And he is trying his best to drag the United States into all-out war along with him.

And given Trump's slavish devotion to the Jewish billionaires that have been his financial benefactors throughout his entire life, he is proving to be in no mood to put America first, all of his campaign rhetoric notwithstanding. After all, Trump started seven businesses, and all seven went bankrupt. And all seven times the Zionist billionaires bailed him out. It is a fantasy to think that Trump would put the interests of the United States above those of Israel. Trump is Zionist-owned lock, stock and barrel.

But the question might be: Who will die first, Donald Trump or Israel? Because both are on life support.

Reprinted with permission from Chuck Baldwin Live.