

LEON: THE PROFESSIONAL THE WILL TO POWER AND THE CAPACITY TO SACRIFICE

A practical analysis using the film theory of P. Paolo Pasolini

this paper has only one author, there has been no collaboration as yet



INTRODUCTION	5
<i>Husserl's Phenomenology: the foundation of Pasolini's film theory</i>	6
<i>Bocchia's dissertation</i>	8
BRIEF PLOT SUMMARY OF FILM	11
<i>Leon</i>	14
<i>Tony and Stansfield: Show me the Money</i>	15
<i>The Drug War's Impact on the American Economy</i>	18
<i>Pasolini on the phenomenon of drug addiction</i>	20
<i>The political economy of Mexico's drug war</i>	22
THE STANSFIELD SYNDROME: Mental Illness and its economic cost	24
<i>What are the current costs and outcomes related to mental health and substance abuse disorders?</i>	26
<i>Jesus and the value of money</i>	27
<i>Matilda</i>	28
<i>Vendetta, Generally</i>	31
<i>Vendetta in the film</i>	32
<i>The phenomenon of sexual violence</i>	31
<i>An undocumented class of refugees</i>	35
<i>Leon's death</i>	37
<i>The usefulness of Pasolini's film theory as regards Leon: the Professional:</i>	37
<i>The little Yemeni Scarecrow and Matilda</i>	37
Heroes and Villains: the ambiguity of law and order	39
<i>The will to power and its rejection in the Jewish/christian narrative:</i>	40
<i>the cultural patrimony of Pasolini and Besson</i>	40

<i>The common themes of joy sin guilt loss of joy in the Christian narrative</i>	40
<i>The wish of the Israelites to have a king</i>	41
<i>Personhood, the Will to Power and Marcus Dubber's Analysis of the Police</i>	46
<i>Pasolini and the Police</i>	48
<i>The Will to Power in Henry David Thoreau</i>	50
<i>Aragorn, Boromir and Faramir</i>	53
<i>Frodo, Sam and Gollum</i>	53
<i>More on Frodo, Sam and Gollum: a mysterious mercy</i>	53
<i>The will to Power in Frankfurt</i>	55
<i>The Will to Power in Pasolini</i>	56
<i>The rage against power and sexual hypocrisy in Pasolini</i>	57
<i>Pasolini's viscerally Christian film theory</i>	59
<i>The madness of kings</i>	61
<i>The madness of Nebuchednezzar</i>	63
<i>The madness of Hamlet</i>	65
<i>Madness, Gaslighting and bullshit in the "democratic" political process</i>	67
<i>The Will to Power and "Pissing Matches"</i>	68
<i>Nancy Salamone</i>	70
<i>Marilyn Van Derber</i>	71
<i>Criticism of a certain naivete</i>	73
THE WILL TO POWER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STORY OF LEON	74
<i>1. Head shrinking Luc Besson and the American audience</i>	74
<i>Maturity and "arrested development" in Leon: the professional</i>	76

<i>The will to power, daddy issues and sexual purity</i>	77
<i>Georgia Rule</i>	78
SECOND PART: SAVONAROLA, THE RENAISSANCE GANGSTA AND THE BLESSED PIER GIORGIO	81
<i>Bio of Pier Giorgio Frassati</i>	81
<i>Sav.</i>	84

INTRODUCTION

This writing hopes to be an accessible yet sound and useful scholarly analysis of the film *Leon: the Professional*, and in particular of Leon and Stansfield, according to the film theory of P. Paolo Pasolini. Many people see these two characters as quite similar: both of them resorted to violence and vendetta to achieve their ends. However, according to a Pasolinian analysis, their actions are directly opposed: Stansfield represents the will to power, which upsets the order of things, and Leon, a fundamental willingness to sacrifice, which sets that order right. For Pasolini, the will to power is the original evil, and the villain of history. According to this analysis, therefore, despite their apparent similarities, Stansfield is a villain and Leon is a hero. In furtherance of this analysis, the paper will examine the real life experiences that went into Pasolini's film theory as well as the experiences of Luc Besson and Jean Reno that so strongly impacted the film.

In addition to this primary objective, the paper will also attempt to sketch out a parallel which may sound implausible: the parallel struggles of Leon against Stansfield in the drug wars of New York City in the 1990s, and Girolamo Savonaola against Cosimo dei Medici in Renaissance Florence, which inspired a good-natured European aristocrat, Pier Giorgio Frassati, to quietly give his life for the poor in Turin, Italy in the early part of the 20th century. This has the practical goal of articulating our mission in the world by uniting the Italian and American icons we use. If the hypothesis is correct, an analysis of these two struggles should show that despite what is often taught by organized religion, goodness and evil are not primarily moral positions or even habitual behavior, though these are related, but rather, that goodness is primarily the capacity to sacrifice in order to remedy the evil of the will to power.

Husserl's Phenomenology: the foundation of Pasolini's film theory

In contrast to many intellectuals, Paolo Pasolini was supremely practical. He was always and everywhere concerned with people and their problems, which is a phenomenological approach to life, rather than an ideological one. In an interview with RAI public television in _____, he stated, "for me, reality is a miracle." Though he was not German, his style was similar to a school of philosophy developing in Germany at the time, pioneered by Edmund Husserl, a Jewish philosophy professor who was concerned with the realities of phenomena. From wikipedia:

Phenomenology (from [Greek](#) *phainómenon* "that which appears" and *lógos* "study") is the [philosophical](#) study of the structures of experience and [consciousness](#). As a [philosophical movement](#) it was founded in the early years of the 20th century by [Edmund Husserl](#) and was later expanded upon by a circle of his followers at the universities of [Göttingen](#) and [Munich](#) in [Germany](#). It then spread to [France](#), the [United States](#), and elsewhere, often in contexts far removed from Husserl's early work.^[1]

Phenomenology is not a unitary movement; rather, different authors share a common family resemblance but also with many significant differences. Gabriella Farina states:

"A unique and final definition of phenomenology is dangerous and perhaps even paradoxical as it lacks a thematic focus. In fact, it is not a doctrine, nor a philosophical school, but rather a style of thought, a method, an open and ever-renewed experience having different results, and this may disorient anyone wishing to define the meaning of phenomenology."^[2]

Phenomenology, in Husserl's conception, is primarily concerned with the systematic reflection on and study of the structures of consciousness and the [phenomena](#) that appear in acts of consciousness. Phenomenology can be clearly differentiated from the [Cartesian](#) method of analysis which sees the world as [objects](#), sets of objects, and objects acting and reacting upon one another. Husserl's conception of phenomenology has been criticized and developed not only by himself but also by students such as [Edith Stein](#) and [Roman Ingarden](#), by [hermeneutic philosophers](#) such as [Martin Heidegger](#), by [existentialists](#) such as [Nicolai Hartmann](#), [Gabriel Marcel](#), [Maurice Merleau-Ponty](#), [Jean-Paul Sartre](#), and by other philosophers such as [Max Scheler](#), [Paul Ricoeur](#), [Jean-Luc Marion](#), [Michel Henry](#), [Emmanuel Levinas](#), [Jacques Derrida](#), and sociologists [Alfred Schütz](#) and [Eric Voegelin](#).

This paper will argue that like Germany, Italy had been a collection of diverse tribes which were forcibly unified from the top down by “the will to power” which imposed bizarre and untenable philosophies to justify its cruelty and greed, and inspired reactions of various kinds. Phenomenology was one such reaction.

For [Husserl](#), the body is not an extended physical substance in contrast to a non-extended mind, but a lived “here” from which all “there’s” are “there”; a locus of distinctive sorts of sensations that can only be felt firsthand by the embodied experiencer concerned; and a coherent system of movement possibilities allowing us to experience every moment of our situated, practical-perceptual life as pointing to “more” than our current perspective affords. To identify such experiential structures of embodiment, however, Husserl must clarify and set aside not only the ways in which the natural sciences approach the body, but also the ways in which we have tacitly taken over natural-scientific assumptions into our everyday understanding of embodiment. Husserl’s [phenomenological investigations](#) eventually lead to the notion of kinaesthetic consciousness, which is not a consciousness “of” movement, but a consciousness or subjectivity that is itself characterized in terms of motility, that is, the very ability to move freely and responsively. In Husserl’s phenomenology of embodiment, then, the lived body is a lived center of experience, and both its movement capabilities and its distinctive register of

sensations play a key role in his account of how we encounter other embodied agents in the shared space of a coherent and ever-explorable world.

Bocchia's dissertation

The following is an abstract from a doctoral dissertation of Pietro Bocchia defended at the University of Notre Dame on 07/07/2017. The dissertation is not available to the public and the author of this paper has not yet requested to read it. Bocchia is concerned with how Pasolini's phenomenology impacted his politics, and we here are concerned with film theory. We present this to place our argument in a larger context.

My dissertation singles out the religious theory of knowledge that lies at the core of Pasolini's social and political critique, as well as of his poetics of 1968. Deeply (although not exclusively) influenced by his Catholic formation, Pasolini constructed his religious theory of knowledge around the two key notions of *religiosità* (religiousness) and *ierofania* (hierophany, literally "the manifestation of God"). Based on his phenomenology of human experience, Pasolini conceived of *religiosità* as an absolute, inner drive, which was irreducible to any human power, and of *ierofania* as the miraculous essence of the existence of reality. My dissertation demonstrates that, in the face of the consumerist and secular society of the late sixties, Pasolini saw in the recovery of the religious dimensions of both inner life and reality the necessary condition of the political, as well as artistic renewal of Western societies. According to Pasolini, once the individual restores religion (or the



sacred) as the overarching and founding value of his or her existence, he or she becomes an *esempio* (witness)—whether a poet, politician, or ordinary citizen. By bearing witness to the possibility of an actual otherness within homogeneous secular society—an otherness which is religious in nature—the *esempi* are the foundation of artistic and political change.

Second, my dissertation sheds new light on the influence of American culture on Pasolini's Christian-socialist views of democracy which, during the second half of the sixties and, more specifically, in 1968, were centered around the notions of "democracy" and "charity." By providing some of the sources through which Pasolini became acquainted with the American political and cultural situation, I demonstrate how Pasolini regarded certain American political realities as revolutionary, including the student movement SNCC (Social Non-violent Coordinating Committee). In keeping with his religious views, Pasolini saw the *religiosità* of some members of the SNCC, as well as their idea of anti-community—understood as the locus of authentic and real exchange between individuals of different races and education levels—as conducive to authentic democracy.

In order to be practical, this paper will examine the staggering cost to the global economy of some of the major themes in *Leon, the Professional*: domestic violence, sexual issues, mental illness, drug addiction and the drug war. I will argue that *Leon*, far from being an unrealistic view of these phenomena, is quite sober and honest about them. This may be because Besson, not being American, was not afraid to point the finger at our culture. It's always easier to find fault with someone else than with yourself. It may also be because Besson had a relationship with a girl whose life resembled that of Matilda. In this Besson resembles Pasolini, although he is not an intellectual who engages directly with politicians and other powerful figures.

Pasolini also took the time to explain himself and his unorthodox methods to the elites of his day with whom he engaged in a continual conversation which ended up with him actually getting assassinated. Since the scapegoat prostitute who went to prison for his murder is now dead, (cite this) it is unlikely that the truth will ever be properly understood. (Below photo of Pelosi, the hooker, at arrest and behind bars.)

Ironically, though he had been rejected by the Catholic church, a priest said his funeral Mass. A poet of the day, exiting his funeral, said, Pasolini was a man whom no one defended. For this quote, see the video at the bottom of this page: <https://en.wordsinfreedom.com/pasolini-40-years-ago-like-a-bag-of-trash/>

(The cover photograph of Leon was chosen with care to demonstrate what happens in the power/sacrifice conflict. Someone who recently saw it averted their eyes in pain and said, Ah! that is so sad. Yes, it is. But every time a Christian makes the sign of the cross, they are remembering such a scene in their heart. It goes to the essence of this paper's argument.)

BRIEF PLOT SUMMARY OF FILM

This plot summary is provided for those who are unfamiliar with the film. By way of background, Besson and Reno were based in Paris and Portman, in Israel. (is this accurate? CITE THIS). The scenes inside the apartment are all taken in Paris, whereas the street scenes were filmed in New York City.



Luc Besson's stylish thriller is set in **New York**, though most interiors were filmed in the studio in Paris, as hitman Léon (Jean **Reno**) versus rampantly OTT crooked cop Stansfield (Gary Oldman). Real **New York** locations include Spanish Harlem, Chinatown and Wall Street; along with Hoboken and West **New York**, New Jersey.

<http://www.movie-locations.com>





Grocery Shop, East 97th Street and Park Avenue, Manhattan.

<http://www.onthesetofny.com>



otsoNY Comments: In the late 1990s, the grocery store on the corner of East 97th Street and Park was still open for business and trading as a convenience store. In 2015, it has since closed down.



Leon's Apartment, 71 East 97th Street and Park Avenue, Manhattan.

The film was released in 1994, the American version was edited but despite that, the film generated considerable controversy. *Unsettling truth has a way of doing just that.*

Leon

Leon Montana, (the audience will learn this through the course of the story) a young man of modest means in southern Italy, falls in love with a girl from a higher social circle whose father, discovering the relationship ,forbids that it should continue.



When the lovers disobey, he murders his daughter, prompting Leon to a vendetta. After murdering his enemy, Leon flees the country and comes to New York, where his own father is already working for a mid level “crime” boss named Tony who operates out of a modest bakery in Little Italy. As the story begins,

Leon has been working for Tony for many years and has become a key employee of Tony’s operation.

Leon’s job is to be a “cleaner”, that is, to clean the streets of the ubiquitous and heavily armed drug dealers who are supported by a corrupt DEA official. He is paid three thousand dollars a head for his work, and the money is kept by Tony, for various reasons: to avoid questions from the government, to protect it from rivals and “gold diggers”, and because Tony is portrayed as comparatively crafty and Leon, simple minded and unable to read, thus intimidated by banks. It is never explained exactly how much money Leon has earned, but at one point he says “I have money with

Tony--a lot of money.” Leon never spends his money, living unnoticed in a run down tenement and blending in so that though he lives cheek by jowl with his enemies, his identity is never discovered. He spends his free time training to be an effective assassin, doing calisthenics and target practice, and watching old movies in the cinema or on the television. He drinks milk constantly, and takes care of a houseplant.

Tony and Stansfield: Show me the Money

No one can do much in present day society without money, and Leon for all his ancient ways is no exception. There are two things to take into account here when considering Tony’s role in the story. One, the illegal drug economy has long been the largest economy in urban neighborhoods in terms of money actually changing hands between residents. One need only review the sad story of the Gotti family to realize how effective that economy is in destroying social loyalties, traditions and protections of any kind.



In 1985, the FBI had gathered enough evidence to place Gotti and Dellacroce under federal indictments for racketeering. Other associates were indicted on heroin trafficking charges. *The drug charges infuriated Castellano, who punished illegal drug trafficking with a penalty of death.* As captain, Gotti knew he would be held responsible for the

transgressions of his crew. To smooth over the situation with Castellano, Gotti asked Dellacroce to speak to the boss on his behalf.

But before an understanding could be reached, Dellacroce died of cancer. All goodwill between Castellano and Gotti dissolved when the boss didn't attend Dellacroce's funeral. Gotti saw the behavior as disrespectful and, according to later testimony, he decided to take action. Two weeks later, on December 16, 1985, Castellano was gunned down while eating at the [Sparks Steak House](#) in Manhattan. Gotti was made boss soon after. (biography.com) (italics mine)

(and if you want to go mobbin like that, <http://www.sparkssteakhouse.com>)

Pasolini fingered consumerism as the main villain and in his day, the drug economy was just beginning to be entrenched in the middle class. By the time of Leon, it was fully in control.

A man like Stansfield thus wields incredible power. He is insane, addicted and violent, yet as an officer of the law prosecuting the most lucrative "crimes", he, legitimately has access to the bank accounts of anyone he plants drugs on, which means literally anyone who for any reason he decides is a threat, he can take away their money and thus, bring them to their knees in short order. This is equivalent to living under the regime of a bloodthirsty and psychotic dictator who dresses in snappy suits and listens to Beethoven. It really makes you reconsider horrific movies like *Salò* in a new light: from, that could never happen, to: that could happen and does.

In fact, in an article published in May 2012 in the journal of Post Modern Culture, Northwestern University scholar Alessia Ricciardi makes this point:

Abstract

Pier Paolo Pasolini's *Salò*, or the 120 Days of Sodom customarily has been read as a scandalous artistic exception. In light of the cases of prisoner torture at Abu Ghraib, however, the film can be taken to elaborate a critique of contemporary political conditions that is less than hyperbolic. Indeed, reading the film in contiguity with Giorgio Agamben's thinking on biopolitics, especially in *Homo Sacer*, Pasolini's *Salò* may be said to unveil its own critical and philosophical seriousness of purpose. Even hostile critics who tend to be dismissive of Pasolini's rhetoric thus may be forced *après-coup* to concede that the film paradoxically operates in a quasi-realistic register. Pursuing this line of argument, "Rethinking *Salò* After Abu Ghraib" examines the overlap between the visual iconography of cruelty in the film and the photographic documentary record of torture at Abu Ghraib, finding a troubling proximity. In particular, the essay dwells on three distinct layers of meaning in the film: 1) the reappropriation of the literary model provided by the Marquis de Sade's *Les 120 journées de Sodome*, 2) the film's ostensive

historical background and setting of the Republic of Salò, and 3) the phenomenology of contemporary neofascism that Pasolini considered to be the *raison d'être* of the film. "Rethinking Salo" also conducts an investigation of idiotic humor and stupidity as conduits to sadistic violence in both Pasolini's film and the record of torture at Abu Ghraib, making reference to Adriana Cavarero's pathbreaking study, *Horrorism*.

In the era of Matilda, RICO was already a law but now matters are far worse: we have the Patriot act. Under these conditions, Tony is not a criminal any more than Leon is. He is protecting the neighborhood from the unfettered, unhinged will to power and allowing people like Matilda to continue to eat.

Many people say this portrayal of the drug war is exaggerated, but these are the same people who say climate change is exaggerated. They are simply not considering the numbers, the scientific evidence. To convince these of reality, how much evidence is needed? Shall we bury them in it until they feel the death that breathes down Mathilda's neck every minute of every day? Very well then sobeit. We can do that. The will to power is concerned with the power that money and drugs holds over people in our world. As always it is opposed to freedom and free will.

The Drug War's Impact on the American Economy

[JEFF DESJARDINS](#) on June 9, 2014 at 5:33 pm

POINT ONE: our appetite for drugs is huge.

POINT TWO: The economic cost to fight this sickness is ridiculous.

America's and the world's appetite for drugs is insatiable. Billions upon billions of dollars have been spent on both the consumption of illicit drugs and fighting the war on drugs. At first glance as an investor, you probably don't think this affects you (that is, if you don't use or sell drugs). But a closer look will reveal the enormous economic impact that the war on drugs has on America. Prepare yourself for some very alarming numbers. Since 1971, the United States has spent \$1,000,000,000,000 on the war on drugs. If you have a hard time reading that enormous number, it's 1 TRILLION dollars! There are an estimated 500,000 inmates incarcerated for drug related charges. At an annual cost of \$25,000 per inmate, that equates to \$12.6 billion a year. America spends 58% less money to educate a child than it does to keep an inmate behind bars. The next generation (who will be future consumers) is suffering and is being heavily disadvantaged.

POINT THREE: The cost of consumption is huge as well.

On the consumption side, the numbers are just as incredible. The estimated annual value of the cocaine market is \$88 billion. For Heroin, it is \$55 billion. The average cocaine addict will spend \$25,000 per year to fuel their habit and the average heroin addict will spend \$18,000.

POINT FOUR: This money is needed for other things.

These massive sums of money could be spent on much more productive things. The USA has been struggling financially for years now, to the point where a major city like Detroit had to declare bankruptcy. The enormous amount of money that is spent untaxed on drugs is mind boggling, and the large majority of it goes out of the country. Can you imagine if these wasted dollars could be used to fuel its growth or pay back its astronomical debt? The first step of rehab is to admit there is a problem. Spending over a trillion dollars and incarcerating hundreds of thousands is definitely that. The next step is finding a way to solve it – we're open to ideas.



[Agenda](#) [Initiatives](#) [Reports](#) [Events](#) [About](#)


English ▾


TopLink



[Global Agenda](#) | [Illicit Economy](#)

What next for the war on drugs?





Pasolini on the phenomenon of drug addiction

If we are truly “open to ideas” as Desjardins says, Pasolini has some ideas on this subject. Pasolini wrote about drugs in a piece called: *Drugs, a true Italian Tragedy*. Since this was in the era when he was speculating about “fictitious” greek tragedy, and its connection to the unhappy youth, and consumerism in general (not only the consumption of drugs) we can assume he meant to ascribe to the drug phenomenon the same kind of epic proportions the Greeks would have ascribed to their tragic stories.

First he pushes aside the idea that we need to be “tolerant” of the drug addict. He keenly felt the hidden disdain of a society that “tolerated” homosexuals and sympathized deeply with addicts as a similarly disdained category of people. We need to ask why, why this mass addiction, he says. If we analyze one single individual, we could use pop psychology to go into their background but if we want to explain mass addiction, he attributes it to a surrogate for culture. People need culture and lacking that, they tend toward a desire of self-annihilation. But to love culture, he says, requires a great deal of vitality. Those who do not have this vitality because of trauma, renounce culture and

turn to its surrogate, drugs. The effect of drugs mimics rational knowledge through an experience which is aberrant so to speak but in some way homologous to rational knowledge.

Since until recently (he was speaking in 1975 in Italy) the only people who suffered a loss of culture were the “elites”, while the simple people had retained theirs, the elites were the ones who fell victim to despair and drug addiction. Now however he notes:

It is true that even today if I go to the piazza Navona (a high class hangout) and see a drug addict wandering around with a bored and vaguely sinister air, I feel in him that characteristic unhappiness common to the borghesia and I curse the unhappy circumstance that leads him to smoke hash instead of reading a book. But this is not the typical situation. It is much more common to find an addict in a bar of Piazza Cinquecento or in quarticciolo. (less high class, more baggadonuts.)

As usual, he was not observing the situation from an ivory tower, but in the street, and thus his evidence is phenomenological and not theoretical or statistical. His detractors will say, yes because he was a tramp. Even though that is not why he was in the street, he was in the street because he loved people and life generally and there is more of it in the street than in the halls of politics. But even were the argument true, how exactly does that impact the evidence he gathered? That is like saying, a hooker is such a bad person that they can't testify about what they saw during a shoot out. In fact, like Besson, he is amazingly accurate.

He goes on:

What do I want to say with this? I want to say that the phenomenon of drug use has changed radically in the past 10 or 20 years. It has become a mass phenomenon that involves every social class...today we live in a period in which the “space” or the “emptiness” for drugs has expanded in an enormous way. Why? Because culture in the anthropological sense, the “total” sense, has been destroyed...for example, the two values of “God” and “family” *which are idiotic in the mouths of priests and moralists but which instead in the popular life which is “below” history are truly everything of*

value, (italics mine) today do not matter anymore, and you cannot speak to any young person about them, much less a young person who is on drugs...(translation mine)

He concludes with compassion for the addicts, saying that drugs should be legalized, since if someone wants to die, even without realizing it, due to sadness,

“how can a society which offers them such a tragic and repugnant spectacle of itself, impede them from doing it?” (translation mine).

The political economy of Mexico's drug war

By [Helen Redmond](#)

[Issue #90: Features](#)

•
ARGUMENT: This is not a criminal problem.

“The whole world has a bad strategy for fighting drugs...This is a health problem, not a criminal problem.”

—Dr. Arturo Valenzuela Zorrilla, Juárez physician



POINT TWO: The drug war is a very dangerous phenomenon.

THE MEXICAN drug war is a killing machine.

POINT THREE: It is a war, just like a regular conventional war.

The level of violence and slaughter is similar to conventional warfare. In just six years, 70,000 people have been killed, but some estimate the number is a staggering 120,000.¹ More than 20,000 people have disappeared and a quarter of a million have been displaced.² A major investigation into *narcofosas*(mass graves) in Mexico by the magazine *Milenio* found the corpses of 24,000 people.³

POINT FOUR: civilians cannot escape it.

Entire cities and towns have erupted into war zones chock-full with military checkpoints and drug cartel roadblocks. Armed with military grade weapons including grenade launchers, the drug gangs are an equal match for Mexican soldiers and police.

POINT FIVE: The government and the military are involved in human rights violations as much as the “criminals”.

Drug cartel *sicarios* (assassins), the military, and police have committed atrocities and violated human rights countless times. Dismembered body parts are left on streets and found decomposing in barrels of acid.

POINT SIX: The public has been warned: we take no prisoners.

Dead bodies with mouths duct taped shut hang from busy commuter bridges. Women are raped and murdered with impunity, and journalists who expose law enforcement corruption are kidnapped and killed. The drug war takes no prisoners.

This bloody war, ostensibly to rid the country of illegal drugs and drug trafficking, has been a grisly failure. Mexico continues to be a major exporter of heroin and marijuana and a central transshipment point for cocaine from Andean South America bound for the United States. Drugs cross the heavily fortified US-Mexican border far more easily than do migrants seeking work in the United States. The power of the drug cartels to kill, corrupt, and elude capture has grown exponentially as have their profits.

THE STANSFIELD SYNDROME: Mental Illness and its economic cost

I am just going to riff right now because I think this is bullshit, I believe these numbers are ridiculously low. **No one wants to talk about it because it's scary, even scarier than the drug war probably**, and because there is a "stigma" attached to it. There are a TON of celebrity suicides but just look around--Ask someone to make a list of all the people they know who have killed themselves or someone else due to mental disease. According to phenomenology personal experience trumps abstract studies.

Someone told me that where they went to college almost 90% of the students suffered from a mental disorder that was in the DSMV. Has anyone looked into suicides at places like Cornell and NYU? of course these things are hushed up.

Here is a sample list from one anonymous contributor: methods of death, guns, hanging, drank chemicals, overdosed, jumped from bridge, etc.

One: CM
Two: JH
Three the brother of BC
Four BF
Five GG
Six JR
Seven PZB
Eight Brother of CG
Nine brother of AD
The friend of MB, PF
EM's close relly
CD and his brother DD and his sister SD
MM
BJF
the bf of PNF
The relly of JB
the brother of EB and all his kids (murder suicide)
RV
DD
Gr. Mt.
the colleagues of V
the wife of C
BMs friend
MV's gf
Pr C's drug dealer

Serious mental illness costs America **\$193.2 billion** in lost earnings per year. Mood disorders, including major depression, dysthymic disorder and bipolar disorder, are the third most common cause of hospitalization in the U.S. for both youth and adults aged 18–44.

[Mental Health By the Numbers | NAMI: National Alliance on Mental ...](#)

**We need to be wily as always with numbers.
Is the Kaiser family foundation a front for
some Eli Lilly type big pharma joint?
revenue 138.6 million (is this real,)**

The Henry J. **Kaiser Family Foundation**, or just **Kaiser Family Foundation** (KFF), is an American non-profit organization, headquartered in San Francisco, California. It focuses on major health care issues facing the nation, as well as U.S. role in global health policy.

Founder: [Henry J. Kaiser](#)

Headquarters: [San Francisco, California](#), U.S

Purpose: Health care, [health policy](#)

President and CEO: Dr. Drew Altman

[Kaiser Family Foundation - Wikipedia](#)

What are the current costs and outcomes related to mental health and substance abuse disorders?

By [Rabah Kamal](#) *Kaiser Family Foundation*

[Chart Collections Health Spending](#)

Posted: July 31, 2017

SHARE

[Click to share on Facebook \(Opens in new window\)](#)

[Click to share on Twitter \(Opens in new window\)](#)

View as Slideshow

This collection of charts (updated July 31, 2017) explores trends in the prevalence, outcomes, costs, and access to care associated with mental health and substance abuse disorders in the United States and comparably wealthy countries. A [related brief](#) offers discussion of data available as of May 5, 2016.

Eighteen percent of adults in the United States have a mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder

The 2015 National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) found that about 43.4 million adults (17.9%) in the United States had any mental illness in the past year (including mental, behavioral, or emotional disorders, but excluding developmental and substance use disorders). Mental illness was more prevalent among women (21.2%) than men (14.3%), and occurred among more than a fifth of adults ages 18 to 25, as well over a fifth of adults ages 26 to 49.

Jesus and the value of money

It is very unfortunate that the Church has focused so little on money when Jesus has so much to say about its place in the Kingdom. Is it because the Roman princes like their fancy hats and limosines? Didn't Jesus say something about beware of the tassels and the places of honor at banquets? What is going on here? Did those priests play hooky that day in Bible class? Should we quote Curtis Mayfield to them? Does the Vatican palace have gangsta white walls? This scandal is perhaps

without equal in the world and the actions of Pope Francis, so long overdue that the library card--in fact the library itself-- is probably not even in existence anymore. (on a personal note I don't know much about the institutional church at all but it just seems so ridiculous. I mean if you're going to be a mobster at least be one, right?)

Let's just review for a moment, THE LOVE OF MONEY IS THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL. no man can have two masters....for he will hate the one, and love the other. Jesus quote. Jesus throwing out the money changers, Jesus telling Peter to pay the temple tax from his daily labor, Jesus wearily complaining, "I have no where to lay my head" Jesus sending out the disciples and saying "the laborer is worth his wages" Jesus wisely telling the crowds, you are only following me for free bread. Jesus telling the Samaritan woman, if you drink the water I will give you you will never be thirsty again, and the honesty of her answer, give me this water always. (and the scandal of Him talking to this woman, bound to offend the piccolo borghese, like Pasolini interviewing hookers about sex, was in his eyes nothing compared to her thirst, both physical and spiritual.)

THE THEOLOGY OF THE EUCHARIST v intellectual excuses for guilt, death WHAT IS THE MONETARY VALUE OF A HUMAN SOUL?

30 pieces of silver for the entire human race?

Padre Pio's dad worked in the US to pay for him to essentially get crucified.

The DNA of Jesus..science will soon be able to measure the caloric energy of things like demonic presence (Pio survived on 400 calories per day, without being thin--regularly broke human thermometers with his fevers. if accurate, energy of the eucharist is obviously involved here but we need scientific evidence of this)

Matilda

Matilda Lando lives in the same tenement as Leon, just down the hall. She is the 12 year old child of a violent and chaotic family, whose only true love is her little brother, aged four. Her teenage step sister resents her, just as the step sister's mother resents Matilda's father, who earns his living with the corrupt, unhinged, drug addicted DEA official hiding drugs. [should this be added: While this paper will not discuss certain cultural stereotypes in detail, it is also vaguely insinuated that the

Lando branch of the family is Latino and the other branch, gringo (the last name,

		10 years.	
	Cote d'Ivoire	Between November 2010 and September 2011, children made up 51.7% of cases of sexual violence. In more than half of these cases against children, the survivors were below 15 years of age.	Save the Children (2013)
	Kenya	The US National Center for Education Statistics claims in 2007-2008 there were 800 rapes on elementary, middle and high school campuses and 3,800 cases of sexual battery aside from rape.	Robers et al. (2010)
	South Africa	Recent South African police statistics show 21,000 cases of child rape or assault reported, against children as young as nine months old. Only an estimated 1 in 36 cases of rape is reported.	ILO (n.d.)
	Malawi	Between three-fifths and two-thirds of offences against children were reported to someone, be this a parent, a teacher or the police. Bullying is most often reported (65.5%), whereas forced sex (61.4%) and oral sex (60%) are the least reported.	Jones et al. (2008)
	Africa	Around 3 million girls in Africa are at risk of undergoing FGM/C every year. Estimates indicate that 91.5 million girls and women over age nine in Africa are currently living with the consequences of FGM/C.	Yoder et al. (2004) Yoder and Khan (2008)
Asia	India	53.22% of children report facing sexual abuse, 52.94% boys and 47.06% girls. 21.90% of children have been sexually assaulted In 2007, MWCD reported the presence of over 3 million female sex workers in India, with 35.47% of them entering the trade before the age of 18. Girl prostitutes in India are tortured, held in virtual imprisonment, sexually abused and raped. Brothel keepers regularly recruit young girls.	Kacker et al. (2007) Pietkiewicz-Pareek (2012)
	Thailand	In 2013, more than 19,000 children were treated at provincial hospitals because of abuse; about 70% were treated for sexual abuse.	UNICEF (n.d.)
	Cambodia	Of the 1,499 reported rapes during 2007-2008, 69.7% were against children; of the 535 rape incidences in 2009 seen by NGOs, 72% were of children.	UNICEF (2012)
Pacific	Papua New Guinea	Nearly half reported rape victims are under 15 years and 13% are under 7 years. 50% of those seeking medical help after rape are under 16, 25% are under 10 and 10% are under 8.	UNICEF (2008) Davidson (2013)
	Latin America and the Caribbean	Across Latin America and the Caribbean, a review found that between 8% and 27% of women and girls reported sexual violence by a non-partner. However, the level of reported violence varies widely by collection and data analysis.	Contreras et al. (2010)
South/Central America	Peru	One report in Lima revealed that nearly one in five women reported sexual abuse – defined as unwanted sexual touch or sex acts before 15 years of age – as did 18% in Cusco.	Contreras et al. (2010)
	Honduras	Domestic servants, who are predominantly girls, may live in isolated homes and are susceptible to physical and sexual abuse.	US Department of Labor (2012a)
	Brazil	In 2011 alone, more than 10,000 children and adolescents were reported as being victims of sexual abuse, some as young as 11. Sexual violence is the second most reported crime against children in Brazil, with most victims aged between 10 and 14.	Plan International (2014)
North America	US	Nearly 1 in 5 women (18.3%) and 1 in 71 men (1.4%) have been raped. 42.2% of female victims were raped before the age of 18.	Black et al. (2011)
	Haiti	Almost one in five girls in Haiti's capital Port-au-Prince were raped during an armed rebellion in 2004-2005.	Save the Children (2013)
Europe	UK	One in five women (aged 16-59) has experienced some form of sexual violence since the age of 16.	Ministry of Justice et al. (2013).

Region/country		Statistic	Source
Global patterns		In 2002, 150 million girls and 73 million boys under the age of 18 had experienced forced sexual intercourse or other forms of sexual violence involving physical contact.	Pinheiro (2006)
		Up to 50% of sexual assaults worldwide are committed against girls aged under 16.	UNFPA and UNICEF (2011)
		In 2000, it was estimated that 1.8 million children were being sexually exploited in prostitution and pornography. Around 1 million children are thought to enter prostitution every year.	UNICEF (2010a)
		In high income countries that are not experiencing conflict, 21.2% of females and 10.7% of males aged 0-18 are victims of sexual abuse, meaning an average of nearly 16% of all children.	Stoltenborgh et al. (2011)
		A review on the prevalence and risk of violence against children with disabilities, published in July 2012, found that, overall, children with disabilities were almost four times more likely to experience violence than non-disabled children. Children with disabilities were 3.7 times more likely to be victims of any sort of violence, 3.6 times more likely to be victims of physical violence and 2.9 times more likely to be victims of sexual violence. Children with mental or intellectual impairments appear to be among the most vulnerable, with 4.6 times the risk of sexual violence.	Jones et al. (2012)
Sub-Saharan Africa	Swaziland	Sexual violence as a child is associated with more than three times the risk of reporting STDs, including HIV, compared with those not exposed.	Reza et al. (2009)
		Nearly 38% of women aged 18-24 report experiencing sexual violence before the age of 18.	UNICEF Swaziland and CDC (2007)
	Tanzania	27% of women aged 18-24 report experiencing sexual violence before the age of 18. Over 6% of females aged 13-24 who were ever pregnant report that at least one pregnancy was caused by forced or coerced sex.	UNICEF Tanzania et al. (2011)
	Zimbabwe	32% of women aged 18-24 report experiencing sexual violence before the age of 18. Among 18-24 year olds, only about 3% of females and slightly above 2% of males who have experienced sexual violence received professional help from institutions.	Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency (2012)
	Uganda	65% of females aged 15-19 report sexual or physical violence.	UNICEF (2011)
	Liberia	80% of victims of gender-based violence in 2011-2012 were younger than 17 and almost all were raped.	Save the Children (2013)
	Sierra Leone	70% of the sexual violence cases seen by IRC were girls under 18 and more than 20% were under 11 following the conflict. 215,000-257,000 Sierra Leonean women and girls may have been subjected to sexual violence 83% of survivors of gender-based violence in 2011-2012 were younger than 17 and almost all of these cases involved rape.	Save the Children (2013)
	DRC	65% of 16,000 cases of sexual violence during conflict involved children, mostly adolescent girls. 10% of the victims in 2008 were children less than	Save the Children (2013)

combined with the dark hair of Matilda and her father versus the caucasian features of the step mother and her daughter, added to the fact that oftentimes undocumented or otherwise marginalized drug dealers can be found living with gainfully employed native born american women as a cover,)]. Lando is portrayed as going after sex in the bathroom of their apartment, while his wife protests that she “has to go to work”.

Matilda is neglected and physically (and possibly sexually) abused by her family, and although enrolled in a school for “wayward girls”, (oh the irony) presumably paid for with the drug money, has stopped going to school. She hangs around smoking cigarettes on the stairs, avoiding abuse, and becomes familiar with Leon’s habits, as he passes her silently on his way to the corner bodega to buy milk. One day, noticing her black eye, he offers her a kleenex, and she offers to buy him milk. This exchange would save Matilda’s life, and cost Leon his own.

Vendetta, Generally

Vendetta is part of the culture of the ancient world. from wikipedia:

A **feud** [/fjuːd/](#), referred to in more extreme cases as a **blood feud**, **vendetta**, **faida**, **beef**, **clan war**, **gang war**, or **private war**, is a long-running argument or fight, often between [social groups](#) of people, especially [families](#) or [clans](#). Feuds begin because one party (correctly or incorrectly) perceives itself to have been attacked, insulted or wronged by another. Intense feelings of [resentment](#) trigger the initial [retribution](#), which causes the other party to feel equally aggrieved and [vengeful](#). The dispute is subsequently fuelled by a long-running cycle of retaliatory [violence](#). This continual cycle of provocation and retaliation makes it extremely difficult to end the feud peacefully. Feuds frequently involve the original parties' family

members or associates, can last for [generations](#), and may result in extreme acts of [violence](#). They can be interpreted as an extreme outgrowth of social relations based in [family honor](#). Until the [early modern period](#), feuds were considered legitimate legal instruments^[1] and were regulated to some degree. For example, [Serb](#) culture calls this *krvna osveta*, meaning "blood revenge", which had unspoken^[*oubious - discuss*] but highly valued rules.^[2] In tribal societies, the blood feud, coupled with the practice of [blood wealth](#), functioned as an effective form of social control for limiting and ending conflicts between individuals and groups who are related by [kinship](#), as described by anthropologist [Max Gluckman](#) in his article "The Peace in the Feud"^[3] in 1955.

Many people are familiar with Jesus quoting the book of Jewish law, the Leviticus (is this accurate? cite this) You have heard it said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth...He then proposes sacrifice instead: if someone hits you on one cheek, offer him the other. If someone takes your shirt, offer him your cloak as well. A follower of Christ is explicitly forbidden to seek vendetta. Yet "malavita" cultures are often incompletely Christianized, and may retain holdovers of tradition and superstition. This is what the American psyche believes.

In truth, our own legal system which masquerades as righteous and civilized is a terrible avenger. Our punishments are ridiculous. In her best selling book *Dead Man Walking*, about the police power's obsession with legalized vendetta, Sister Helen Prejean notes that an eye for an eye was actually a merciful way of dealing with your enemy in ancient times. Most people would take both eyes in return for one, or break your jaw if you broke their tooth; vengeance was retaliatory and overgrown. In our own times, it is the desire to punish someone that leads to the death penalty. The deep, instinctive cry inside that "someone has to pay." It is that, and nothing more. CITE EVIDENCE

Vendetta in the film

When Stansfield, the cop, discovers that Lando has been cutting the drugs, he engages in his own personal vendetta. He guns down the entire Lando family, except for Matilda who had gone downstairs to buy milk, and immediately seeks refuge with Leon. After a debate with himself which is well displayed, he lets her into his apartment to escape the gunfire.

Learning that Leon is a skilled hitman, Matilda is not repelled as he anticipated, but interested. She asks him to let her stay there and teach her to kill the corrupt cop to exact revenge for her brother. She asks, then she begs. He first attempts to shoo her away, and when she says “where to?” he states frankly, “not my problem”, then considers shooting her in her sleep, and finally when in despair, she puts a pistol to her head and pulls the trigger, he shoves the gun away at the last minute and agrees to let her stay.

The following is part of the dialogue where he tries to shoo her out.

Mathilda,

why are you doing this to me?

I've been nothing but nice to you!

I even saved your life yesterday,
right outside the door.

Right, so now

you're responsible for it.

If you saved my life, you must have

saved it for a good reason.

The phenomenon of sexual violence

If you threw me out now

it's like you never opened your door.

Like you let me die right there

in front of it.

But you did open it,

so...

Mathilda...

If you don't help me, I'll die
tonight. I can feel it.

But I don't want to die tonight.

And because Leon in the end can't bear to let her die, he dies himself.

It is important to realize that many times the only way for women to escape this kind of sexual violence is to disappear.

Frank Ahearne, who was hired by the government to find Monica Lewinsky and her mother (at least this is the story he gives) now assists people who need to drop out of sight. This is what he says

What's the gender split of your clients?

It used to be 90 percent men, but now it is more 50/50. Men typically leave for financial reasons and women for violence. I

think the evening out in numbers is because women have come to realize they have options. I know that must sound sexist.

An undocumented class of refugees

The United States has long identified with the slogan “let freedom ring” and the statue of Liberty with her poem, “I lift my lamp beside the golden door.” But the charity --or the “see, I told you so” righteousness if you prefer-- of the Washington/Jefferson crowd may have turned to pride and arrogance, which makes us blind to present day realities (and even the hypocrisy of the past, given that we slaughtered any number of native born American tribes in order to lift the

lamp beside the door, and as Thoreau notes, enslaved Africans and stole land from Mexicans and Alaskans.)

In any case, the US government created a law called political asylum to shelter Jews and others fleeing persecution during the world wars. The main categories for this asylum you must prove that you fall into one of the following categories:

Race, religion, political affiliation or membership in a particular social group. Here is the Federal Statute: US Codes Title 8, Section 1158: (source: Cornell Law Library)

(B) Burden of proof

(i) In general

The burden of proof is on the applicant to establish that the applicant is a [refugee](#), within the meaning of [section 1101\(a\)\(42\)\(A\) of this title](#). To establish that the applicant is a [refugee](#) within the meaning of such section, the applicant must establish that race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion was or will be at least one central reason for persecuting the applicant.

But what is a refugee? Under the UN convention: (taken from Epthinktank.com)

Refugees are a special class of migrants who under international law deserve specific protection by their host state. According to Article 1 of the 1951 UN Convention, as modified by the 1967 Protocol, a refugee is defined as a person who 'owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country.' This definition implies that several qualifying conditions apply to be considered a refugee: (1) **presence outside home country**; (2) **well-founded fear of persecution** (being at risk of harm is insufficient reason in the absence of discriminatory persecution); (3) **incapacity to enjoy the protection of one's own state** from the persecution feared. The definition of refugees was actually **intended to exclude** internally displaced persons, economic migrants, victims of natural disasters, and persons fleeing violent conflict but not subject to discrimination amounting to persecution.

A refugee is not the same as an asylum-seeker. According to the [United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees](#) (UNHCR) 'an asylum-seeker is someone who says he or she is a refugee, but whose claim has not yet been definitively evaluated'. In the case of mass refugee movements (usually a result of conflict), the reasons for fleeing are

evident and there is no capacity to conduct individual interviews, such groups are often declared *prima facie* refugees.

But the drug war, the skin trade, domestic and civil violence, economic corruption and mass mental illness are our new situation. How do we create categories of refugees if we are all refugees? It's a nice question which Bocchia's paper tries to begin to answer.

Leon's death

The end of the film is oddly unsatisfying and many people have called for a sequel for a long time. CITE. At least the film does not sugar coat the realities of the drug war. Sooner or later, Leon was likely to die in that war, and so he does.

After Matilda takes a misguided and premature swipe at Stansfield, recklessly confronting him in a government building and forcing Leon to expose his whereabouts to rescue her, things head for a bad end. Stansfield ambushes Leon with the use of weaponry normally reserved for foreign engagements with hostile powers and with every single man under his command, and Leon, though on the point of escape disguised as a police officer, is recognized at the last instant by Stansfield and shot down as he heads for the street of freedom. With his last breath, he pulls the pin of a grenade and calls Stansfield to his side, where it is revealed that Leon is covered in live grenades, and that the game is over. As Matilda having escaped down an air shaft in tears, heads for Tony's, the entire building is blown away, pulverizing Leon, Stansfield and everything else. Tony refuses to put Matilda to work, and warns her to get out before he loses his patience. In the last scene of the movie, we see that Matilda has returned to the school, where she is planting Leon's houseplant on the grounds.

The usefulness of Pasolini's film theory as regards Leon: the Professional: The little Yemeni Scarecrow and Matilda

Pasolinian film theory is an appropriate tool to analyze for Leon: the Professional for a number of reasons. One is that Pasolini had intimate personal knowledge of the squalid urban underworld in which Leon and Matilda are forced to live. Though 40 years earlier and in another country, he was forced by poverty,

religious conflict, and family disintegration caused by war, to live in the worst parts of a big city, the slums which were full of crime bosses, prostitutes and petty thieves. The drug culture had not yet infiltrated at that time, but the violence, poverty and desperation were everywhere and ruled the streets he walked every day as a young man. These experiences would forever mark Pasolini, the people in his life and the subjects he treated in his work, as well as his film theory and life views in general. He did not shy away from these experiences, but instead, was driven by the need to tell the world the truth that he knew. He consistently chose to treat forgotten, ignored, controversial and/or disturbing subjects in his films.

For example, in a documentary about the destruction of the beautiful city Sana in Yemen, the documentary opens with an unusual and unfamiliar scene: a small person obscured by clothing standing in a field of grain, swinging what looks to be a primitive weapon around in the air, and creating a rhythmic snapping sound. At first glance, the person appears to be hunting birds with some sort of long slingshot.

As the opening credits roll onto the screen, the viewer discovers something quite different: This film is dedicated to the little girl--a human scarecrow. -! *That small child had the job of standing unnoticed, and forgotten, in that field all day, swinging that rock around her head to keep birds away from the grain.* All day, every day, forever. She is the heroine of his film. Like the young, pregnant Mary in his Gospel according to Matthew, she is silent. Pasolini's gaze rests upon her with love, and with him you see the sight that otherwise you would probably ignore. This is the compelling power, the sensitive eye, the compassionate heart of Pasolini, who sees the world as Christ sees it. We should all see as he sees, we should all see Matilda as he saw that little Yemeni scarecrow in *Le Mura di Sana*.

Since in *Leon*, the police power is presented as a hidden force of evil and the antagonist of the entire tragedy, Pasolinian theory is a good tool to examine the film.

Finally, Pasolini and Besson share a common heritage: that of Christian Europe, and the existential crisis brought on by power grabs in their backyard that led to the drug war so prominently featured in the film. Paolo Pasolini was excluded from

the roman catholic church and from the communist party as well and in fact, never really “fit in” very well in any organized world view or political party. However, if we identify true Christianity as the capacity to sacrifice to respond to the will to power, then his Christian intuition was unrivaled among film directors of his day (or maybe any day). He consistently chose the most mistreated of society as his subjects, beginning with Accattone, a weirdly sympathetic treatment of a suicidal, misogynistic, thieving roman pimp and progressing through La Ricotta, a short satire of passion plays featuring a starving actor who dies on the cross, literally, from having been overstuffed with food by the cast and crew of the production.

Heroes and Villains: the ambiguity of law and order

Book by Judge ?? Judy??? “don’t piss on my leg and then tell me its raining.” the will to power is cunning, psychologically sophisticated, and amps up its game to match wits with its opponent, the capacity to sacrifice. thus, it sets up the dichotomy in a false way, tricking the unwary into cooperation with it through ignorance or ineptitude.

Our collective opinion of the POLICE POWER and how it is formed by the media especially if there is nothing else in our minds. Cowboy, John Wayne etc cop shows Law and order, William Shriver THE NIGHTMARE YEARS how did we go from this to Jack McCoy always gets his man? Power is power no matter what flag it's waving. Then Olivia Benson, (sexual abuse) Bobby Goren (insanity) the matrix, the hunger games, the purge--that Sauron would want us to cast him down and set up NO ONE in his place has not occurred to him. That we would seek to destroy the ring has not entered into his wildest dreams. This is the trump card that sacrifice holds in the game with power. Power cannot guess the card, because power would never use it nor even recognize its game changing value.

The American psyche is replete with images of the "Godfather" in an uncountable number of depictions in which Mario Puzo's tale could get lost as in a sea. It is also replete with images of "cowboy cops", mavericks in their own right who transgress the limits of legal authority in order to restore order and bring criminals to justice. It is a classic psychological technique: evoke sympathy for the "bad guy" and then destroy that sympathy with the inevitable triumph of righteousness. The voiceless romantic interest of the cowboy is often shown as being forcibly kidnapped by the outlaw, or pining after the outlaw in some tawdry way, or both. (both John Wayne and Marilyn Monroe figure into Leon: the Professional, and this will be discussed later on.) Because we have been schooled to sympathize with Leon in our emotional selves, and to unconsciously use our "superior" rational selves to patronize and deceive that perceptive, inarticulate sympathy into insignificance, the moral superiority of Leon is invisible to many people at first glance. We need to deconstruct our stereotypes in order to grasp the significance of the will to power in Besson's narrative.

The will to power and its rejection in the Jewish/christian narrative: the cultural patrimony of Pasolini and Besson

The common themes of joy sin guilt loss of joy in the Christian narrative

Both Pasolini and Besson were born in territories that for many centuries were predominantly Christian in terms of spirituality. Thus, the Christian narrative is clearly in the collective consciousness of Pasolini's Italy and Besson's France, and

whatever they may have felt about it personally, it surely affected their vision of the world and its power struggle.

The memory of joy, subsequent misdeed of some kind, the ensuing guilt and loss of paradise is a common theme among ancient mythologies. One of the strongest arguments for this from empirical evidence is that we are not comfortable with death. If we were merely creatures of nature and nature commands that we die, why then do we resist? The ancient Egyptians..gilgamesh...

The garden of Eden story in Genesis presents the tree of life as being in the center of the garden, while the tree of “knowledge of good and evil” as being the poison that kills human beings. Whensoever as you shall eat of it, you shall die the death, God warns. But famously, the serpent “who was the most cunning of all the creatures the lord God had made”, suggests to humans that God is merely jealous of his all powerfulness and does not wish to share. Many uncounted ages later, Christ reveals that Satan has misunderstood the situation: God is not interested in a power grab, but something different. he even tries to console some demons of insanity by granting their request to enter into a herd of swine. This is clearly not a power-hungry and vengeful character.

In a particularly poetic passage in Genesis about God walking in the garden in the cool of the evening, Adam and Eve have suddenly realized they are naked and have hidden themselves. The middle east has preserved some of this shame about sexual bodies even to the present day, covering womens’ physical presence so completely under fabric that they have to look through an eye slit to see the world. In our own culture, we have the whole “dressed like that she was asking for it” situation.

The wish of the Israelites to have a king

When Moses had settled the nation of Jews in the promised land, they began to want to blend in with the rest of the world, and to have a “conventional” political set up

instead of just a prophet. The Israelites were warned by God not to ask for a king, but they did not listen.

Israel Asks for a King

8 When Samuel grew old, he appointed his sons as Israel's leaders.[a] **2** The name of his firstborn was Joel and the name of his second was Abijah, and they served at Beersheba. **3** But his sons did not follow his ways. They turned aside after dishonest gain and accepted bribes and perverted justice.

4 So all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah. **5** They said to him, "You are old, and your sons do not follow your ways; now appoint a king to lead[b] us, such as all the other nations have."

6 But when they said, "Give us a king to lead us," this displeased Samuel; so he prayed to the Lord. **7** And the Lord told him: "Listen to all that the people are saying to you; it is not you they have rejected, but they have rejected me as their king. **8** As they have done from the day I brought them up out of Egypt until this day, forsaking me and serving other gods, so they are doing to you. **9** Now listen to them; but warn them solemnly and let them know what the king who will reign over them will claim as his rights."

It is important to realize that the prophets were becoming *financially corrupted*, "*accepting bribes and perverting justice.*" Is this the regretful hindsight of the author, trying to justify the request for a king which by the author's time the Jews have realized was a bad idea? According to the prophet, God is very specific as to how the king will abuse the people, and warns that when the people cry to Him for relief He will not answer. The people however insist that *they want to be like the other nations, and have a king to fight their battles.* So, they want earthly protection, and they want to conform to their peers.

10 Samuel told all the words of the Lord to the people who were asking him for a king. **11** He said, "This is what the king who will reign over you will claim as his rights: He will take your sons and make them serve with his chariots and horses, and they will run in front of his chariots. **12** Some he will assign to be commanders of thousands and commanders of fifties, and others to plow his ground and reap his harvest, and still others to make weapons of war and equipment for his chariots. **13** He will take your daughters to be perfumers and cooks and bakers. **14** He will take the best of your fields and vineyards and olive groves and give them to his attendants. **15** He will take a tenth of your grain and of your vintage and give it to his officials and attendants. **16** Your male and female servants and the best of your cattle[c] and donkeys he will take for his own use. **17** He will take a tenth of your flocks, and you yourselves will

become his slaves. **18** When that day comes, you will cry out for relief from the king you have chosen, but the Lord will not answer you in that day.”

19 But the people refused to listen to Samuel. “No!” they said. “We want a king over us. **20** Then we will be like all the other nations, with a king to lead us and to go out before us and fight our battles.”

Accordingly, God told the prophet to anoint Saul king over Israel. The author notes that Saul’s family was “of standing” meaning, they had clout and money, and that Saul was a big man and good looking. --It is always interesting to contrast this with the physical description of Jesus because oddly enough, there isn’t any. In fact there is no physical description of anyone in the New testament except that Zachaeus is short and that the prostitute has long hair. that’s it.

21 When Samuel heard all that the people said, he repeated it before the Lord. **22** The Lord answered, “Listen to them and give them a king.”

Then Samuel said to the Israelites, “Everyone go back to your own town.”

Samuel Anoints Saul

9 There was a Benjamite, a man of standing, whose name was Kish son of Abiel, the son of Zeror, the son of Bekorath, the son of Aphiah of Benjamin. **2** Kish had a son named Saul, as handsome a young man as could be found anywhere in Israel, and he was a head taller than anyone else.

Yet in the beginning Saul was humble before God. Sadly, that humility did not last.

21 Saul answered, “But am I not a Benjamite, from the smallest tribe of Israel, and is not my clan the least of all the clans of the tribe of Benjamin? Why do you say such a thing to me?”

God had predicted that no good would come of this situation. And the history of the Kings can be studied to determine whether the prediction was borne out.

Rejection of the will to power runs through the historical recounting of the life of Jesus Christ, the Christian deity, like a deep river of conviction. Christ, though a

descendant of the most wealthy and glorious of all Israeli Kings, Saul, David and Solomon, is born in obscurity in modest circumstances. He is raised without fanfare or luxury. Before undertaking his public career, Jesus is famously “led into the desert to be TEMPTED by the devil.” Satan, the traditional opponent of God, interestingly chooses to offer Jesus three forms of power, presumably the power his own angry soul seeks: the power to satisfy himself physically (if you are the son of God, command these stones to turn into bread.) the power to call angels to save him while acting reckless (leap from this cliff and angels will save you) and the power to dominate earthly territories. (all these cities are mine, and I will give you them all if you worship me.) Jesus rejects them all without apparent showmanship.

Matthew 4:1-11 New International Version (NIV)

Jesus Is Tested in the Wilderness

4 Then Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted[a] by the devil.

2 After fasting forty days and forty nights, he was hungry. **3** The tempter came to him and said, “If you are the Son of God, tell these stones to become bread.”

4 Jesus answered, “It is written: ‘Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God.’[b]”

5 Then the devil took him to the holy city and had him stand on the highest point of the temple. **6** “If you are the Son of God,” he said, “throw yourself down. For it is written: “He will command his angels concerning you, and they will lift you up in their hands, so that you will not strike your foot against a stone.’[c]”

7 Jesus answered him, “It is also written: ‘Do not put the Lord your God to the test.’[d]”

8 Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor. **9** “All this I will give you,” he said, “if you will bow down and worship me.”

10 Jesus said to him, “Away from me, Satan! For it is written: ‘Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only.’[e]”

11 Then the devil left him, and angels came and attended him.

He asks the crowds what they expected John the baptist to be, and says, people who live in luxury are in the palaces of Kings. We will use Matthew’s gospel, since Pasolini

said that Luke is too refined, Mark too crude and John too mystical for his purposes.
(who said that Pasolini was not a believer, --?)

Matthew 11:7-15 New International Version (NIV)

7 As John's disciples were leaving, Jesus began to speak to the crowd about John: "What did you go out into the wilderness to see? A reed swayed by the wind? **8** If not, what did you go out to see? A man dressed in fine clothes? No, those who wear fine clothes are in kings' palaces. **9** Then what did you go out to see? A prophet? Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet. **10** This is the one about whom it is written:

"I will send my messenger ahead of you,
who will prepare your way before you.'^[a]

11 Truly I tell you, among those born of women there has not risen anyone greater than John the Baptist; yet whoever is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.

12 From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven has been subjected to violence,^[b] and violent people have been raiding it. **13** For all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John. **14** And if you are willing to accept it, he is the Elijah who was to come. **15** Whoever has ears, let them hear.

At one point during his career, the people tried to seize him physically and make him king, but he "slipped out quietly and went away."

John 6:15 New International Version (NIV)

15 Jesus, knowing that they intended to come and make him king by force, withdrew again to a mountain by himself.

where is that in matteo

During his trial, when asked point blank by the judge, Pontius Pilate, are you a king?

He answers, you say so.

[John 18:37-38](#) [ESV](#) / [4 helpful votes](#) [Helpful](#) [Not Helpful](#)

Then Pilate said to him, "So you are a king?" Jesus answered, "You say that I am a king. For this purpose I was born and for this purpose I have come into the world—to bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth listens to my voice." Pilate said to him, "What is

truth?" After he had said this, he went back outside to the Jews and told them, "I find no guilt in him.

Personhood, the Will to Power and Marcus Dubber's Analysis of the Police

In the introduction to his book, Patriarchy and the Foundations of American Government, Markus Dubber has this to say:

Introduction: "The power to govern men and things" (pp. xi-xviii)

Among the powers of government *none is greater than the power to police, and none less circumscribed*. For centuries, it has been a commonplace of American legal and political discourse that the police power “is, and must be from its very nature, *incapable of any very exact definition or limitation.*”² Upon the police power, “the most essential, the most insistent, and always one of the least limitable of the powers of government,”³ hinges nothing less than “the security of social order, the life and health of the citizen, the comfort of an existence in a thickly populated community, the enjoyment...(italics mine).

If accurate, this is quite outrageous, since it is well known that the revolutionaries spun history to say that this “limitless power” so open to abuse and so neatly justified by its ample and essential benefits is the very villain they were fleeing from.

In Chapter 8 and 9, Dubber goes on to say,

8 The Law of Police: Internal and External Constraints (pp. 180-189)

The police power is by its nature free from principled constraint. Policing is an art, even a science. But it is not a matter of moral legitimacy. Moral questions are inappropriate because morality, in the modern sense, governs interactions among persons. Morality is a quality of personhood, and rights are personal. Police, however, doesn't deal with persons, but with resources and threats. An object of police governance is either a resource for the welfare of the community or a threat to that welfare. The job of the policer is to classify everyone and everything properly, and to treat each object...

9. Lochners' Law

...Police, in other words, conflicts with personhood. To set up this conflict, however, is one thing, to give it meaning is another. Talk of human dignity doesn't make for a meaningful standard by which state action can be measured, unless we get a better sense of what human dignity is, and what personhood implies.

Without a clear understanding of what personhood requires, it can become as oppressively vague a category of governance as police has been. Just as the invocation

of an undefined and unlimited concept of police can insulate state action from scrutiny...

PSYCH ANALYSIS ancient myths down to THE DSMV CONDENSED: GUILT
FEAR FORGIVENESS LOVE

PERFECT LOVE CASTS OUT FEAR (john the apostle)

Pasolini and the Police

Despite his deep hatred for the Power, Pasolini does not let emotions blind him to distinctions which are important. For example, in a passage from Lettere Luterane from August, 1975, where he sketches out notes for a possible film treating the

incident, Pasolini defends the actions of a police officer who committed suicide over the escape of a prisoner.

Everyone read it distractedly. About a month ago a police officer killed himself because the detained individual entrusted to his care had fled, taking advantage of the faith that the police officer had placed in the prisoner.

A friend of the suicide, doing his own investigation on his own time, after a long while was able to capture the escaped man... (translation mine).

Pasolini expresses the view that the officer was honorable and did not understand that the police colluded with and was an arm of the will to power. He believed that the officer was heir to the ancient pre-Christian culture that had existed for millennia all over the world, which was on the point of extinction due to consumerism.

Elsewhere I have called this an episode of obedience, to a series of norms and values that define a culture that is by now disappeared, (almost totally disappeared, though this has happened in the past few years). ..these norms and values no longer exist because the culture that expressed them has been destroyed. Neither priests nor generals believe these values anymore...but the police officer, Vincenzo Rizzi, still believed them...

He wanted to use film to teach his audience this anthropological lesson, that *the collective consciousness, the cultural memory, of an entire people can be crystallized in the soul of a single one of its members* and thus, preserved as long as that soul should remain uncorrupted by selfishness. (fate questo in memoria di me.)

Thus, Vincenzo Rizzi was an obedient man in a world of disobedience. (Rhetorical disobedience, that which is created and manipulated by the power as a contradiction in itself and above all as a guarantee of modernity, which is absolutely necessary to consumerism.)

It is a tribute to the character of Pasolini that he was able to be so clear-headed, given the persecution he endured at the hands of the legal system. Wu Ming is a pseudonym for an anonymous band of Italian authors, much like Luther Blisset. In an article published four years ago in *Internazionale*, the band has come out hotly denying that Pasolini ever sided with the police. As evidence they site his obsession with the horrible torture and death of a mentally ill prisoner named Marco Elisei by Fascists.

The solitary agony and death of Marcello Elisei would run deep in Pasolini, and would inspire the ending of *Mamma Roma* (1962). But in 1959 Pasolini is not yet a filmmaker. He is 37 years old, he has written collections of poetry, screenplays, and two novels that have caused uproar: *Ragazzi di vita* and *Una vita violenta*. He has already gone through arrests, charges, and trials. The prime minister's cabinet was directly involved in *Ragazzi di vita*'s censorship. Nevertheless, this is nothing compared to the fascist stalking, police and judicial mobbing, and media lynching the man is about to endure.

In the collective book *Pasolini: judicial report, persecution, death* (1977), Stefano Rodotà summarises the issue in one sentence: "Pasolini remained *uninterruptedly in the hand of judges* from 1960 to 1975." And beyond, actually. Post mortem. Rodotà talks about a "single trial," a long chain of investigations and hearings that dragged Pasolini in courtrooms countless times, even several times a day, through humiliations and oppression, while the press outside insulted him, mocked him, lynched him.

<https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/2719-the-police-vs-pasolini-pasolini-vs-the-police>

The Will to Power in Henry David Thoreau

In the life of Thoreau as it has come to us, there are many examples where the will to power is rejected in favor of sacrifice. It is told of Thoreau that after graduating from the university he got a job teaching school. He was fired shortly

thereafter for refusing to administer corporal punishment to the students. The American Society of Authors and writers (AMSAW) reports:

Thoreau was graduated in 1837 ninth in his class, but he refused a diploma, thinking that there were better ways to spend five dollars. He changed his name to Henry David and became a teacher. When criticized by the supervisor of the local public school for not using corporal punishment on his students, Thoreau thrashed a random group of his pupils to illustrate the senselessness of it all and resigned from the school.--amsaw.org

Because of this, he risked ridicule, poverty and abandonment which he indeed suffered-for what woman (or man) would marry a man who refused to use power to earn a living? And what society would embrace such a person? And how would such a person survive?

Thoreau also opposed the enslavement of African Americans, and famously said, "I cannot for an instant recognize as my government....that which is the slaves' government also." (as quoted in <http://www.massmoments.org>)

He likewise opposed the Mexican-American war and refused on these grounds to pay a tax, which landed him briefly in jail. See for example, the play "The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail" "https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Night_Thoreau_Spent_in_Jail"

Finally, in Higher Laws, a chapter of Walden, Walden, Thoreau expresses his views that although he is not a vegetarian, and in fact kills game even while practicing transcendentalism, it seems to him that killing animals for food is a mistake. All of these examples support the view that Thoreau rejected the will to power.

The Will to Power in Tolkien

Tolkien's mother was probably the one who taught him the most about rejecting the will to power. When she converted to Catholicism, she lost a good deal of privilege, money and high society, which would forever affect her own life and the lives of her family. Angelus Press reports:

Tolkien was introduced to prolonged hardship for the Faith at an early age. Born into a Protestant family, when he was three his father died, and when he was eight his mother Mabel converted to Catholicism with her two sons. As a result, relatives refused the widowed mother financial assistance, and four years later she died of acute diabetes. Tolkien later wrote:

“My own dear mother was a martyr indeed, and it is not to everybody that God grants so easy a way to his great gifts as he did to Hilary and myself, giving us a mother who killed herself with labor and trouble to ensure us keeping the faith.”[ii]

Raised afterwards in poverty by a capable and kind guardian – the Welsh-Spaniard Fr. Francis Morgan of the Birmingham Oratory – Tolkien developed pious habits he would keep throughout his life of frequent Mass, regular confession, daily prayers, hope in the efficacy of the Sacraments, and trust in the Church’s Magisterium.”<https://www.angeluspress.org/blogs/tradition/professor-tolkien-goes-to-mass-what-the-author-and-scholar-saw-that-others-dismissed>”

Moreover, Tolkien saw the consequences of the will to power in the first world war. As the Mises Institute observes, (I am only quoting this particular paragraph, not endorsing their website because I have not read it)

And here we have the correct understanding of the theme of the novel: it is about the evils of power. More precisely, the book aligns itself against power--not "economic power" or "social power", but specifically political power. This is also the central theme of the classical liberal political tradition. “<https://mises.org/library/tolkien-v-power>”

While this paper will argue elsewhere that Power subsumes all forms into one vast will to dominate, the point here is that perhaps there is little literature so adept at displaying the will to power, and its rejection, within a narrative structure, as *The Lord of the Rings*. All the characters are presented with a choice regarding the Ring which is aptly called the One Ring among the so called Rings of power.

Tolkien’s work is fiction, unlike Thoreau’s, and in this is more similar to Besson’s film. Here, the characters and their actions are the subjects of our analysis and we will look at them in detail as regards their relationship to the will to power.

Galadriel and Gandalf

The ring is such a strong temptation to the wise and powerful Gandalf that he fears to touch it, using tongs instead to lift it from the fire. When he doubts that it might be the true One ring, and reaches out his hand to touch it, the voice of malice he hears scares him. Similarly, Galadriel refuses to touch the ring when Frodo offers it to her, but is nearly swept away by a tidal wave of desire to take the ring and destroy her enemies with it.

Aragorn, Boromir and Faramir

Aragorn was the Dunedan, the man of the West, whose people had botched their chance to destroy the ring forever, and the two brothers Boromir and Faramir were stewards, tasked with maintaining the realms of human beings until the world was made new again. All three were tempted to use the ring, famously, when Frodo begs him, “can you protect me from yourself? Would you destroy it?” Strider closes his noble fingers on Frodo’s hand and says “I would have gone with you until the end.” Boromir, upon whose shoulders the heaviest burden lay, was the one who crumbled and fell. Even he however, as he died to save Merry and Pippin, was able to wrestle free of the will to Power in the end.

Frodo, Sam and Gollum

This ring, crafted by the devil himself, calls to the soul of a creature and tempts it with the pure will to power according to the personal desires of the one being so tempted. The temptation is so strong that in the end, even the sturdy and innocent hobbit Frodo falls prey to it, grasping the ring with an expression of evil will and declaring “it is mine” and must be freed by the unintentional sacrifice of his arch enemy, Gollum.

More on Frodo, Sam and Gollum: a mysterious mercy

At this juncture, another, equally critical rejection of the will to power in the relationship of Frodo, Gollum and the Ring should be examined in light of the relationship between Leon and Stansfield

Perhaps even more important than Frodo's struggle with the Ring is his destiny of self-destructive forgiveness toward his enemy which the former entails. Frodo is called upon for the sake of the world to continually show mercy to, and even constrained to rely on, a hated figure whose only wish is to throttle him. The two ring-bearers are yoked together: they can only achieve their goals in each others' company, no matter how horrible and atrocious that may become.

In the mines of Moria, when Frodo says regretfully of Gollum, "it's a pity Bilbo didn't kill him when he had the chance", Gandalf replies that it was pity that stayed Bilbo's hand. He reminds Frodo not to be "so quick to dole out death and judgment", since he is not able to restore life to those who truly deserve it. It is clear that Tolkien must have thought long and hard about this theme, as the surprise ending of Gollum's demise, which is hinted at here, is so quietly woven into the story that it would be almost impossible to guess. Add to that the heartbreaking fate of Frodo, predicted by Galadriel in the film when she says to a guilt ridden Elrond telepathically "the quest will claim his life."

**on a personal note, it is fitting that shortly after saying this, Gandalf is yanked down to Hell by the Balrog, who was summoned by the stupidity and carelessness of Pippin (not the first time that happened). When I first read this story, when Gandalf fell into Moria I must have cried more than the fellowship did. I put the book down for months, unable to take it in. His return to life seemed impossible and the story, however gripping, seemed pointless and unbearable without his presence.

If Frodo was summoned to the quest also to redeem Gollum, then it could be said that Leon was summoned to Matilda's drama to redeem Stansfield or at least, bring him to judgment in some way. Had Stansfield not persecuted the Lando family and driven Matilda to seek refuge in Leon's apartment, he would never have been drawn into her quest for vendetta for her brother, which reminded him of his own

revenge story. The story he told Matilda was that after his girlfriend's father had murdered the girl over her love for Leon, Leon had done the same to him. Ironically Matilda's reaction to Stansfields will to power, specifically her desire to die now that she had no love, and her willingness to risk her own life to avenge her little brother reminded Leon of something in himself, drew him into her story, and eventually gave him the capacity to lay down his own life. Thus, as with Frodo and Gollum, the will to power seems to summon its opposite, and to create the opportunity for a struggle between pride and humility.

TALK ABOUT LUCAS GETTING HIS IDEA FOR STAR WARS FROM TOLKIEN, LUCAS BEING A JEW IS THUS LINKING THE TWO COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESSES IN OUR TIMES (and also is a friend of Natali portmans' family as well)

The will to Power in Frankfurt

Harry Frankfurt sets out modestly to suggest to the world that we need a theory of Bullshit, and that all rolling, so to speak. the school which deconstruction theories,



he will do is start the ball Frankfurt is aptly named, as developed a lot of is called "the frankfurt school."

And the professor has started the ball rolling. Many people now are developing classes on calling bullshit. CITE

How does bullshit relate to the will to power? BS is undoubtedly a tool of Pasolini's Power, as he mentions the BS in the press and politics over and over. CITE Harry Frankfurt does not mention the will to power specifically in his essay. However, he does mention Wittgenstein who like Frankfurt and Nietzsche was from the Germanic culture. *Surely the ability to deceive listeners regarding your intentions* as well as regarding the subject of your discourse, is an essential and vitally important aspect of the ideology of power. For, it is not phenomena which deceive us to our deaths, it is not the fruits of the tree of good and evil that kills us, but the untruths we believe about them. And if a lie is disguised as "merely bs", like an army disguised as a Trojan horse, how easily it gets into our conversation, our thoughts, our actions, and our culture, and *how difficult it is to deconstruct*.

The Will to Power in Pasolini

Unlike Thoreau, Pasolini did not retreat to a woodland shelter to contemplate transcendental realities in solitude, though he did purchase a ruined medieval tower in Chia so he could retreat there. Unlike Tolkien, he did not create fantastical lands to quench his thirst for supernatural truth. Instead, he engaged in a continual ad hoc

war with The Power, greed and selfishness which had been codified into the ideology of consumerism, more deadly in his eyes than any Machiavelli, any Hitler.

The reasons for this will probably be traced to his personal experiences. Born later in time and closer to the eye of the ideological hurricane, so to speak, his situation was more desperate, the outrage more urgent somehow. Both his father and brother fell victim in different ways to world wars, his younger brother being shot down by communist partisans in a misunderstanding which was so common in those times CITE. After being banished from the parish school based on a fight with the local priest, he took his mother to Rome and lived in abject poverty there for a while; some speculate that a homosexual sugar daddy helped him break into the world of cinema and money. There in the Roman slums, shoved up against the dirty wall of reality, he developed an acidic and brutal realism so beautiful at times that the vatican has said, He also developed a rage at those who intentionally or negligently were scandalized by the truth, and instead of helping its cause, collaborated with the will to Power.

In *la ricotta*, when Orson Welles, playing the part of Pasolini the director, is asked by a reporter his opinion of the famous director Fellini, Welles responds. “he dances.” Since the entire film *La Ricotta* is filled with acidic sarcasm in the form of actors dancing to jazz while Stracci dies of starvation, we are led to believe that Pasolini regards fellini in the same light. One thinks of the famous Lady Gaga hit, *Just dance*, (interestingly, Gaga compared filming the video to being on the set of a martin scorsese movie.) As in *La ricotta*, the video is filled with images of drunkenness and oblivion, as the singer aggressively advises herself (and the baffled listeners) to “just dance -its gonna be ok, doo doo doo do, just dance, spin that record, babe.”

The rage against power and sexual hypocrisy in Pasolini

We may rightfully speculate that in his hour of need, Pasolini sold himself to provide for himself and his mother, and was often literally raped against the dirty walls of the Roman slums. This would explain his uninhibited fury against the patriarchal and hypocritical culture of the elites of his day, a hypocrisy which he would have been

in a position to unmask in a manner equally dramatic to Denzel Washington prosecuting Tom Hank's case in Philadelphia: ARE.....YOU.....GAY?

Joe Miller : *[to Jamey Collins on the witness stand]* are you gay?

Jamey Collins : *[confused]* what?

Joe Miller : *[gradually raising his voice]* are you gay?, You know a faggot?, A, a punk, a fruit, a queen, a fairy a booby snatcher, rump roaster, pillow biter, ARE YOU GAY?



Leon isn't the only famous film to have a controversial scene cut out. (these shots are taken from BuzzFeed website.)

And one has to wonder about the personal sexual history of Antonio Banderas, since he also played the cop/boyfriend of a sexually traumatized psychiatrist named Sarah Taylor who ended up shooting both him and her own abusive father in another controversial and "disturbing" movie about sexual hypocrisy and rage: "Never Talk to Strangers". WHO WROTE THE SCRIPTS FOR THESE MOVIES WERE THEY GAY RESEARCH THIS

In fact in an unfinished novel, Petrolio, he writes gritty details of the homosexual underbelly of Italian high society. He also wrote a scathing criticism of the indifference of Pope Pius XII to the poverty outside his front door. CITE At the time, he was scoffed off as crazy, but in our times, witness the incredible reality that

the Pope's butler, a man with no intellectual or legal pretensions of any kind whose job included *doing the vatican laundry*, CITE THIS was PUT INTO PRISON for blowing the whistle on the same behavior. And it was the pope himself, Ratzinger, who quietly had him released, and resigned from that unthinkable mess of sexual and financial will to power.

Hypocrisy and scandal in this paper, how to get at the truth?

What is the DEFINITION AND HISTORY OF the word HYPOCRISY
bullshitting gaslighting

The devil's oldest trick, commit a sin and then finger Jesus, the innocent one
this is SO bullshit, this is SO trump.

Whoever calls you insane is insane

"you're not a threat when you're out of your head"

besson, pasolini "pedophile tramps, both of them" but Pasolini is also batshit, therefore dead whereas Besson is somehow legit and cool, why is this? Is it only because Pa was gay, or maybe because he confronted the power directly and continually

JSTOR, the cite for Dubber--Aaron Swartz, how is it possible he is dead and trump is alive? How is this possible?

Orson welles and the martians, --Orson welles was interested in political BS and how to employ mass communicatinos to DIFONDERE the BS---is this why did Pa pick him to play himself? the quote orson tells the journalist, the same people who paid for this film own your newspaper. Good day. LOL

I have a kid (Bessons wife for ex) I abuse the kid I wack her around I screw her, she runs away Besson takes care of her, besson sleeps with her, maybe doesnt even wack her around, but somehow, I am the victim, he is the pedophile.

THERE BUT FOR THE GRACE OF GOD GOES ABSOLUTELY ANYONE

Pasolini's viscerally Christian film theory

The rejection of power and the will to sacrifice are linked by Christ when He says, *the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom.* In support of this, when Simon Peter correctly identifies Jesus as the "son of the living

God,” Jesus gives Simon a new identity based on his insight: Blessed are you,--I will call you Rocco (lol), I will give you the keys of the Kingdom.

This is how the new International Version of the Bible puts the conversation:

13 When Jesus came to the region of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, “Who do people say the Son of Man is?”

14 They replied, “Some say John the Baptist; others say Elijah; and still others, Jeremiah or one of the prophets.”

15 “But what about you?” he asked. “Who do you say I am?”

16 Simon Peter answered, “You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God.”

17 Jesus replied, “Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by flesh and blood, but by my Father in heaven. **18** And I tell you that you are Peter,^[b] and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades^[c] will not overcome it. **19** I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be^[d] bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be^[e] loosed in heaven.” **20** Then he ordered his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Messiah.

How much jealousy the other disciples must have felt at this spontaneous “Peter just got an A in theology” declaration of Jesus. Was it this that prompted Johns’ mother to pester Jesus for some good jobs for her kids too? But the keys have nothing to do with castles or banks or safe deposit boxes. They are the keys to someone’s soul, which is beyond monetary value, the key to Pasolini’s film theory. The key to someone’s soul is the confession of truth,--whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven-- and acceptance of the forgiveness and freedom--whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven--that Christ is prompted to offer by that confession. **We have all but forgotten this meaning of kingship, because we never examine our souls.**

TALK ABOUT THE GARDEN OF EDEN AND GENESIS 2:25. the ancient nexus guilt: shame: sexual behavior: the will to power. other ancient myths with this themeTalk about Hamlet here--gaslighting--guilt--darkness--dreams--mental illness--the play’s the thing, in which to catch the conscience of the king. Pasolini as prophet

of the 20th century and his film theory as applied to Leon, which disturbs the American conscience on so many levels. HORATIO I AM DEAD

The madness of kings

Pasolini believed that the role of an intellectual such as himself was to call the people to account for their actions: in other words, to confront their sins and seek forgiveness. Never indifferent, never lazy, he used any means at his disposal to accomplish this goal, and wrote many letters to the papers which were eloquent but not diplomatic. For example, he was naively glad that the US president Nixon had been called to account, and wished for a similar situation in Italy. CITE. But his preferred method of social criticism was film, since he believed it was often more effective to show reality than to present it in writing. CITE

Unconfessed guilt, particularly guilt resulting from the will to power, leads to insanity. There are enough examples in history of kings going insane to make any rational person think twice about the will to power. To return to the Israelites, Saul went insane after disobeying God, and David's harp was the only thing that calmed him down. This gave David the opportunity to witness many things about Saul's illness, so much so that later he himself feigned madness to escape from --was it abimelech? Dont think so check this. Saul visits the Witch of Endor to get advice, but only succeeds in summoning the spirit of the dead, and irritated, prophet who scolds Saul and predicts his demise. The Gospelcoalition.org has this to say:

Saul's nighttime séance with the witch of Endor in [1 Samuel 28](#) is regarded as the *coup de grâce* on his tragic kingship of Israel. In this text, the Israelite king has reached the bottom of the moral and theological abyss in resorting to occult practices in Israel that he himself has forbidden with the death penalty, in a desperate bid to find out what will happen in an imminent battle with the Philistines on Mount Gilboa.

This text narrates a critical turning point in Israel's history. The end of the first dynasty is at hand, and the tall ruler will fall as Saul, whose name means "the asked for one,"^[1] asks about the future from the place of the dead—Sheol. This word means "the asking place," perhaps because death is always asking for more.^[2] The irony is that the asking place will soon have its request ("the asked for one") fulfilled. Saul and Sheol are inseparably linked.

This text raises all kinds of theological questions. Did the witch have the ability to bring the departed spirits of the dead back to predict the future for the living, or was this simply a demonic delusion? Does not only God have the power to predict the future? Or

do departed spirits or evil spirits? What about other sources of revelation besides the Word of God? Does this text not prove that such exist?

We are mainly concerned with the concept of the will to power as leading to insanity, however. In Christian narrative, the prince of lies (Satan) is also the prince of the underworld, the prince of death, like a Giant Shelob from the void, always asking for more. Saul was brought to this point by a long sad story of disobedience resulting from the will to power, because “power corrupts..and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” WHO SAID THAT CITE THIS

Saul thus dies and the kingship is transferred to the lovable shepherd boy with the golden harp, the little kid who brought down the giant with a slingshot, the bff of Saul’s own son, the one who danced for joy when the ark of the covenant was brought to the city-- The famous warrior king David. He was such an unlikely choice that his own father could not believe it, but “god sees what we do not see”, the chaste and obedient heart of David. In the beginning of his career, David is so uncorrupted by the will to power that given the chance to spear the murderous and vengeful Saul through the heart, he will not do it. How could I kill the Lord’s anointed and live, he wonders? This state of grace will not last forever, though. He soon falls prey to the same pride that plagues all political celebrities.

It is David though whose guilt is unmasked by the use of a story. When he kills Bathsheba’s husband, he is confronted by the prophet who tells him a “story” of a man with one small ewe lamb. David is outraged at the behavior in the story, and demands that the king be executed. Of course, that king is himself--but God instead allows David to witness the disintegration of his kingdom through civil war caused by his behavior. The damage done to the Kingdom of Israel has affected world history since that time. In fact, Pasolini’s Petrolio is not only about sexual hypocrisy but also about the the “no blood for oil” debate. CITE

WE SHOULD ALSO NOTE THEY THOUGHT JESUS WAS CRAZY TOO

The madness of Nebuchednezzar

And no history of the Israeli royal dynasty would be complete without the craziest king of all: Nebuchednezzar II, the Babylonian king who defeated Solomon and dragged the Jews into Babylonian captivity. The most powerful monarch in history of those times, he was told by the Israelite Daniel, one of the four exiles who had been brought up as Babylonian princes, that he would go insane and eat dirt for seven years until he acknowledged the power of God.

It is important to note the historical discrepancies and they are cited in many places. We will use LIVIUS.com

Daniel on Nebuchadnezzar's madness

In October 539 BCE, the Persian king [Cyrus](#) took [Babylon](#), the ancient capital of an oriental [empire](#) covering modern Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Israel. In a broader sense, Babylon was the ancient world's capital of scholarship and science. The subject provinces soon recognized Cyrus as their legitimate ruler. Since he was already lord of peripheral regions in modern Turkey and Iran (and Afghanistan?), it is not exaggerated to say that the conquest of [Babylonia](#) meant the birth of a true world empire. The [Achaemenid empire](#) was to last for more than two centuries, until it was divided by the successors of the [Macedonian](#) king [Alexander the Great](#). A remarkable aspect of the capture of Babylon is the fact that Cyrus allowed the Jews (who were exiled in Babylonia) to return home.

The final redaction of the biblical book of *Daniel* (called after a Jewish sage at the court of Belshazzar, i.e. [Nabonidus](#)' crown prince Bêlsharusur) took place in the second century BCE, but the text contains many older elements. Probably, no less than four authors have contributed to the text. The resulting text cannot be taken as history. Too many elements are too incredible (e.g., about every personal name is wrong).

However, chapter four contains a bit of information that is corroborated by a text known as the [Prayer of Nabonidus](#). According to *Daniel*, the [Babylonian](#) king [Nebuchadnezzar](#) suffers from a mental illness, and lives isolated for seven years, until he acknowledges the power of the one God. From cuneiform texts, nothing is known about Nebuchadnezzar's mental health. The original story must have centered on another royal patient: Nabonidus, about whom rumors like this did circulate (see the [Verse Account](#)). Moreover, several details return in the Prayer, where Nabonidus is the sad hero: the period of seven years, the isolation, the ultimate recognition of the power of the supreme God. Since the authors of *Daniel* consistently avoid mentioning Nabonidus, it is likely that one of them is responsible for the change of names.

This means that two elements of the *Verse Account* are corroborated: the madness of Nabonidus and his monotheistic attitude. Stated differently, we have two sources for the accusations - a [Babylonian](#) poem full of insults and a Jewish story.

The Daniel Version

[4.29] At the end of the twelve months Nebuchadnezzar was walking about the royal palace of [Babylon](#).

[4.30] The king spoke, saying, "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for a royal dwelling by my mighty power and for the honor of my majesty?"

[4.31] While the word was still in the king's mouth, a voice fell from heaven: "King Nebuchadnezzar, to you it is spoken: "The kingdom has departed from you!"

[4.32] And they shall drive you from men, and your dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field. They shall make you eat grass like oxen; and seven years shall pass over you, until you know that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomever He chooses."

[4.33] That very hour the word was fulfilled concerning Nebuchadnezzar; he was driven from men and ate grass like oxen; his body was wet with the dew of heaven till his hair had grown like eagles' feathers and his nails like birds' claws.

Prayer of Nabonidus

[1] Words of the prayer, said by Nabonidus, king of Babylonia, [the great] king, [when afflicted]

[2] with an ulcer on command of the most high God in [Tayma](#):

["I, Nabonidus,] was afflicted [with an evil ulcer]

[3] for seven years, and far from [men] I [was driven, until I prayed to the most high God.] And

[4] an exorcist pardoned my sins. He was a Jew from [among the children of the exile of Judah, and said:]

[5] "Recount this in writing to glorify and exalt the name of [the most high God."Then I wrote this:] "When

[67] I was afflicted for seven years [by the most high God] with an evil ulcer during my stay at Tayma,

(echoing the condemnation of the serpent in Genesis: dirt shall you eat, and on your belly shall you crawl all the days of your life)

The madness of Hamlet

A story that has many parallels, and is more well known to the Anglo Saxon consciousness is the story of Hamlet, an amazingly insightful look into crime, mental illness, guilt and gaslighting that has stood the test of time. Hamlet is more useful to our discourse here, because instead of using music or storytelling to unmask guilt, Hamlet uses theater, which as a dramatic art, most closely resembles film.

Hamlet is the crown prince of Denmark, whose beloved father has recently been murdered and whose mother has almost immediately married the dead king's brother in what many see as a strangely quick change of affections. Enraged by his mother's behavior and deeply resentful and suspicious of his uncle, Hamlet is tormented by nightly visions in which his father, condemned to purgatory for many ages for having been killed without sacramental confession, orders him to seek revenge on his uncle and his mother, "my seeming virtuous wife" who it is revealed, was unfaithful to her husband with his brother, and collaborated in the murder.

HAMLET

Angels and ministers of grace defend us!
Be thou a spirit of health or goblin damned,
Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell,

45

Be thy intents wicked or charitable,
Thou comest in such a questionable shape
That I will speak to thee. I'll call thee "Hamlet,"
"King," "Father," "royal Dane." O, answer me!
Let me not burst in ignorance, but tell

50

Why thy canonized bones, hearsed in death,
Have burst their cerements; why the sepulcher,

GHOST

I am thy father's spirit,

10

Doomed for a certain term to walk the night

And for the day confined to fast in fires,

Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature

Are burnt and purged away.

Shakespearean tragedy is always epically awful and Hamlet is one of the most epic of all. A long and tortured rave punctuated by ghostly visitations, and the babbling confession of the king in the castle chapel which forestalls the inevitable, results in the deaths of almost everyone Hamlet loves, and himself last of all. These include first, two of Hamlet's school buddies Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, who are shamefully sent to England with Hamlet by the king with the goal of discreetly executing the "insane" Hamlet until Hamlet turns the tables on them, and declares that he is only crazy north by northeast but he "knows a hawk". Then, Hamlet kills his girlfriend's father, who has been sent by the king to spy on him, believing it is in fact the king. Hamlet's lovable girlfriend Ophelia, who then goes crazy herself due to Hamlet's bizarre behavior, falls into a river and drowns. Finally, Laertes, Ophelia's brother and a close friend of Hamlet, challenges Hamlet to a duel at the suggestion of the king, who takes advantage of Laertes' rage to poison a dagger which will be used in the duel. The poison ends up killing the king, Hamlet's mother, Laertes and Hamlet, leaving only Hamlet's friend Horatio to "tell the tale in pain."

Any Christian would know that Hamlet's dream of his vengeful father must be nothing more than a dream, since the Christian God would obviously not permit a soul in purgatory to return to earth to ask for a vendetta. (to say nothing of a Christian God who torments people because they were murdered without the chance to confess)

However, there are many layers to this story. Hamlet wisely tests his dream by penning a play similar to the story the vision has told him, gives the script to a traveling drama troupe, and invites the king to the theater to observe his reactions from the “cheap seats” so to speak. When the king’s crime is recreated before his eyes, he runs from the theater in guilt, shrieking LIGHT! GIVE ME LIGHT! Hamlet believes himself vindicated by this concrete evidence but this only leads to more woe.

Madness, Gaslighting and bullshit in the “democratic” political process

But some might argue, now that we have a democratic political narrative going on, we need not fear the madness that comes from too much power being concentrated in one person. Is this accurate? Let’s investigate through the modern equivalent of theatrical drama: film.

For some reason Robin Williams, an actor with a great comic streak who if you look closely always seems to be a little bit sad at the same time, has done a lot of films about “madness” and mental disease including *The Big White*, *What Dreams May Come* (was this about suicide/ check that out) *Patch Adams*, *Awakenings* and *Dead Poets Society*. It is interesting and moving that he also killed himself but let’s leave that aside for the moment.

A very interesting portrayal of gaslighting and political BS is in a movie many people have never seen, *Man of the Year*. It certainly wasn’t one of his most popular movies, but goes to the essence of “democratic” gaslighting and bullshit as the modern equivalent of Hamlet.

In the film, a computer programmer is working out the kinks in a voting application and discovers an error which will cost her bosses millions of dollars and embarrass them in front of the world. (does this sound like Silicon valley or what). They warn her to keep quiet as Williams, who in the movie plays a comic talk show host, runs for president as a gag to amuse his fans, and gets elected due to the glitch. Meanwhile, a romance is developing between the comic and the programmer.

The corrupt CEOS drug the coffee of the programmer, making her appear insane, then try to kill her in traffic. She pulls over and calls Williams on the phone babbling about being followed, but she is still a little bit jacked on the “roofie” and he too believes she is crazy. HOW DOES THIS MOVIE END I FORGET

The Will to Power and “Pissing Matches”

The following is taken from a review of the book *A secret history of the pissing figure in art*, by francois Boucher, from the sept 20, 2017 issue of the New Yorker. the author of this paper discovered this article and the existence of this book while looking for academic support for this paper’s argument regarding the will to power.

In the beginning was the pissing boy, the *putto*. He appeared first in the margins of illuminated manuscripts, peeing discreetly as if in fear of detection: the gentle plash, the flaxen strands as wispy as a maiden’s hair. By the fifteenth century, he’d grown brazen and begun to multiply—“processions of urinating children set about inundating paintings and sculptures in villas and public squares,” Lebensztejn writes. They pissed into vases and basins and shells and conchs, onto snowdrifts and poppy husks and flocks of cupids. They pissed in the mouths and anuses of other boys, who themselves pissed in more mouths still. These were no ordinary boys. Spritely and seraphic, often winged and laurelled, they charmed their way into old churches, where they patrolled the transepts and friezes, pure of heart and full of bladder. In Padua’s Ovetari Chapel, for example, Andrea Mantegna painted a cycle of frescoes that included a pissing *putto* suspended from a garland, where, according to Lebensztejn, he “lets loose a long jet of urine, as if it were a bemused, symbolic paraphrase of the baptismal water.”

Indeed, a boy’s piss seems at some point to have crossed streams with holy water, becoming blessed with ablutionary powers. In Italy, Lebensztejn notes, “it is still customary, even today, to call an infant’s intemperate pee *acqua santa*.” Sometimes the gift of pure piss transferred to adulthood, though it helped if you were aiming heavenward. A thirteenth-century fresco in the Basilica of Saint Francis of Assisi shows three angels, grown men, holding their penises over Christ on the cross, as if they might relieve his suffering by relieving themselves.

Of course, the angels, being angels, feel no relief as they piss. They get their celestial jollies by raining a little holy water on us, but they know nothing of urination as a physical urge. If you want to enjoy some real salt-of-the-earth pissing, Lebensztejn reports, you

have to skip ahead to 1600. It was then that, with the advent of genre painting, and its attendant embrace of everyday experience over iconography, more and more adults began to piss in images. In Rembrandt's "Pissing Man" and "Pissing Woman," both from 1631, we've at last found a couple urinating without ceremony, the peasant woman "turning around to reassure herself that no one is watching."

<https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/a-secret-history-of-the-pissing-figure-in-art>

It is common for the vernacular of any language to modify scholarly terms for daily use, and in this case, a Nietzschean "will to power" CITE has become "pissing match" or "wizzing contest". Much as "humbug" has become "bullshit", this disintegration of polite speech is perhaps an unfortunate but nonetheless accurate reflection of the coarsening of our souls. Let us therefore try to understand it.

Since Leon is clearly presented as the object of Matilda's affections, and Matilda is a strangely compelling character, men are likely to become jealous and scoff at Leon as a "savior", a macho thug who took advantage of a situation and got involved in a "pissing match" with authority. Anyone who would defend such a person must be psychologically twisted or underdeveloped in some way. Matilda must have "daddy issues" or she must want to "ride or die with the bad boys".

There are elements of truth in nearly every argument, or the argument would not stand up to any criticism. However, having issues with a violent and dysfunctional father who is far and away more destructive than Leon, is not a mental defect but a clear eyed recognition of the realities which Pasolini calls our first teachers. If our schoolbooks tell us to respect our parents and our parents are deadly, what sane person would not listen to the phenomena to survive?

Furthermore, *it is not only needy and desperate street children such as Matilda or people in certain careers who resort to bodyguards to watch over their persons and property.* Many girls and women from more educated, refined and privileged echelons of society are forced into the same situation due to violence which turns them into refugees and exiles, even in their own countries, cities and neighborhoods. As an

example, take the story of Nancy Salamone, *a successful stockbroker who since her honeymoon, came home every night to violence and beatings*, and lived in that situation for many years. People who feel uneasy about these things often say “why didn’t she just leave”--maybe because they are uncomfortable reflecting on how *physically* dangerous that actually is, to say nothing of the socio-economic repercussions.

Nancy Salamone

Nancy Salamone is a marketing and sales executive with in-depth knowledge of the women’s market. She has a proven expertise in the development and packaging of products and services which increases a company’s share of the women’s market. Ms. Salamone is an author, speaker and advocate for women’s economic empowerment. Her efforts extend to survivors of domestic violence. She has documented her own struggles with domestic violence in her book “A Victory Over Violence” which aims to inspire other people facing similar challenges. Ms. Salamone has lectured at New York University (NYU) and The Center for Financial Services Professionals in New York City. She has appeared on Good Morning America and in Forbes, Fortune Magazine and on HuffPost Live to share her expertise on women’s financial issues, domestic violence and workplace violence due to domestic violence. (Huffpost)

Nancy Salamone, a bride at 19, discovered just after her honeymoon that her new husband's explosive anger could be triggered by the most trivial thing.

"I put the towels in the bathroom, not the way he was used to them, and that started off an evening of screaming and yelling and being physically abused throughout the night. It was my introduction to what my marriage was going to be like," Salamone said.

The truth of her marriage stayed a dark secret. On the outside, she was a smart and confident vice president of a company, but on the inside, she was a wife who'd been battered for nearly 20 years. After one harrowing night, she decided to get out.

"At one point, he got me on the couch and his hands were around my neck. And I said to myself, 'Just close your eyes, you're going to die,'" Salamone said.

She finally sat down with her boss and asked for help.

"I very simply said, 'This has been an abusive situation, I do not know what this person is going to do.' And that I was afraid," Salamone said.

Work became a safe haven for Salamone, and experts say she is far from alone. More women are turning to the workplace for help with an abusive situation at home. (abc news)

That is certainly not a ride or die scenario. When she finally left, *she got a bodyguard* and admits, that not every woman is fortunate enough to have that kind of money at their disposal. *Those like Matilda are often obliged to resort to sexual currency and dubious de facto security guards simply to stay alive.*

Marilyn Van Derber

And in order to illustrate that the most strident detractors of “macho thugs” are often jealous of those “macho thugs” and are trying to cover it up, consider the story of Marilyn van derbur, a Miss America pageant winner in the 1950s who was the victim of incest by her well to do father (who died before the story was made public).

“Scuff, scuff, scuff.”

The sounds of expensive felt soles making their way down the hall of a Denver mansion in the middle of a night.

The slow turn of the door handle on the private bedroom door of a 5-year-old girl. The child recalls from memory that they were the sounds of terror and of horror in her home.

And she says she listened for them every night of her life until she was 18 years old.

Her father wore these shoes, remembers Miss America 1958 Marilyn Van Derbur. The late father was a wealthy and prominent Denver businessman and philanthropist. The Boy Scouts building in Denver once had his name on it — since taken off — and he was a chairman of the Denver Center for the Performing Arts, said Van Derbur.

“He played the piano. He loved poetry. He was one of the finest speakers I have ever heard ... Mother was beautiful, gracious, lovely. You would look at my family and think, ‘It could never happen,’” said Van Derbur.

Miss America 1958, author of the prize winning “Miss America By Day,” says she is a childhood incest survivor and discusses the incest and the aftermath with passion and obsession in a telephone interview with The Times.

Her father was never charged nor convicted for the crimes the daughter says happened in her childhood and he died before she went public with the story. However, her mother was still living when the story originally came out in the Denver Post, but before her daughter came out publicly.....

“What I have been able to share with America, is that ‘Incest doesn’t just happen in ‘those’ families.’ ... What people need to understand is this (incest) could happen to anybody,” Van Derbur said. (from the Shreveport Times)

Additionally, to dismiss Leon because he was in a “wizzing match” with Stansfield, left over from his own personal tragedy, is to ignore clear reality. It was not Leon who got involved in a pissing match, but instead, his girlfriend’s father, and then, Stansfield, Lando and Tony. Leon is an icon of “minding your own business.” He does absolutely nothing in his own interest except get money to buy milk. Furthermore, he lives down the hall from Matilda but is noticeably shy and reticent to engage in conversation with her, as he is with everyone. The nature of his job makes this a logical trait, but conniving individuals generally find ways to exploit their targets in any given situation. Leon is not conniving. He is not involved in a personal power struggle of any kind.

In further support of this is the fact that Matilda is the more powerful instigator in the relationship. While Leon does offer her a tissue to clean the wounds of her sister, it is Matilda who makes conversation, who offers to buy his groceries, who has observed his habit of buying two cartons per trip, and Matilda does not hesitate to walk straight up to his door upon witnessing her dead family in the doorway of her house. Had she hesitated, she would have died. There was not a moment to decide, but in fact, in the precognitive sense, she had probably already decided that someone who did not wallop her as a form of greeting was probably a safe wager.

Criticism of a certain naivete

It appears naive to separate political, economic and social power as the Mises institute has done. AND MANY OTHERS, CF FREUD V NIETZCHE Freud blamed all madness on sexual repression, whereas Nietzsche blamed it on political oppression, but later in life he was reputed to have written *The Will to Power*, in which he synthesized his earlier ideas into a more succinct hypothesis: the will to power is always the same in the end. It is the error of an intellectual to “not see the forest for the trees.” But the trees of power are all in the same forest. Or to use another metaphor, the various forms of power would all appear to be arms of the same machine, as Tolkien conceived of the Rings of Power:

Three rings for elven kings under the sky
seven for the dwarf lords in their halls of stone....
One ring to bring them all, one ring to find them.

Saruman, you stretch out your hand and I perceive
a finger of the hand of Mordor, cruel and cold! ...
Only one person can wield the ring,

We see this in our own times as power becomes digital and global, and reaches out to all forms of influence in our society, crossing imaginary lines between commerce, politics and human social interactions. This is not so much a paranoid delusion or a conspiracy theory as it is a commentary on the nature of the will to power. It simply will “brook no rival”. That is how it is made.

Pasolini was a student of and expert in the work of Antonio Gramsci, the Italian communist who spent much of his life in prison, during which time he wrote the famous prison notebooks. He was only released when he was on the brink of death from a terminal illness and died shortly thereafter, aged 42. CITE. While this paper is focused on the will to Power in Besson's film, as seen through Pasolini's film theory and not on Power as Gramsci conceived it, it would be helpful to know something of the political theoretician who interested Pasolini so much. How did Gramsci think about political power? Gramsci was keenly interested in the nexus between economic and

political power, not least because his father had been falsely accused of some misdeed while working for the government, and the family had suffered economically for this. With great attention to detail, he studied the amount of caloric energy available to a typical Italian farmer at the time, from which the infantry would presumably be recruited, and compared it to that available to a typical French. He then reasoned that since the French had more energy available they would surely prevail in war, which is one of the most simple and direct ways of linking political and economic power.

Similarly, it is naive to think that power was divided in Leon: the professional. Stansfield's desire was for all forms of power, though a government official he wore a cloak of legitimacy in the political area, he wished also for more money than his salary, and also used his power to affect the social dynamic in the lando family, on the streets where tony had his bakery, and elsewhere.

THE WILL TO POWER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STORY OF LEON

1. Head shrinking Luc Besson and the American audience

Now that we have unmasked some of the reasons we can't speak clearly about Leon: the Professional, let's just review them before we move into this next part of the discussion:

One. We all experience sexual desire, but to the extent that we are aware of ourselves physically and psychologically, we all feel conflicted about sexual desire in some way, because it is beyond our control and causes so many difficulties and sufferings in our lives.

Two: None of us want to “grow up”, or take responsibility for anything because it’s hard. Thus, we continually tell other people to grow up and stop being pedophiles. The truth is we are all the same. we are all made of the same human material.

Three. None of us want to suffer or die, even though we may believe in heaven.

So let’s stop shouting “pedo” at Luc Besson, and try to understand what happened. Let’s take a look at the evidence not as a judge but as a realistic and compassionate doctor might do. (and on a personal note, I am not a guy, and I have personal experience of a lot of the same stuff as Matilda. It is certain that situations like that depicted in Leon occur far more frequently than is commonly conceded, and not only in less developed cultures, where it is openly practiced, but also quite often in sophisticated first world social circles, and certainly not only in Hollywood, and even among people who present themselves in public as paragons of moral propriety. Wanting someone to pay for this is natural but its not going to do any good.)

Luc Besson directed a film prior to Leon: the Professional which was harsher but contained some of the same elements he would later employ in the second film. This film is called La Femme Nikita, CITATION and in its turn has elements of Lolita, the book by Vladimir Nabokov. CITATION

Apart from The Professional, a controversial movie which arguably catapulted Besson into the international scene, Besson is famous for another controversy in real life: having met his first wife when she was eleven and marrying her a few years later, then leaving her with a young child after meeting another actress whom he used in another film. The first wife has said that she had a child with Luc, whom she loved, and fulfilled her dream, but then he left her. She now works to protect young girls from physical and sexual mistreatment. CiTATION.

But what most people may not know is that Jean Reno convinced Besson not to have Matilda and Leon become erotic lovers. The original script called for this but Reno pitched to the director the idea that while Leon should be simple, ignorant and subject to the manipulation of the street wise Matilda, he still refused her romantic

advances with the excuse that he “hadn’t had much experience” and wouldn’t be a very good lover.

Reno played Leon as naïve and childlike to remove some of the sexual tension that was present in the finished cut between his character and the orphan, Mathilda. The cut was altered upon its American release to remove this element altogether, before it was later restored on further releases. ...Originally, Leon and Mathilda, who was written as a 13/14 year old, became full lovers. (<http://whatculture.com/film/5-original-script-drafts-made-popular-movies-unrecognisable?page=2>)

The film presents Matilda as having a solid grasp of the realities of life, which she learned courtesy of her father and Stansfield: drugs, guns and sex are viable currency and she recognizes in Leon a way to keep herself safe and at the same time get revenge on her little brother’s killers. She is not so much looking for someone to “save her”, as someone to teach her how to become an assassin.

Maturity and “arrested development” in Leon: the professional

It is also interesting to hear what Besson himself, the creator of the narrative says about Leon and Matilda: that they were “a couple of kids”. CITE One of the reasons he has cited for not asking Portman to do a sequel is that she is “grown up” now, implying that somehow the story needs her to remain a physical child--for she certainly was not an emotional child in the same way that Leon and Stansfield were. CITE. In fact it is characteristic of all humans that none want to “grow up” because growing up means taking “responsibility” which means, sacrifice, or in the alternative, rejecting sacrifice and responsibility, choosing selfishness, and forcing others to sacrifice by collaboration with the will to power. Under this definition, who of the two

adults is the child in this movie? Clearly, Stansfield. Who is the adult? Clearly, the simple, milk drinking, illiterate, sexually “underdeveloped” Leon, who alone among the three, WILLS to give his life for someone else.

Matilda had adulthood forced upon her, but unlike Stansfield, she does not duck her head in a power grab. Rather than collaborate with corrupt authority, she is on the point of offing herself. Thus, her potential adulthood is a lot closer than that of Stansfield.

As is typical of the man-child syndrome, it allies itself with the apparent legitimacy of public authority, the police, so that the sacrifice is robbed of its value. Leon was nothing more than a thug who died a thug’s death--Stansfield, the hero cop who died to protect the innocent.

The will to power, daddy issues and sexual purity

There is a popular saying: “daddy issues, not just for girls anymore.” The weaker of the two parties in any relationship is often the scapegoat, and consequently girls and women are often blamed for the “daddy issues” the men in their lives are not dealing with. It seems a workable hypothesis from Besson’s life story CITE that he rejected his father on various grounds, and aspired to be Leon, the hitman who engages in a perpetual vendetta against his father in law. Like Leon, Besson left the hum drum life of the countryside for the big city of Paris, where he met his first wife who he has said was a mystery to him, someone whose life he never fully understood.

One of the most moving scenes in the movie is when Leon cries, telling Matilda about his lost love. It is a very well acted scene and as often happens, brings out the best in the actors themselves, revealing Leon's inner sorrow and at the same time erasing some of Matilda's outward cynicism from her face as she realizes to her surprise that Leon has a story of sorrow to tell that rivals her own.

What is also very important about this scene is that it is decisive in establishing the foundations of the relationship between sexual purity and the capacity to sacrifice. Though it must have been painful for him to dredge up old memories, Leon confides in Matilda instead of using the situation to his advantage and she also, seeing his grief, does not push the issue.

Georgia Rule

In this section we will compare Matilda to another scapegoat, Rachel, from another controversial movie, Georgia Rule, starring three popular actresses, Jane Fonda, Lindsey Lohan and Felicity Huffman.

Rachel's wealthy stepfather began to have sexual relations with her at age 12, and stopped at age 14. Four years later, she has become wild and rebellious and basically has sex with whoever strikes her fancy. Hoping to remedy the problem, but trapped by bullshit and refusing to acknowledge where the problem truly lies, Rachel's mother continues to scapegoat her daughter. She sends the girl to Georgia, her own

no-nonsense mother and Rachels' grandmother, who lives alone in a boring Midwestern town full of emotionally and sexually "stifled" Mormons. As one might imagine, Rachel "goes to town", wreaking havoc among the local relationships and caring so little that she threatens the scorned women that if they bother her again, she will "find all your boyfriends and f--- them stupid".

Georgia demands that Rachel observe rules and get a job, which she does, at a local doctor's office. When she hits the doctor up for sex, he initially acts like a know it all, but eventually it is revealed that he has issues too, and she scolds him for moping. (I believe that it would have been more effective to reveal the doctor's internal conflict over sex with Rachel instead of using the squeaky clean excuse that he is pining for his deceased wife. Is he somehow a saint to the stepfather's demon? Not likely. But maybe that would have been too much controversy for an already problematic script). Meanwhile, Rachel's mother and grandmother confront the husband with a baseball bat, and he tries to bribe Rachel with a maserati. or is it a bugatti, LOL. JAJAJAJA

Compare this to a similar scene in another controversial "daddy issues" movie: more sugarcoated than Leon but still containing some of the same elements. Georgia rule. When Rachel, older than Matilda and having already become an obstreperous, unmanageable and destructive "tramp", asks her boss for sex, he like Leon "nobly" declines, advising her that it isn't a good idea. But the difference between the two men in some ways couldn't be more acute, and Rachel notices his latent selfishness and self centeredness and calls it out: you don't have to be so DAMN sad about it!

In fact, Leon is innocent and selfless in a way that a sophisticated wasp never is. His refusal to have sex with Matilda is not based on some imagined "moral high

ground” but on an instinctive goodness, and even his pretext is blunt: So you see, Matilda... I wouldn’t be a very good lover. One almost feels it is not a pretext after all--one almost feels that Leon is speaking from his heart as much as anyone can.

How is it possible that Reno was able to pull this acting off? I would argue, because it is entirely plausible. Consider this passage from Pasolini, who is writing about the capacity of honest, uncorrupted people to postpone sexual gratification in favor of some higher ideal. As a matter of fact, he writes in the context of his unexpected defense of the police.

We scorn this, and call it repression because we tend to be so selfish that such a behavior is unknown to us. But, it would not be unknown to Reno’s Leon. He is not a “noble savage” but rather, what Pasolini would refer to as the people who have not had contact with the “cultura media corrutrice” because “nemmeno ha fatto il quarto elementare”. DISCUSS THE INTERVIEW WITH PASOLINI

SECOND PART: SAVONAROLA, THE RENAISSANCE GANGSTA AND THE BLESSED PIER GIORGIO



Bio of Pier Giorgio Frassati

The following biography of Pier Giorgio Frassati, a wealthy citizen of Turin in the 1920s, was taken from <http://www.frassatiusa.org> . Because Frassati has already been beatified, and because he held Savonarola in such high esteem, we have to believe the official Church will eventually remove savonarola from the “damned heretic” list, just as this paper argues, Leon will be removed from the “damn sicario gangsta” list. The headings are mine.

1. Pier Giorgio was born to a very influential family.

Pier Giorgio Michelangelo Frassati was born in Turin, Italy on April 6, 1901. His mother, Adelaide Ametis, was a painter. His father Alfredo, was the founder and director of the newspaper, “La Stampa,” and was influential in Italian politics, holding positions as an Italian Senator and Ambassador to Germany.

2. He became spiritual at a very young age.

At an early age, Pier Giorgio joined the Marian Sodality and the Apostleship of Prayer, and obtained permission to receive daily Communion (which was rare at that time).

3. Due to his love for God, He started to care for the poor and the woebegone.

He developed a deep spiritual life which he never hesitated to share with his friends. The Holy Eucharist and the Blessed Virgin were the two poles of his world of prayer. At the age of 17, he joined the St. Vincent de Paul Society and dedicated much of his spare time to serving the sick and the needy, caring for orphans, and assisting the demobilized servicemen returning from World War I.

4. His career choice was made with God in mind.

He decided to become a mining engineer, studying at the Royal Polytechnic University of Turin, so he could "serve Christ better among the miners," as he told a friend.

5. He was interested in working with the institutional Church.

Although he considered his studies his first duty, they did not keep him from social and political activism. In 1919, he joined the Catholic Student Foundation and the organization known as Catholic Action. He became a very active member of the People's Party, which promoted the Catholic Church's social teaching based on the principles of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical letter, *Rerum Novarum*.

6. He was extraordinarily generous.

What little he did have, Pier Giorgio gave to help the poor, even using his bus fare for charity and then running home to be on time for meals. The poor and the suffering were his masters, and he was literally their servant, which he considered a privilege. His charity did not simply involve giving something to others, but giving completely of himself. This was fed by daily communion with Christ in the Holy Eucharist and by frequent nocturnal adoration, by meditation on St. Paul's "Hymn of Charity" (I Corinthians 13), and by the writings of St. Catherine of Siena. He often sacrificed vacations at the Frassati summer home in Pollone (outside of Turin) because, as he said, "If everybody leaves Turin, who will take care of the poor?"

7. He worked for world peace.

In 1921, he was a central figure in Ravenna, enthusiastically helping to organize the first convention of Pax Romana, an association which had as its purpose the unification of all Catholic students throughout the world for the purpose of working together for universal peace.

8. He loved to enjoy the beauty of God's world and all its culture.

Mountain climbing was one of his favorite sports. Outings in the mountains, which he organized with his friends, also served as opportunities for his apostolic work. He never lost the chance to lead his friends to Mass, to the reading of Scripture, and to praying the rosary.

He often went to the theater, to the opera, and to museums. He loved art and music, and could quote whole passages of the poet Dante.

9. He admired Savonarola very much.

Fondness for the epistles of St. Paul sparked his zeal for fraternal charity, and the fiery sermons of the Renaissance preacher and reformer [Girolamo Savonarola](#) and the writings of St. Catherine impelled him in 1922 to join the Lay Dominicans (Third Order of St. Dominic). He chose the name Girolamo after his personal hero, Savonarola. "I am a fervent admirer of this friar, who died as a saint at the stake," he wrote to a friend.

10. He defended his ideas, even in fistfights.

Like his father, he was strongly anti-Fascist and did nothing to hide his political views. He physically defended the faith at times involved in fights, first with anticlerical Communists and later with Fascists. Participating in a Church-organized demonstration in Rome on one occasion, he stood up to police violence and rallied the other young people by grabbing the group's banner, which the royal guards had knocked out of another student's hands. Pier Giorgio held it even higher, while using the banner's pole to fend off the blows of the guards.

11. He got polio probably from being around sick people.

Just before receiving his university degree, Pier Giorgio contracted poliomyelitis, which doctors later speculated he caught from the sick whom he tended. Neglecting his own health because his grandmother was dying, after six days of terrible suffering Pier Giorgio died at the age of 24 on July 4, 1925.

His last preoccupation was for the poor. On the eve of his death, with a paralyzed hand he scribbled a message to a friend, asking him to take the medicine needed for injections to be given to Converso, a poor sick man he had been visiting.

Pier Giorgio's funeral was a triumph. The streets of the city were lined with a multitude of mourners who were unknown to his family -- the poor and the needy whom he had served so unselfishly for seven years. Many of these people, in turn, were surprised to learn that the saintly young man they knew had actually been the heir of the influential Frassati family.

Pope John Paul II, after visiting his original tomb in the family plot in Pollone, said in 1989: "I wanted to pay homage to a young man who was able to witness to Christ with

singular effectiveness in this century of ours. When I was a young man, I, too, felt the beneficial influence of his example and, as a student, I was impressed by the force of his testimony."

On May 20, 1990, in St. Peter's Square which was filled with thousands of people, the Pope beatified Pier Giorgio Frassati, calling him the "Man of the Eight Beatitudes."

12. His body is not decayed.

His mortal remains, found completely intact and incorrupt upon their exhumation on March 31, 1981, were transferred from the family tomb in Pollone to the cathedral in Turin. Many pilgrims, especially students and the young, come to the tomb of Blessed Frassati to seek favors and the courage to follow his example.

Sav.

It would seem that if someone is holy enough that their dead body is still intact, then whoever they chose as a mentor is probably fairly holy as well. CITE THE PHENOMENON OF INCORRUPTIBLS HERE--is it possible?

But before we throw the whole thing out based on the insane idea that someone's body could be incorrupt, let's wade into the weird waters of Girolamo Savonarola, find the money and power, and try to deconstruct the spin.

But Savonarola was also an early democrat, pushing for the creation of a citizen's council that would form city policy.

He was also a friend to the poor. Under Savonarola, the city created a building society that offered loans at rates well below what was demanded by Florence's private bankers -- 5 to 7 percent, as opposed to the 32.5 percent that had been standard practice under the de Medicis. One of the charges that led to Savonarola's downfall was that he impoverished the city by refusing to ever turn away a beggar.

He also patronized the famous painters of his day. Michelangelo would later say that when he painted the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, it was the sermons of Savonarola he heard in his mind.

Savonarola was a fierce critic of ecclesiastical corruption, and this is perhaps the most contested aspect of his legacy for those proposing to canonize him. He referred to Alexander VI as a "broken tool," accusing the pope of practicing simony and of dubious personal morality. He defied the pope by aligning Florence with the French king, Charles, rather than the "Holy Alliance" of Italian city-states championed by Alexander. Toward the end, Savonarola called for a church council that would depose Alexander.

There was never serious question about Savonarola's doctrine -- his chief theological work, *The Triumph of the Cross*, is widely viewed as orthodox. In 1558, Pope Paul IV -- who had served in the court of Alexander VI -- said that Savonarola was not a heretic. The question for examiners today is not doctrinal but disciplinary: whether Savonarola defied the authority of the pope in impermissible fashion.

In English the name of Savonarola may be synonymous with religious fanaticism, but many Italians, and Florentines in particular, have a different image.

In an age of corruption, Savonarola represented honest government, making him something of a patron for the current Italian drive to break the grip of cronyism and political patronage that has long dominated their politics.

In a move laden with symbolism, prosecutor Gherardo Colombo took part in a ceremony in Florence on May 23, 1998, marking the anniversary of Savonarola's death. Colombo is a key figure in Italy's "clean hands" anti-graft campaign.

In modern parlance, a gangsta is anyone that the will to power does not find useful. the quaint religious superstitions of some Sicilian and Calabrian (and Mexican) gangstas fits well in this narrative, since religion is obviously a relic of the benighted past. Secretly, people like Clinton, Trump, Putin and maybe even Obama want to be

gangstas, because a gangsta is “more cool” and is a more accurate representation of their self image. WHY IS THIS? (cite Di NIRO). but we digress.

During the Middle Ages, there was a political set up known as the Holy Roman Empire, wherein kings probably dreamed of recreating a caesar like situation for the glory of God. (or their own). Still, it does seem that unlike the present day situation here in the US, quite a few of the most cultured and wealthy people including kings and princes actually believed in and loved Jesus and were willing to sacrifice their lives for His project *even in a bloody way*. See for example, the story of “Good King Wenceslaus” who became famous for going around secretly at night giving food to the poor, much like the pope in Shoes of the Fisherman, and whose brother perhaps wishing that money could be spent on his caviar stash, speared Wenceslaus with a lance (or maybe a javelin) (in our times, how many people realize that Trump’s brother was an alcoholic who died in an unhappy way. Does “boceslaus” not think of his brother as a “loser?” research this.) or the well known movie about Becket, who was a peasant promoted to a religious office by his friend, a debauched king. When he began to love God more than he loved the king, the kings’ friends murdered him in the cathedral. HOW DO WE KNOW HTIs isNT JUST THE cATHOLIC chURcH SPINNING cRAP TO THEIR OWN BENEFIT, FIND OUT Who paid for the Renaissance? It’s always interesting to view the hypocritical finger pointing of church types, saying to each other, look how much money that guy has, what a hypocrite. The Vatican was good at that, we’ve noted, but The Protestants famously did that to the Catholics as well, breaking away to “curb excesses” and then producing ridiculous princes of their own like Jimmy Swarrart and Benny Sims, Joel Olsteen and others.

<https://www.classicfm.com/discover-music/real-story-good-king-wenceslas-carol/>