

# Amoris Laetitia Endorsed by Cardinal Mueller: “No Problem with its Doctrine”

THE ISSUE OF THE APOSTOLIC EXHORTATION, *Amoris Laetitia* is still in the air. However, this morning it took a sharp turn towards closure; it did so for two reasons. One, Pope Francis punctuated his push for pastoral theology both clarifying his intent and strengthening its dynamism by tying it to the issue of “*authority*”, authentic Christ-like authority. The linking of pastoral theology to authority by the pope was complimented by Cardinal Mueller, the Prefect for the Sacred Congregation of Faith, who also spoke out clearly, two days earlier, on the doctrinal message and pastoral dimensions of the document, *Amoris Laetitia*.

## PASTORAL THEOLOGY AND CHRIST-LIKE AUTHORITY

This morning January 10, 2017 [Pope Francis gave a homily on authority during morning Mass at Casa Santa Martain](#) in which he stated

*“Authority, if true, will enter hearts, like Jesus’ did. But if it’s just formal, it won’t ...”*

To clarify his meaning the pope juxtaposed top down authority imposed by means of bureaucratic position (like that exercised by the Pharisees) to “real” authority acquired by affinity of hearts (like that exercised by Jesus, the Good Shepherd). To further clarify his meaning, Francis examined three characteristics of “real authority”.

He begins by noting that the scriptures reveal people were amazed at the teaching of Jesus; they were “amazed” because He

taught “as one with authority and not as their scribes” ([Matt 7:29](#)). Francis explains that the teaching of the legalistic Pharisees did *not* enter the hearts of those who heard it. True authority penetrates into the heart. Like the Pharisees, Jesus did *not* neglect any point of the law, yet He taught it in such a way that His words entered into people’s hearts.

A priest who teaches with true authority is able to penetrate hearts because he is a servant of rather than a lord over his flock. **It is servant-leadership that confers genuine authority.**

Pharisees teach, but they do *not* touch hearts because they are too “clerical”, too concerned about their positions of authority. This type of priest, Francis emphasized, is infected with a

*“...psychology of princes: ‘We are the masters, the princes, and we teach you. Not service: we command, you obey.’ And Jesus never passed Himself off like a prince: He was always the servant of all, and this is what gave Him authority.”*

Moreover, **a true servant leader is in close relationship with those whom he serves.**

*“Jesus did not have an allergy to the people: touching the lepers, the sick, didn’t make Him shudder.”*

The Pharisees, however, assumed a position of superiority. A Pharisee eschews “the poor people, the ignorant,” they liked to parade about the piazzas, in soutains and genteel garb.

*“They were detached from the people, they were not close [to them]; Jesus was very close to the people, and this gave authority. Those detached people, these doctors, had a clericalist psychology: they taught with a clericalist authority – that’s clericalism.”*

Quoting Blessed Paul VI (*Evangelii nuntiandi* 48), Pope Francis made clear: **“One sees the heart of a pastor who is close [to the people].”**

In addition to service and closeness to his people, a man with authority is **“coherent”**.

Coherence distinguishes the authority of the scribes from that of Jesus. That is, Jesus’ life corresponds to His words. A coherent shepherd lives what he preaches as Jesus “lived what He preached.” A clericalist is more intent on looking good and dazzling people with his brilliance while assuming a posture of superiority. Consequently, they are not coherent; their personality is divided on a central point about which Jesus warned His disciples:

*“But, do what they tell you, but not what they do’: they said one thing and did another. Incoherence. They were incoherent. And the attitude Jesus uses of them so often is hypocritical. And it is understood that **one who considers himself a prince, who has a clericalist attitude, who is a hypocrite, doesn’t have (true) authority!** He speaks the truth, but without authority. Jesus, on the other hand, who is humble, who is at the service of others, who is close, who does not despise the people, and who is coherent, has authority. And this is the authority that the people of God senses.”*

A priest with authority is a servant that is close to his people, a servant who lives a coherent life. Like Jesus, he is a good shepherd, a good pastor. **A pastor knows the truths of the faith but is able to concertize them in love as a shepherd having authority over his flock because he knows them, serves them and coherently loves them.** It is the pastoral dimension of his formation that confers the fullness of authority necessary for his office, necessary for success as a pastor.

## THE PASTORAL DIMENSION OF AMORIS LAETITIA

To grasp *Amoris Laetitia*, it must be interpreted in this light, in the light of pastoral theology deeply rooted in the wisdom and truths of the faith, in the constant teaching of the Church, as Francis points out twice in [paragraph 300](#) of *Amoris Laetitia*“

*“Priests have the duty to “accompany [the divorced and remarried] in helping them to understand their situation according to the teaching of the Church”*

*“This discernment can never prescind from the Gospel demands of truth and charity, as proposed by the Church.”*

Clearly, the issue at hand is a pastoral one, viz., how to uphold the teachings of the Church in the modern world, a world void of a sense of the sacred, a world in which divorce and remarriage are common place, a world in which the sons and daughters of the Church have been inculturated without their awareness of its effects. Since the whole process is about salvation and pastoral accompaniment during an Hour of Mercy, pastors are being nudged into being more pastorally minded. This is clear to the Archbishop of Dublin, to the Prefect for the Sacred Congregation of the Faith, and to many other cardinals and bishops who stand with the pope in opposition to Cardinal Burke and the misinformed lay men who have lined up to bat for him against the pope.

*“Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not Christ our Lord, but their own belly; and by pleasing speeches and good words, seduce the hearts of the innocent. For your obedience is published in every place. I rejoice therefore in you” ([Romans 16:17-19](#)).*

Men causing dissension are all misreading the document, which is clear enough to many others, and to the *New Era* staff. Thus, according to Cardinal Mueller:

*“It is a misreading” of the Pope’s exhortation to say it has been the cause of polemics.”*

*“The Church has no power to change the Divine Law”...not even a pope or council can do that.”*

Some, like those at *Church Militant* and *The World Over*, like to point out that there is confusion and therefore implicitly (in Arroyo’s case – explicitly) take the side of Cardinal Burke. It must be admitted: Yes, there is confusion, but that does not mean that Cardinal Burke is correct in his assessment of *Amoris Laetitia* and that the pope must answer in some way to him.

There is confusion because men like Mr. Arroyo, and ultra-traditionalist or liberal bishops are manufacturing confusion. In a response to *New Era’s* third article on the issue ([Attack on Pope Francis: Supposed Loyal Catholics Distort Information Defame Pope](#)), Dr. Marzak pointed out that there is always confusion where there is disobedience and pride, when people pursue their own path rather than submit to legitimate magisterial authority in humble obedience. He pointed out that it is liberal bishops and schismatic *seda vacantists* who are causing the confusion; they are often supplemented by well meaning but over-zealous laymen who misunderstand pastoral theology and the relationship between the practical and speculative intellect as examined in [Article One](#). In response to a comment pertaining to [Article Three](#) in the series on *Amoris Laetitia*, Dr. Marzak stated.

*“Watch what will happen this year when Cardinal Mueller begins to deal with them (those liberal and ultra-*

*conservative bishops causing confusion). Now that the Church is fully aware of their aberrant policies the CDF (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) will act – let's watch and see.*

*"It is just not liberals causing confusion, how do you account for pious sedivacantists who ordain their own bishops contrary to what the Church teaches; they are causing confusion too (and most of it)."*

*"Nonetheless, it is not confusion that is the issue, it is pride leading to willful disobedience which the self-righteous perpetrators then try to mask in confusion to cover their errancy by instead attacking the papacy as if they were some type of holy body constituted to lead the church instead of the See of Peter."*

In this regard, Cardinal Mueller has spoken out, and spoken out clearly. In a January 8, interview with tgcom24, Cardinal Mueller objected to Cardinal Burke and those "Princes of the Church" who publicly challenged the pope by questioning the doctrinal accuracy of *Amoris Laetitia*. According to Cardinal Mueller, the Church's highest ranking doctrinal official, the prefect for the Sacred Congregation of the Faith, according to Cardinal Mueller: ***Amoris Laetitia* is "very clear"**. This has been *New Era's* position from the beginning of the controversy, so much so that the staff here has been in a continual quandary over Cardinal Burke and Raymond Arroyo's failure to "get it" speculating that the problem might be either a clerical error having to do with authority or a failure to appreciate the fine differences between the intellectual work of pastoral theology *vis a vis* dogmatic theology. Now that Cardinal Mueller has vociferously supported the clarity of the document, the staff here is relieved.

Highlighting the pastoral dimension of *Amoris Laetitia*, Cardinal Mueller stressed that it is Pope Francis' desire that priests take time

*"...to discern the situation of ... persons living in an irregular union – that is, not in accordance with the doctrine of the church on marriage – and asks for help for these people to **find a path for a new integration into the church** according to the condition of the sacraments (and) the Christian message on matrimony."*

Cardinal Mueller clearly understands the difference between pastoral and dogmatic theology and how they intersect; consequently he sees clarity in the document:

*"In the papal document, he said, "I do not see any opposition: On one side we have the **clear doctrine on matrimony** (dogmatic), and on the other the **obligation of the church to care for these people in difficulty** (pastoral)."*

Cardinal Mueller evidently understands [Amoris Laetitia is a "call for the pastoral accompaniment of people who are divorced and civilly remarried or who are living together without marriage.](#)

Concerning the doctrinal clarity of the document, Mueller told the Italian television network:

*"A possible fraternal correction of the pope seems very remote at this time because **it does not concern a danger for the faith.**"*

["Amoris Laetitia is very clear in its doctrine and we can interpret \(in it\) Jesus' entire doctrine on marriage, the entire doctrine of the Church in 2000 years of history."](#)

We hope this is clear enough. **According to the highest ranking doctrinal official in the Catholic Church; AMORIS LAETITIA DOES NOT CONCERN A DANGER FOR THE FAITH."**

Further, in response to a query which asked are the divorced-and-remarried in some cases permitted to receive the Eucharist "without the need to change their way of life" Cardinal Mueller responded:

*"If Pope Francis' exhortation "had wanted to eliminate such a deeply rooted and significant discipline, it would have said so clearly and presented supporting reasons,"*

Cardinal Mueller is not confused, nor are score of other bishops, nor is the staff at *New Era*. As Dr. Marzak has previously pointed out, the confusion is being caused, on the one hand, by disobedient liberal bishops such as the one in San Diego and, on the other hand, by far right leaning bishops and churchman nearing schism or already in schism. Confusion emanating from diverse poles of the theological spectra helps generate more confusion among the larger body of sheep and lambs. The confusion is *not* coming from either Pope Francis or *Amoris Laetitia*; the confusion is rooted in clericalism, intellectual arrogance, liberal moral weakness (concupiscence and irascibility) that blinds and, above all else, it is rooted in disobedience and pride.

No where does the document *Amoris Laetitia* admit people living in mortal sin to receive the sacraments. What the Pastoral Exhortation does encourage, [as Cardinal Mueller correctly points out is:](#)

*"A process of (pastoral) discernment, (that), might eventually lead to a determination that access to the sacraments is possible."*

If its detractors better understood and appreciated the



pastoral dimensions of theology and the extreme difficulties, sacrifice and self-giving pastoral theology demands; if they understood what Francis means by “authentic authority”, they might “get it”. Some seem more intent on running the Church like a police state, a state in which they can comfortably sit back and play the judge as if God were some type of task master watching closely every day to espy and root out all errors rather than a God of LOVE who humbles Himself, who abases Himself to become little like his flock in order to tenderly serve, love and nurture them by knowing their names and sharing their lives, their pains, joys, sorrows and tribulations and by confirming His life to the doctrine of His Cross (coherence).

It is too easy to play the judge; it costs nothing but an easy arm-chair accompanied by good cuisine and an ever watchful eye always ready to catch a sinner and even a pope in error. In this they feel self-satisfied and accomplished. **This might be dogmatic theology, but without love and authentic authority it fails even at that and it is certainly not pastoral theology,** the theology of the Good Shepherd” who lays down his life for his sheep. This is the type of shepherd Francis is endeavoring to be, the type of shepherds he is calling the priests of the Catholic Church to become.

---

# Russian Hacking of DNC – Unsubstantiated Fake News for the Guillable

ON FRIDAY JANUARY, 6 THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE (ODNI) released their highly vaunted cyber report: “[Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent US Elections](#) based on data gathered by the CIA, NSA, and FBI. The Report was billed as conclusive evidence that Russian backed operatives hacked DNC computers and disrupted the political process in America. Finally, the New Era staff thought, a substantial report buttressed by ample evidence to support the pervasive allegation of a Russian cyber attack.

**Result:** Expecting a stuffed butterflied filet, the collective palate was fed an unsatisfying cuisine of saltine crackers. The Report, based on unsubstantiated common sense hunches, suffers from a dearth of substantial evidence. It is so unconvincing that it constitutes another egregious embarrassment to the United States and the US Intelligence Community.

Earlier, (three weeks prior to the release of the January, 6 Report) [New Age Intelligence Projected](#) that:

“The allegations, even if they are true, and for sake of a strong case, let’s presume they are true, will falter for at least three reasons.”

1. “The CIA and American Intelligence Communities report that America’s cyber security was hacked is devastating... **It means that the Russians beat us and are beating us at cyber security; it means that the nation is not safe under President Obama.**”

2. "It further manifests to honest Americans **the extent to which Democrats prefer lies to truth. They prefer that Clinton gets elected to Americans being told the truth.** They are upset because the truth about Hilary could not remain hidden, that Americans actually learned the truth about her... It is a lamentable day when Americans have to learn the truth from the Russians because their own politicians lie to them.
  
3. "Finally, **the third reason** that trying to implicate the Russians will fail is the **hypocrisy** of it all. By this point, most people are aware that it is common US foreign policy to interfere in the elections of other countries. For the Democrats to raise a tremor about presumed Russian interference indicates the height of arrogance and their blind hypocrisy. "

In Short, according to [Peter Kornbluh Director of the National Security Archive](#),

*"The United States is only getting a taste of its own medicine." The United States is guilty of a "long pattern of ...manipulation, bribery and covert operations to influence the political trajectory of countless countries around the world."*

This is hypocrisy. Hypocrites cannot lead a nation. Hypocrisy disqualifies persons from leadership because hypocrites are "blind guides.

*"Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, **hypocrites**; because you go round about the sea and the land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, you make him the child of hell twofold more than yourselves. Woe to you **blind guides**" ([Matthew 23:15](#)).*

If what neo-con and neo-liberal globalists are saying about

the Russians is true, they have left America unsafe, have been defeated in cyber wars, and have compromised American security; they prefer lies to truth prefer that Americans believe lies and are upset when the truth is revealed, upset not because they lied but because they were caught and being stripped of power. Above all, they are acting like hypocrites, whom Jesus refers to as “blind guides”, a blindness that disqualifies them from leadership.

With the release of the highly advertised intelligence report, the **Neocons and Neoliberals have moved from hypocrisy to embarrassment**; their situation just keeps getting worse, one distorted and finely concocted report after another.

Expectations were high for a quality report; what has come forth is an embarrassment.

#### **WHAT DOES THE REPORT SAY?**

The “Intelligence Report”, released by the ODNI, was ordered by President Obama. Prior to its release it was billed as a “declassified” version of its “top secret” counterpart, a counterpart that is supposed to prove that the Russians conspired to support Trump in the recent presidential election. *New Era* doubts that the “top secret” version (the one being conveniently withheld from public scrutiny) is robust; its robustness is doubted because the declassified version is little more than flim-flam dressed up in professional garb to impress specious observers.

Without providing any evidence to the public, the public is expected to believe that the Russian operatives, under direct orders from President Vladimir Putin, hacked DNC computers, lifted private and defaming information, and then filtered it to Wiki Leaks who then purportedly transformed the hacked data into public news to “denigrate” Hilary Clinton and propel Donald Trump into the White House.

## **MOTIVE**

According to the Report:

*“We (The Intelligence Community) assess with high confidence that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election, the consistent goals of which were to undermine public faith in the US democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump. When it appeared to Moscow that Secretary Clinton was likely to win the election, the Russian influence campaign then focused on undermining her expected presidency.”*

*“We also assess Putin and the Russian Government aspired to help President-elect Trump’s election chances when possible by discrediting Secretary Clinton and publicly contrasting her unfavorably to him. All three agencies agree with this judgment. CIA and FBI have **high confidence** in this judgment; NSA has moderate confidence.”*

*“In trying to influence the US election, we assess the Kremlin sought to advance its longstanding desire to undermine the US-led liberal democratic order, the promotion of which Putin and other senior Russian leaders view as a threat to Russia and Putin’s regime.”*

*“Putin publicly pointed to the Panama Papers disclosure and the Olympic doping scandal as US-directed efforts to defame*

*Russia, **suggesting** he sought to use disclosures to discredit the image of the United States and cast it as hypocritical.”*

*“Putin **most likely** wanted to discredit Secretary Clinton because he has publicly blamed her since 2011 for inciting mass protests against his regime in late 2011 and early 2012, and because he holds a grudge for comments he almost certainly saw as disparaging him.”*

No one needed the collaborative efforts of virtually an entire intelligence community to tell them that the Russians prefer Trump to Clinton (Point One). Nor is it a crime for anyone anywhere in the world to prefer one candidate over another. The fact that Russian news agencies were used to discredit Clinton is basically meaningless (Point Two). Any press agency operating in the United States has the first amendment freedom to speak its mind. Certainly, a foreign press publishing material on the internet is protected by the same freedom and even more so; they operate under their own laws.

Nor should it come as any surprise that Russia is opposed to the liberal global agenda (Point Three) and favors Trump who has indicated some aversion toward liberal global hegemony.

Point Four must be a jest – it is a mere inference from an unrelated incident suggesting a *tit for tat* approach to intelligence gathering and projection. Finally, Point Five is another mere probable scenario. Putin “**most likely**” wanted to discredit Secretary Clinton. Of course he did – the two do not get along – so what? Not to be outdone by the *tit for tat* approach, the Intelligence Community now use grudges as supposed evidence. Grudges and *tit for tat* arguments suggest that there is no conclusive evidence and that any evidence that does exist is inconclusive or irrelevant unless made to look relevant because it is basically all that exists as seems to be the case illustrated below.

But before racing to this conclusion. **The Report does provide  *motive***, which is necessary for a crime. The question becomes: what type of evidence exists to support a plausible but hypothetical motive?

## **EVIDENCE**

According to the ODNI Report, the Russian General Staff Main Intelligence Directorate (GRU) chose Wiki Leaks as the outlet for hacked DNC data.

*“We assess with high confidence that the GRU relayed material it acquired from the DNC and senior Democratic officials to WikiLeaks...Moscow most likely chose WikiLeaks because of its self proclaimed reputation for authenticity.”*

It takes more than a presumption to know this. How does anyone know, without evidence, that Russia hacked the data and filtered it through WikiLeaks? The reader is expected to accept this verbiage because the ONDI verbally assures them that such a statement is made, with “high confidence”. Then, with the same bravado, they announce that Moscow “**most likely**” chose Wiki Leaks. **Most likely is only a probability scenario** – no evidence has been presented to support the claim that Russia hacked the DNC and passed the data to Wiki Leaks. If there was evidence, the report would not have to preface the assessment with a “most likely” statement. No one with an objective mind is in the business of accepting allegations because someone else carries a title and presents a professionally looking report based on “most likely” and **probability suggestions** inferred from unrelated actions. Objective observers require evidence, not mere probability statements. If Russia is behind the hacking, what is the proof to support the allegation. *New Era* was under the impression that such proof would be abundantly supplied in the Report, instead we were fed with probability statements about the

Russian government, statements that were and are exacerbated by contrary statements that are verified by solid evidence, made by Wiki Leaks Director Julian Assange, who asserts that: **“Our (Wiki Leak’s) source is *not* the Russian government.”**

<https://youtu.be/bP3wPbbF06k>

**“Our Source is not the Russian Government”** (39 second mark).

According to [Vox Press](#)

*“Whether or not that interpretation is right, it’s quite clear from the report that US intelligence believes the Russian military intelligence service is WikiLeaks’ source. This was always the **most likely scenario**, and now we’ve got the ODNI report to back it up.”*

Russian military intelligence might be a hypothetical **“most likely scenario”**, but there is no demonstrated evidence to back the assertion. Moreover, the director of WikiLeaks denies any connection with the Russians. Thus, Vox’s conclusion that, “now we’ve got the ODNI report to back it up”, is fallacious and bogus – as weak as the Report itself.

Thus, according to Whistleblower William Binney, a cryptanalyst-mathematician and former [National Security Agency official](#):

*“The various ways in which usually anonymous spokespeople for U.S. intelligence agencies are equivocating – saying things like “our best guess” or “our opinion” or “our estimate” etc. – shows that the emails alleged to have been “hacked” cannot be traced across the network. Given NSA’s extensive trace capability, we conclude that DNC and HRC servers alleged to have been hacked were, in fact, not hacked. The evidence that should be there is absent; otherwise, it would surely be brought forward, since this could be done without any danger*



*to sources and methods. Thus, we conclude that the emails were leaked by an insider – as was the case with Edward Snowden and Chelsea Manning. Such an insider could be anyone in a government department or agency with access to NSA databases, or perhaps someone within the DNC.*

*[“In order to get to the servers,](#) they [hackers] would have to come across the network and go into the servers, penetrate them, and then extract data out of the servers and bring it back across the network,” Binney explained. “If it were the Russians, it would then go to Russia, and it would have to go from there across the network again to get to WikiLeaks.”*


*“My point is really pretty simple. There should be no guessing here at all, they should be able to show the trace routes of all the packets, or some of them anyways, going to the Russians and then from the Russians to WikiLeaks,”*

## **SO WHAT DOES THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PROVIDE AS EVIDENCE?**

The only hard core evidence that the Intelligence Community has, has nothing to do with hacking, but rather, it has to do with “trolls” and foreign publications, in this case “Russia Today” (RT) and “Sputnik”.

*“Moscow’s influence campaign followed a Russian messaging strategy that blends covert intelligence operations—such as cyber activity—with **overt efforts** by Russian Government agencies, state-funded media (RT and Sputnik), third-party intermediaries, and paid social media users or “trolls.”*

The ODNI Report's strongest evidence has to do with RT and thus the Report gives major emphasis to this Russian press agency. For example, according to the ODNI, RT is a propaganda arm of the Kremlin that leads the world in YouTube viewers:



[SOURCE: Vox News](#)

If this is true, it means that the Russians are winning the media war with the Americans under Obama and Clinton. It is also a tacit admission that other governments besides Russia are engaged in alternative media operations, governments such as the UK and Qatar as indicated in the above graphic. The BBC, Al Jazeera (Qatar-US ally) and CNN may engage in propaganda, and along with [Radio Free Europe](#) and [Radio Liberty](#) seek to subvert foreign governments, but no one else can. The Russians can engage in alternative news all they want – it is up to the viewer to decide. **It is the fault of the American government and the American mainstream press corp (not of the Russians) that people are loosing, and in many cases, have lost, confidence in their veracity.** Apparently, many American viewers are beginning to think that it is the liberal American Press that is engaged in subversion and “fake news”. As a direct result, many Americans are looking for an alternative news source. RT just happens to fill the bill; they are challenging what they refer to as the American “surveillance state”, “civil liberty abuse’s”, “drone use”, as well as the US economic system, American Greed, and the overwhelming debt accumulated by all levels of government. It is apparently a sin for a foreign government or media outlet to question the *faux pas* of the American Government. Thus,

according to the Report:

*“RT’s criticism of the US election was **the latest facet of its broader and longer-standing anti-US messaging** likely aimed at undermining viewers’ trust in US democratic procedures and undercutting US criticism of Russia’s political system. RT Editor in Chief Margarita Simonyan recently declared that the United States itself lacks democracy and that it has “no moral right to teach the rest of the world” (Kommersant, 6 November).*

*“RT’s reports often characterize the United States as a “surveillance state” and allege widespread infringements of civil liberties, police brutality, and drone use” (RT, 24, 28 October, 1-10 November).*

*“RT has also focused on criticism of the US economic system, US currency policy, alleged Wall Street greed, and the US national debt. Some of RT’s hosts have compared the United States to Imperial Rome and have predicted that government corruption and “corporate greed” will lead to US financial collapse” (RT, 31 October, 4 November).*

These allegations prove nothing more than a foreign news agency is reporting on America; if the news is unflattering, perhaps many Americans are involved in unflattering business, perhaps the government is involved in unflattering foreign engagements. That is not RT’s fault. If RT is making the “stuff” up, it is doing nothing different than any other government engaged in psy-ops and information wars.

However, the issue of Hilary Clinton’s poorly protected private server is another question. For some reason, the Secretary of State imprudently decided to take her sensitive

information from behind a presumed government secure wall to be placed on her own server. John Podesta, a high ranking officer in her organization, was daft enough to give out his password to a phishing request. His password was the word "password"; even Huma Abedin, Clinton's right-hand lady had access to Clinton's emails. Clinton's cavalier treatment of American security data is the real crime, along with any other indictable information that surfaces as a result of her carelessness. Clinton was so careless that, according to Assange, "a fourteen year old could have hacked into her server." **The Russians did not have to hack Hilary's server, she was giving the information away.**

According to the [Daily Wire](#)

*"The ongoing attempt to blame Russia for the leaked DNC emails has also clearly irritated Assange, who blasted the campaign for it on NBC News. "In order to divert attention from proof that we (WikiLeaks) published that the (Bernie) Sanders campaign was subverted within the DNC," he (Assange) said, **"the Clinton campaign tries to take attention away from a very serious domestic allegation about election interference (that Hillary interfered in the election process herself!) and try and bring in foreign policy (The Russians did it)."***

Similarly, in her January 2013 testimony before Congress for the Benghazi debacle, Clinton, under oath, denied having knowledge of weapons procured for Syrian rebels. Assange, however, claims that Wiki Leaks possesses a series of emails proving Clinton not only knew about weapons supplied to rebel forces operating in Syria, but that she in fact "pushed" for weapons to be supplied to "jihadists within Syria, including ISIS." In an interview conducted by [Democracy Now](#) Assange stated:

*"Those Hillary Clinton emails, they connect together with the*

*cables that we have published of Hillary Clinton, creating a rich picture of how Hillary Clinton performs in office, but, more broadly, how the U.S. Department of State operates. So, for example, the disastrous, absolutely disastrous intervention in Libya, the destruction of the Gaddafi government, which led to the occupation of ISIS of large segments of that country, weapons flows going over to Syria, being pushed by Hillary Clinton, into jihadists within Syria, including ISIS, that's there in those emails. There's more than 1,700 emails in Hillary Clinton's collection, that we have released, just about Libya alone."*

Assange [told ITV](#) that the information his group had obtained on Clinton could "proceed to an indictment." Because Wiki Leaks has become such a problem for the mainstream media and American Foreign Policy, **it appears that the liberal propaganda machine is now learning from the Russians and reeving up its propaganda campaign under the guise of its own version of "alternative news."** Operating under the name of "**Political Insider**", the globalists posing as right wing conservatives are attempting to undo Assange and the authentic alt-right news services that are benefiting from Wiki Leaks. For example, the people at *Political Insider* refer to the people at *Democracy Now* quoted above as "[far left morons](#)." and to ISIS as "[terrorist scumbags](#)"

According to [Political Insider](#), "Julian Assange of Wikileaks says that they will be soon dropping a bombshell that will absolutely devastate Hillary Clinton, and it has to do with her aiding the **terrorist scumbags** of ISIS!!!" So of course, according to the "*Insider*"

*"There's a lot of reason to believe that Wikileaks is just a Russian espionage operation, which raises even greater concerns about the integrity of our elections."*

Ironically, the mainstream media is not questioning the

veracity of the Wiki Leaks. According to Sean Hannity:

*“For ten years Wiki leaks has never been proven wrong. Not one single time” (9:37 in above video).*

No, the globalists and their mainstream outlets are concerned that people are finally getting the truth. Thus, the so-called ODNI Intelligence Report on alleged Russian cyber-hacking might impress the President who ordered it and the sundry players on the global squad, including media and press agents, bureaucrats and high level adepts, but the people are waking up to the chicanery. With reports such as this one, it is the intelligence agencies that are in danger of being exposed as manipulators and deceivers.

The US Intelligence Community claims to have evidence that Russian operatives hacked Clinton’s emails but insist that they cannot disclose the information. Who, under current circumstances, trusts such a claim – believe us because we say you should. You know we prevaricate – Hilary’s undisputed e-mails prove this – but trust us anyway.

The only substantial evidence put forward in the Report is the evidence that Sputnik and RT are pro-Russian news media. It is not surprising or appalling that news media operating out of Russia might be loyal to their mother country. What does one expect from the BBC – does the BBC vilify the Queen? Nor is it surprising that Sputnik criticizes materialism, hedonism and sexual immorality rampant in the West; our own philosophers and statesmen do that and much more. People around the globe want the truth; they are tired of being lied to. They are now so accustomed to it, that seeing through so-called Intelligence Reports has become easy sport for any eyes that want to see.