

Intelligence Report One: The Blessed Virgin Mary – Error on Both Sides of the Theological Spectrum

[New Era World News](#)

THERE HAS BEEN MUCH CONFUSION about the Virgin Mary, Fatima, and Her requested consecration of Russia and its subsequent conversion. Confusion is not a gift or fruit of the Holy Spirit; the Spirit is manifest in love and peace ([1 Corinthians 14:33](#), [Galatians 5:22](#)). Interestingly, the confusion has not come from outside the church, but from within, from extremists on both ends of the theological spectrum: ultra-liberals and ultra-conservatives. This is to be expected; false ideas are advanced by creating polar opposites that vie with each other giving the appearance that truth must be on one side or the other, when in fact, it is on neither. Because both perceive and focus on the error in the other, they remain incapable seeing their own.

“Why seest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye; and seest not the beam that is in thy own eye? Or how sayest thou to thy brother: Let me cast the mote out of thy eye; and behold a beam is in thy own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam in thy own eye, and then shalt thou see to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye” ([Matthew 7: 3-5](#)).

For example, a false idea such as *materialism* is advanced by opposing (apparently) antithetical ideas such as *atheistic communism* and *hedonistic capitalism*. What many people fail to realize is that **each of these is a form of materialism**, materialism that is advanced by placing them in opposition to each other and by making them somewhat attractive by filling

each with certain elements of the truth that are appealing to different types of people. Communism was forwarded by advocating justice for the working class, social cooperation, brotherhood, and economic equality. It was juxtaposed to capitalism that promoted private property, individual competition, frugality, and economic merit.

The positive elements of one appear excellent when placed in juxtaposition to the negative elements of the other, negative elements that ideologues of each fail to see or endeavor to conceal. The virtues of private property stand out when compared to economic sterility of communal property. The virtues of economic justice and universal employment stand out when juxtaposed to unemployment and worker exploitation etc. Both contain enough elements of truth to be attractive, but also contain disguised elements of error that make them detrimental. The negative elements in one position are avoided by focusing attention on the negative elements in the other.

Communists miss the negatives about communal property because they are so focused on the negatives of unregulated private property. Conversely, proponents of unregulated private property miss its short comings by over-focusing on the negative aspects of communal ownership. To further exacerbate the matter, other solutions or alternative world views are kept out of the discussion such that a person is forced to choose between two believing that they are the only viable solutions. Thus, no matter which way a person chooses, he or she will end up in error because both alternatives are flawed.

If this article does *not* seem to be about Fatima, Russia, and the Era of Peace, bear with the author, it is.

Lech Walesa, the past president and leader of Solidarity in Poland recognized this sociological verity in his autobiography, "*A Way of Hope*" in which he stated that prior to his meeting with the Primate of Poland, Cardinal

Stefan Wyszyński, Walesa thought there were only two solutions to the social problem, *i.e.*, communism versus capitalism. However, after speaking with the primate, he became aware of a new third way, a way he had never heard of before, "Solidarity" or Catholic Social Teaching.

As indicated above, **communism and capitalism are both different forms of materialism** – the one being ***atheistic materialism*** and the other, ***hedonistic materialism***. Because both are forms of materialism, neither is true. But proponents of each believe their own version to be true while representing the other as false, when in fact, both are false.

Saint Padre Pio, like Lech Walesa after his meeting with the primate, knew of a third way. Thus, when asked about communism and capitalism, Pio gave an unexpected response in which he stated that they are both "indescribably evil":

In the East they deny God from the head to the belly button (atheistic materialism or scientific socialism) while in the West they deny God from the belly button to the feet (hedonistic materialism or sexual, organs-pleasure).

To advance a false idea, such as materialism, the idea must be masked behind partial truths set in contra-distinction to a competing ideology. The advance of Capitalism was aided by continually alluding to the evils of Communism. Conversely, Communism advanced by continually pointing out the abuses of Capitalism. **No matter which one is the victor, materialism, a false idea, advances.** The two are juxtaposed, when in fact both are gravely erroneous and detrimental to human well being.

The situation is similar in the church. Two appealing but false ideas, schismatic ultra-liberalism and schismatic ultra-conservatism vie for loyalties. Each presents itself as sacrosanct and the other as unholy WHEN IN FACT BOTH ARE UNHOLY AND MEANT TO DISTURB AUTHENTIC GROWTH IN THE BODY OF

CHRIST. People line up to take either one of apparently two sides; an irreverent *Novos Ordo* Mass assisted by clowns and belly dancers or a reverent Tridentine Mass celebrated by schismatic clerics; head-veils or no veils, altar girls or altar boys, communion in the hands or on the tongue, priest facing the congregation or *ad orientem*, holding hands during the *Pater Noster* or standing singly etc. Interestingly, both can appear to be true and holy depending upon which lens a person is looking through. A dissenting liberal who disdains the coldness of an ultra-conservative misses his or her own schism. A dissenting ultra-conservative aghast at the irreverence of altar clowns and the schism of liberal nuns misses his or her own schism.

What they both miss is the authentic nature of the reform initiated by Vatican II. The conservative looks at altar clowns and, thinking that they are integral to the reform, falsely rejects the reform. The liberal, on the the hand, looks at the individualistic components of the Tridentine Mass and embraces the exaggerated communal dimensions of a false reform. Both miss the authentic reform intended by the Council Fathers. Neither side has correctly evaluated the reform; both sides miss their error by focusing on, and constantly complaining about, whatever displeases them on the other side. **The truth is, the authentic reform (the third way) intended by the Council has not yet been realized.** This led Saint John Paul II to bequeath the future implementation of the Council to the next generation in his "[Last Will and Testament](#)":

"Being on the threshold of the Third Millennium "in medio Ecclesiae," I wish once again to express gratitude to the Holy Spirit for the great gift of Vatican Council II, to which together with the whole Church – and above all with the entire episcopate – I feel indebted. I am convinced that once again and for a long time it will be given to the new generations to draw from the riches that this Council of the

20th century has lavished."

*"As a Bishop who has participated in the conciliar event from the first to the last day, **I wish to entrust this great treasure to all those who are or will be in the future called to realize it.** For my part, I thank the eternal Pastor who allowed me to serve this great cause in the course of all the years of my pontificate."*

Liberal Catholics tend to view things through the lens of progressive pastoral theology. Although necessary, as Pope Francis keeps pointing out, pastoral theology rooted in extreme affect of the heart and divorced from the dogmatic truths of the faith is a dangerous thing. Conservative Catholics, such as Cardinal Burke, tend to view things through the lens of traditional dogmatic theology leading to a disdain for affective modernism and an over-emphasis on intellectual virtue culminating in wisdom – a zeal for wisdom divorced from the theological requirements of charity.

The truth is that neither is correct (each is only partly correct); man is an integral being. Head and Heart, love and wisdom, must function together as an integral unity if there is to be an authentic expression of Catholicism. **Wisdom, no matter how great a good** (Aristotle even referred to it as the *Summum Bonum* – the greatest of all goods) **is deficient without Love.** In fact, wisdom is not only incomplete without love, it is inferior to love – it is meant to be consummate in love:

"IF I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And if I should have prophecy and should know all mysteries, and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have

not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

*“Charity never falleth away: whether prophecies shall be made void, or tongues shall cease, or knowledge shall be destroyed. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away... Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known. And now there remain faith, hope, and charity, these three: but **the greatest of these is charity**” ([1 Corinthians 13: 1-13](#)).*

Like Communists and Capitalists, Ultra-Conservative Catholics and Ultra-Liberal Catholics each prosper by attacking the other, to the detriment of the Church. One emphasizes wisdom, the other love. The problem is that their cannot be authentic love without wisdom (garnered either by reason or faith or preferably both) and there cannot be authentic wisdom without love. Just as there cannot be true moral virtue without the integral presence of all four cardinal virtues; there cannot be true theological virtue without the presence of faith, hope, and love. **There are many counterfeit loves and counterfeit wisdoms corrupted by self-love and pride of life that manifest themselves in disobedience.**

Since schismatic ultra-liberalism and ultra-conservatism are both inauthentic expressions of true integral Catholicism, **their error (that is-the error in both) is detected by disobedience to ecclesial authority** – Ultras show their true color when it comes to obedience to authentic church teachings, which both sides twist and contort while hiding behind an assumed veil of feigned holiness or a veil of feigned love, a veil of reverence and piety or of evangelization by being a cool dude. Liberals, like Judas, hide behind the veil of helping and loving the poor. Ultra-

conservatives hide, like Jansenists, behind the veil of piety. We know what happened to Judas and the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the faith exposes the veil of piety assumed by schismatic ultra-traditionalists:

According to the Holy Office: ["We must resist error even when it masquerade as piety."](#)

Scripture tells us the same; it also reveals how to spot error – error cannot hide forever behind a masquerade of piety nor can it hide behind ersatz love like Judas hid behind the purse whose contents he spent on himself. Both, supposedly antithetical errors, are revealed in the lack of peace, the tranquility of spirit that comes forth from wisdom and love nurtured by humility **and obedience**:

*"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 (ultra-conservatives) and good words (ultra-liberals), seduce the hearts of the innocent. **For your obedience is published in every place**. I rejoice therefore in you (not in them who are disobedient). But I would have you to be wise in good, and simple in evil. And the **God of peace crush Satan** under your feet speedily. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you" ([Romans 16: 17-20](#)).*

It is really quite simple: Those causing dissension by masquerading in piety while questioning the teaching authority of the Church and those causing dissension by masquerading in love but who in reality are serving their "own bellies" in fun and parties, these, both these, seduce the innocent *albeit* in diverse ways. **As communism and capitalism are both manifestations of materialism, schismatic ultra-liberalism and ultra-conservatism are both manifestations of dissension manifest in disobedience.** Sons and daughters of the Church are

not to be misled by the good deeds of others if they are done for selfish purposes, to be noticed and praised; nor are they to be fooled by outstanding intellectual speeches full of learning and apparent wisdom. How is anyone to know when a teaching is false or a deed is a counterfeit? Simple – if those who perform apparent good deeds and teach apparent wisdom cause dissension and are disobedient to the true shepherds of the flock.

The test on both sides – ultra-conservative and ultra-liberal – is peace manifest in a bond of unity and obedience.

Because there are so many problems in the modern world, gender confusion, homo-sexuality, disrespect, abortion, pornography etc. etc. it is easy to be down on the modern world. This is the strong card of the traditionalists: discontent with modernism and the ability to quote popes and encyclicals such as [Pope St. Pius X, Pascendi Dominici Gregis](#), Pope Pius IX, [Qui Pluribus](#) and the [Syllabus of Errors](#) and many other papal and church documents that condemn modernism and apparently confirm their position. Since Vatican II does not join them in their enthusiasm for condemnation of the modern world and instead follows the counsel of Saint Paul to “become all things to all men with the view of winning them to Christ, they reject Vatican II:

*“And I became to the Jews, a Jew, that I might gain the Jews: To them that are under the law, as if I were under the law, (whereas myself was not under the law,) that I might gain them that were under the law. To them that were without the law, as if I were without the law, (whereas I was not without the law of God, but was in the law of Christ,) that I might gain them that were without the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak. **I became all things to all men, that I might save all.** And I do all things for the gospel’s sake: that I may be made partaker thereof” ([1 Corinthians 9: 20-23](#)).*

Instead of stooping and becoming *all things to all*, schismatic traditionalist elitists tend to critique and criticize. When they are not joined in this endeavor by the bishops and Supreme Pontiff they then tend to dissent and then to name call even at times refusing to attend a Novus Ordo Mass. More and more they become self-righteous and then blame all the error they observe on the failure of the shepherds to correct the flock with a rod of iron. failing to realize that it is mercy that God wants not sacrifice they become very judgmental:

“Go then and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice. For I am not come to call the just, but sinners” ([Matt 9:13](#)).

If they understood this, the sacrifices that they make would be sacrifices out of love for the sins of those whom they abhor. **This is reparation sacrifice, the type of sacrifice most pleasing to God that Our Lady requested at Fatima and that Our Lord offered on the Cross.** If a person fasts and sacrifices exclusively for themselves, they have the wrong idea; fasting is a discipline and a form of charity. Properly understood, it is conducted as a discipline of the passions so that one might better serve God and neighbor. **Fasting is a means not an end – a means to better service and higher expressions of love.** Once the passions have been mastered, fasting becomes a form of love for others as do all other types of reparation acts and prayers. **A person genuinely advancing in the spiritual life will *not* be characterized by criticism of others but by love of others and a willingness to embrace the cross for them when they are too weak or ignorant to do it for themselves.** Anyone getting pumped on the idea that they fast and pray, or are smarter than others, is being infected with counterfeit ideas leading to pride and eventually to disobedience and then schism.

If not careful, the justice that many ultra-conservatives

clamor after and decree for others will be the justice they will receive for themselves. Slowly, such people tend to move away from unity with their bishops and become infallible authorities themselves thinking it a little matter to correct and teach the bishops and even the pope himself whom they deem a “heretic”.

Pope Francis, whom they abhor, refers to them as “legalists”; they are like pharisees whom the pope says just do not get it.

“The experience of forgiveness that embraces the whole human family is the grace that the apostolic ministry announces. The Church exists only as a tool to communicate to people the merciful plan of God. At the Council the Church felt the responsibility of being in the world as a living sign of the love of the Father... This moves the axis of the Christian conception of a certain legalism, which can be ideological... Some (think of certain replies to Amoris laetitia) still do not understand, or (want to see everything as) white or black.”

Newera agrees with the pope. The greatest reason being **that we are living in the Hour of Mercy**. The whole universe is impregnated with the echo of the Divine Logos: “Mercy-Mercy-Mercy” and of His Mother who is asking for reparation from her children for the sins of others, asking penance from those who love God for those who are steeped in sin: “Penance-Penance-Penance”. Our Lord and Our Lady are asking for love, mercy, compassion and sacrifice for sinners and the ultra-conservatives are calling for their heads, calling for punishment, divine retribution, and chastisement while the ultra-liberals are condoning their sin and often participating in it. **The pope is correct, they don’t get it;** both are disobedient and dissenters.

When this whole ultra right-left paradigm is telescoped onto the question of the Virgin Mary, two attractive but egregious

versions of the Mother of God appear. Both ultra liberals and ultra conservatives have a version of the Virgin Mary for the rest of the Church. On the liberal side we find the credulous Medjugorje crowd and on the Conservative side we find the Fatima “nuts”. Overly convinced of the rightness of their position, **both proceed to manifest their error in pride, dissension and disobedience** as will be discussed over the next few articles.

Because both ideas about our Lady are in error, the best way to advance the error is to juxtapose one to the other: liberal to conservative and conservative to liberal. **The faithful are left to choose between Ultra-Conservative Fatima know it-alls and Liberal Medjugorje do-gooders, while the authentic *Message of Fatima* gets lost amid a river of confusion**, a river hemmed in by error on either bank – the East Bank of Ultra-Conservatism or the West Bank of Ultra-Liberalism.

“And the serpent cast out of his mouth after the woman, water as it were a river; that he might cause her to be carried away by the river. And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the river, which the dragon cast out of his mouth” ([Revelation 12:15-16](#)).

The purpose of this Intelligence Report is to break down the river walls thereby diffusing the tumultuous flow of confusion spewing from the deceptive mouth of Satan who is a cunning liar and the Father of liars ([John 8:44](#)), liars who assist him in his furtive plan to carry the Virgin Mary away in the river of cunning deception.

End Part One

THE FULL INTELLIGENCE REPORT ON THIS TOPIC WILL BE RELEASED ON THE FIRST SATURDAY OF FEBRUARY 2017

Liberalism Coming to an End in Germany – Alternative for Deutschland?

[New Era World News](#)

GERMAN INVESTIGATORS ARE LABORING to identify the person(s) who perpetrated the December 19 manslaughter of twelve people and the wanton injury of 48 more. The attack was purportedly carried out by a Daesh operative who used a 25 ton vehicle to maliciously mow down innocent people shopping at a Berlin Christmas market. Police announced Monday that a Pakistani national who had requested asylum in Germany was thought to be the driver of the vehicular weapon, but he was released due to insufficient evidence. The driver's accomplice was found dead in the passengers seat. Although the suspect has not been found, Daesh claims that it was "[their soldier](#)" who carried out the operation.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who made the decision to openly greet asylum seekers, is acutely concerned about the culprit being an apprehended Pakistani seeking asylum. Earlier in July of this year another Pakistani asylum seeker, a Pakistani wielding a knife, attacked German train passengers. These incidents are part of an emerging and apparent pattern of asylum seekers attacking their generous hosts in their hosts own neighborhoods. Merkel should be concerned, very concerned; there is a pro-Traditional Europe, anti-liberal Euro-skeptic movement sweeping Europe. It is readily apparent in Slovakia, Hungary, Moldova, Poland, England, France, Italy Transdnistria, Greece, the Netherlands and Russia in which political parties rooted in Christian values are winning

elections and democratically acquiring seats of power.

French voters head to the ballot boxes in the spring of 2017 during which time they are likely to elect a pro-traditional European cultural candidate (either Marine Le Pen from the National Front or the conservative Francois Fillon from the Republican Party), a candidate opposed to open borders and favoring a rapprochement with Russia. Though Le Pen is the more anti-liberal and “traditional” of the two, regardless who prevails, France will move to amend or abrogate the [Schengen Agreement](#), which created open borders among EU member states.

Following the French elections, Germans will head to the ballot boxes in the fall of 2017 (September-October). In addition to French election results impacting German results, today’s assault will likely add fuel to the already kindled fire that is gaining momentum as it moves across Germany in the form of **a new political party that calls itself “Alternative for Germany” (AfD)**. AfD is a conservative, Euro-skeptic populist party that seems to be the German counterpart of the anti-liberal front that is raging in Eastern Europe and gaining momentum in the West. In the wake of today’s heinous crime AfD leader, Frauke Petry, denounced Merkel saying that her over-zealous decision to host over a million asylum seekers in is threatening German peace and security. According to AfD spokesman, Ronald Glaser, Germany’s liberal minded leaders seem more concerned about globalism and political correctness than they do about identifying the underlying causes of social problems and doing something about them.

“Two days ago I joined a meeting of Berlin’s... local secret state police. Their focus was on Islamo-critics or Islamophobes, as they call them. No one was talking about radical Islam, which is of course the main reason for growing anger of these Islamo-critics. But our government agencies are [so] obsessed by their dream of a multicultural world that they won’t do what’s necessary” (Ronald Glaser Spokesman for

AfD).

WHO IS ALTERNATIVE FOR GERMANY?

Originally, the AfD was founded to oppose the euro and Chancellor Merkel's handling of the euro economic crisis. Since then AfD has adopted a pro-family, traditional values, anti-immigrant platform, a platform that has made them, according to [*Der Spiegel*](#), a "dangerous party",

"...a collection of radical-Christian ideologues, arch-conservative military veterans, buttoned-up business professors and disillusioned business owners."

Interpreted in positive terms this means, a collection of deeply religious men and women committed to their faith and its social cultural expression, virile military veterans committed to upholding Germany's Christian patrimony and family traditions, and who are in favor of moral values (rather than an unseen hand) regulating the market place. AfD's leader is "dangerous" because she has brazenly committed political heresy by daring to trample on political correctness and announce what is wrong in Germany:

"...the refugee crisis, problems with the education system, the premature sexualization of children."

Nonetheless, AfD continues to gain popularity. The party was founded in 2013, a year in which it surprisingly won 4.7% of the vote barely missing the 5% threshold necessary to sit in the Bundestag (the Lower House of Parliament that represents the people and elects the Chancellor *aka* the Prime Minister). A year later AfD managed to acquire 7.1% of the vote and 7 of Germany's 96 seats in the European Parliament. By 2016 AfD gained MP seats in ten of Germany's 16 **state parliaments** and is poised to gain seats in next fall's **federal** elections.

Speaking about the 2016 **state results in the Eastern state of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania**, [the BBC](#) reported

*“Anxiety about immigration dominated the Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania election on 4 September, enabling the AfD to take second place (almost 21%), behind the centre-left Social Democrats (SPD – 30.6%) but **ahead of Mrs Merkel’s Christian Democrats** (CDU – 19%).”*

The [Telegraph](#) worded the Mecklenberg results this way:

“Almost exactly a year after Mrs Merkel opened Germany’s borders to more than 1m asylum-seekers, her party was beaten into third place in her own parliamentary constituency, according to preliminary exit polls.”

“The [anti-migrant Alternative for Germany party \(AfD\)](#) surged ahead of Mrs Merkel’s Christian Democrats (CDU) in initial projections with around 21 per cent of the vote.”

“Perhaps this is the beginning of the end for Chancellor Merkel,” Leif-Erik Holm, the AfD’s regional leader, said as the results became clear.”

Reporting on 2016 state elections in the capital, Berlin, Politico reported that Germany’s two leading parties, the Social Democrats and Christian Democrats, both suffered heavy losses while the AfD was catapulted into the state assembly.

[According to Politico](#):

“Berlin’s voters have dealt the embattled chancellor [another heavy blow](#). But what is most remarkable is the fundamental shift in the country’s party landscape and political process that this election heralds. Berlin is Germany’s political and social laboratory par excellence. It is a microcosm where the country’s major challenges play out as if under a microscope. So the stability and consensus that have long been Germany’s

political trademark may soon be a thing of the past.

It seems that Germany's Euro-skeptic party is on the move making headway promoting a pro-Christian/Humanistic anti radical-Muslim values campaign. In May of this year, AfD adopted an anti-Islam policy that includes a section explaining why "Islam does not belong to Germany".

*"There is no room for Muslim practices and beliefs that go against "the free, democratic social foundation, our laws and **the Judaeo-Christian and humanistic bases of our culture**....Moderate (Muslims who accept integration) are valued members of society", the programme says. But it argues that multiculturalism does not work."*

Like other Euro-skeptic parties AfD advocates decentralization and opposes "Euro-federalism" as a type of centralization. If the trend toward centralization is not reversed AfD leaders have stated that they will move to ["pull Germany out of the EU."](#)

As the result of increasing violence associated with the refugee crisis and the continued acquiescence of Germany to EU stipulations, [Merkel's political future looks compromised.](#)

"Mrs Merkel's national approval ratings have fallen to a five-year low of 45 per cent, and she is yet to declare whether she will lead her party into next year's elections. For the AfD, the result is further confirmation that the party has arrived as a force to be reckoned with in German politics."

LIBERALISM COMING TO AN END IN GERMANY

The developing trend (most advanced in Berlin) but in motion throughout most of Germany is clear: The age of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) leadership based on liberal European values is being seriously challenged, perhaps coming to an end.

"The AfD's rightward drift can be seen across Germany, but nowhere is it as clear as in the country's eastern states. Supporters of eastern German AfD chapters are not looking for a conservative alternative on the political spectrum. [They are interested in opposing and resisting the established political system.](#)"

As indicated by the election results in Mecklenburg and especially in Berlin, it seems that in Germany, as elsewhere, liberalism is being questioned. In Germany, according to [Politico](#):

"The political scene has traditionally been dominated by two Volksparteien, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Social Democratic Party (SPD). Each typically garnered around 40 percent of the vote and alternated in leading governments. Sunday's poll (the Berlin result , however, saw five parties land between 21 and 14 percent, effectively leveling the playing field between the erstwhile dominant CDU and SPD on the one hand, and the Greens, the Left, and the far-right (AfD) on the other.... Two-party alliances, long sufficient to secure necessary majorities to govern, will have to make way for three-party coalitions....Now, with representation in 10 of 16 states, the AfD is here to stay."

"The recent vote in the German capital was more than a state election. It was a wake-up call to the fact that German politics is undergoing a sea change that will leave its imprint on the country's federal elections in 2017 and beyond."

With just four years under its belt, the AfD is now the third strongest party in Germany. As in the United States, traditional family oriented European men, men tired of the abuse they have suffered under a liberal agenda, an agenda that has robbed them of their cultural patrimony, striped them of paternal authority, and reduced them to politically correct sycophants, these men have had enough. According to [Der Spiegel](#), Europe's largest and Germany's most influential weekly:

"There are many conservative, upper middle-class voters – most of them older, white males – who had hoped that the AfD would provide them with a new political home reminiscent of the Helmut Kohl-era Christian Democrats. For these voters, Angela Merkel's CDU has become too liberal, too unprincipled, too un-Catholic and too multicultural. It is a natural pool of voters for a party to the right of the CDU."

Although opposed to the AdF, reporters at *Der Spiegel* are realists able to assess a situation well, even if they despise the result:

"Currently, Chancellor Angela Merkel is governing in a coalition together with the Social Democrats, Germany's large, center-left party. That means that those who disapprove of Chancellor Angela Merkel's handling of the refugee crisis (many people) don't have many choices when it comes to casting a protest vote, particularly given that the Greens are reliably pro-refugee."

Of course, this means that the AdF is the projected beneficiary. Whether or not the AdF will attain power in the fall remains to be seen; it is more of a long-shot than the National Front in France. But if Le Pen's National Font pulls out the victory in the spring of next year and Chancellor Merkel's CDU fails to fix the immigrant problem and address the surge in favor of protecting Germany's cultural patrimony,

AdF might be the beneficiary in more than one way in the fall.

The Virgin Mary – Argentina – Pope Francis vs Global Neoliberalism

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE WORLD'S largest religion present in nearly every country of the world, despite what statistical yearbooks say about Islam having more adherents. Those year books often fail to divide Sunni, Shiite and Sufi Muslims, but count them as one body. If Roman Catholics were united with Greek Orthodox and Protestants, the number of Christians would exceed the number of Muslims. [When this is done, there are 2.1 billion Christians and 1.3 billion adherents of Islam.](#)

To make an even more detailed and proper comparison, the largest Christian denomination, Roman Catholicism, should be compared to the largest largest Islamic denomination, Sunnism. When that is done, as it should be if there is to be actually objective data, the Roman Catholic Church is the largest:. According to the [PEW Research Center](#):

"Of the total Muslim population, 10-13% are Shia Muslims and 87-90% are Sunni Muslims."

Thus, at a maximum there are 1.13 – 1.17 billion Sunnis Muslims in the world. According to [Religion Facts](#), there are less than 1.13 billion Sunnis:

"With 940 million adherents out of about 1.1 billion Muslims, Sunni Islam is the largest Islamic sect. (Shia Muslims make up about 10% of all Muslims worldwide.)"

The "Annuario Pontificio 2016," released by the Vatican

Statistics Office announced that:

"The number of baptized Catholics reached 1.27 billion or 17.8 percent of the global population." ([National Catholic Reporter](#)).

According to the [BBC](#), there are less than 1.27 billion Catholics: "[There are an estimated 1.2 billion Roman Catholics in the world.](#)"

Either way, with approximately 1.2 – 1.27 billion Roman Catholics, the Roman Catholic Church is the largest in the world as Jesus said that it would be:

"To what shall we liken the kingdom of God? or to what parable shall we compare it? It is as a grain of mustard seed: which when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that are in the earth: And when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches, so that the birds of the air may dwell under the shadow thereof" ([Mark 4: 30-32](#)).

With a body this large, it is nearly impossible to keep an eye on everything that is occurring day to day throughout the world. However, there has been an unusually large amount of news coming out of Latin America lately. The election of Pope Francis as supreme pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church ranks toward the top of the list. [The Holy Spirit blows where He wills](#) shaping the global climate from age to age.

During the pontificate of Pope John Paul II, the nations of the world focused on the cold war being fought between East and West, between Communism and Capitalism. As that battle reached a crescendo, Karol Wojtyla was called out of Communist Poland to lead the Church in Her definitive hour against Athesitic Communism. Pope John Paul II knew better than any how to posture the Church *vis a vis* the many headed behemoth controlled by neighboring Kremlin *Apparatchik* and *Politburo* members. He adopted the diplomatic posture known as "*Ostpolitik*" bending and acquiescing wherever

he could while standing firm in those few doctrinal areas where he must until such time as the Church could weather the storm and be in a better position to advance the Gospel and build the Kingdom of God?

Pope Francis is also called at a particular time and from a particular place to give emphasis to a particular manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the third millennium. The pope sees himself as an Argentine:

“For me, the people of Argentina are my people, you are important.” “I continue to be an Argentine, and I still travel with an Argentine passport. I am convinced that the people are the biggest treasure of our homeland...a people who know solidarity, know how to walk with one another, know how to help, respect,” and don’t take a step back. “I respect, love and carry (those people) in my heart.” ([Catholic News Service](#)).

SO WHY HAS THE HOLY SPIRIT CALLED A POPE OUT OF ARGENTINA?

First, there has been an approved apparition of Our Lady there, Our Lady of the Rosary of San Nicolas. On Holy Trinity Sunday, May 22, 2016, The local bishop, Hector Cardelli, approved a series of apparitions that began with the rediscovery of a lost statue of the Virgin Mary and glowing rosaries. The bishop has proclaimed that the apparitions are of supernatural origin and worthy of belief. Read his announcement in [English and Spanish](#).


According to Bishop Cardelli”

“In my twelfth year of pastoring San Nicolas and, having followed with faith and responsibility the Marian events that I have known about since the very beginning, I have reached the decision to recognize them for my diocese.”

“I recognize the supernatural nature of the happy events with which God through his beloved daughter, Jesus through his Most Holy Mother, the Holy Spirit through his beloved spouse, has desired to lovingly manifest himself in our diocese.”

"On the occasion of the Jubilee of Mercy of the pilgrims from the Diocese, I announce this valid decision for the flock which I guide and accompany with it the presentation of a book entitled "SPIRITUAL SCHOOL OF SANTA MARIA DEL ROSARIO DE SAN NICOLAS" highlighting the most important teachings in the messages she gives us for our commitment to everything he tells us because he is the culmination of revelation.

Bishop Cardelli spoke about the apparitions with Pope Francis when the Argentine pontiff was the archbishop of Buenos Aires, and the future pope approved of his confirming them.



The
apparitions
began
in
Buenos
Aires
after
rosaries
began
to
glow
in
homes

throughout San Nicolas de los Arroyos.

On September 25, 1983 The Virgin Mary carrying the infant Jesus and wearing a blue gown and veil appeared (but did not speak a word) to a simple elementary 4th grade educated housewife and mother of two named Gladys Quiroga de Motta, now 80 years of age.

The Holy Mother spoke for the first time on Oct. 13, anniversary of the last Fatima apparition. *"Do not be afraid,"* She said. She gave Gladys a Bible reference: Ezekiel 2:4-10.

On October 25, the Virgin Mary appeared to Gladys while she was praying in the Cathedral in a town named Rosario. The Blessed Mother handed her a white rosary while saying:

"Receive this Rosary from my hands and keep it forever and ever. You are obedient; I am happy because of it. Rejoice, for God is with you."

The Virgin Mary asked Gladys to search the church for a forgotten statue that had been blessed by Pope Leo XII.

On November 27, 1983, Gladys found the statue of the Virgin Mary holding the child Jesus in the belfry of the cathedral where it had been placed after being damaged in 1894. Gladys recognized the statue because it resembled the Virgin Mary in the apparitions. Behind the picture were a stained glass window with the Holy Trinity and angels.

On Palm Sunday, 1989, Bishop Castagna relocated the statue from the cathedral to the new Sanctuary of Mary of the Rosary of San Nicolás, which She had requested to be built.



Sanctuary of Our Lady of the Rosary of San Nicholas – Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina

Gladys has reportedly received stigmata on her wrists, feet, side and shoulder. The many messages she received from Jesus and Mary include topics of penance, peace, return to the sacraments and love of God

[Our Lady said,](#)

“Many hearts do not accept my invitation to prayer and to conversion. That is why the work of the devil is growing and expanding.”

“It is up to you to set your eyes and your heart on God.”

“I want to cure my children from this illness which is materialism; an illness which makes many suffer. I want to help them discover Christ, and I want to make it known to them that Christ prevails over everything.”

Jesus told Gladys:

“If this generation will not listen to my mother, it will perish. I ask everyone to listen to her. Man’s conversion is

necessary.”

“Today I warn the world, for the world is not aware: souls are in danger....My mother must be accepted. My mother must be heard in the totality of her messages. The world must discover the richness she brings to Christians.”

“ I want a renewal of the spirit, a detachment from death, and an attachment to life. I have chosen the heart of my mother, so that what I ask will be achieved. Souls will come to me through the means of her Immaculate Heart.”

Other important messages include:

- “The demon acts ferociously, do not be astonished. He attacks without compassion surrounding everything what he can touch. Pray my children, prayer fortifies. You are called by Jesus Christ to pray. The prince of evil spills today his poison with all the forces, because he sees that **he is concluding his sad reign. He has little left, his end is near.**”
- “In these times in which the poison of the evil one seems to contaminate everything, **the Lord becomes evident** for the salvation of souls.”
- The enemy is defying me very ruthlessly, is openly tempting my children. It is a fight between the light and the darkness. It is a constant persecution to my dear Church.
- **“It is in fact this time, a precious time that does not have to be wasted but to be taken advantage of.** The Redeemer is offering to the world the way to face the death that is Satan; is offering as He did from the Cross, His Mother, mediator of all grace.”
- “The soul must unite itself to Christ each day, and for that, there is nothing better than Holy Communion: the Food of the soul for life.”

Gladys received many of these apparitions in the Cathedral

at Rosario, which is the object of hatred captured in an article entitled "[Feminist Protestors Assault Catholic Cathedral in Argentina](#)" portrayed in the following video:

In times such as these when liberalism is experiencing its last hurrah and spewing its fury at the Church, Jesus refers all Christians to His Mother whom He refers to as "my Ark." He said:

"In the past, the world was saved by the Ark of Noah. Today my mother is the Ark. It is through her, that souls will be saved, because she will lead them to me. He who rejects my mother, rejects me."

Mary spoke several times about a coming victory, it will not come without a spiritual struggle, but *"Jesus Christ will win the great battle, my child..."* **Blessed are those who make reparation** for the grave offences which my Son receives.

Finally, Jesus said: "[My Heart wishes the salvation of all souls and loves them, even those who are in sin.](#)"

Although it is easy to get angry and demand justice for such gross violations and sacrileges, the message here is *not* anger and hatred but, as at Fatima, REPARATION and, as with Divine Mercy, LOVE and COMPASSION, which is the message of Pope Francis. Those men (and women) being spit upon are praying the rosary, and since it is at the cathedral where Our Lady appeared as Our Lady of the Rosary, they are presumably making reparation for those spitting upon them. **Reparation means to make up by your own good deeds for the evils committed by others, especially those committed against God such as the blasphemies, outrages, and sacrileges committed by these radical feminists lost in hatred and shouting slogans such as:**

["Take your rosaries out of our ovaries," "O let's swear to](#)

burn down the Church", and "Church, trash, you're the dictatorship."

CRUX also reports that:

"Several dozen of the Oct. 7-10 workshop participants had gathered in front of the Cathedral of Our Lady of the Rosary and staged a parody, which included topless women dancing around a man dressed as Pope Francis while they sang for the legalization of abortion."

On the contrary,

"In Argentina, life is constitutionally protected from "its conception until natural death." Argentine President Mauricio Macri, as his predecessors before him, has said on several opportunities that he doesn't plan on legalizing abortion, even praying for the protection of life when closing the XI National Eucharistic Congress earlier in the year."

Argentina's Constitution does not allow for abortion; it was strengthened in 1994 by a series of international agreements such as the Pact of San José that declares **a right to life, "from the moment of conception."** In 1995, Argentine President Carlos Menem marked the Annunciation, March 25, as the "Day of the Unborn Child." Under Menem, Argentina announced its complete rejection of abortion and contraception and declared that the defense of life was a "priority of Argentina's foreign policy."

With the election of Nestor Kirchner in 2003, relations between Church and state were somewhat strained as Kirchner's administration clashed with the Church over abortion, sex education, and contraception. In 2007, Kirchner was succeeded by his wife Cristina who, like her husband, supported a host of left-wing moral issues including same-sex

marriage, which was legalized in 2010 leading to massive protests spearheaded by Catholic and Protestant evangelical groups. At that time Pope Francis was the Archbishop of Buenos Aires. In this position, he called on legislators to opposes the bill referring to it as ["a move by the father of lies to confuse and deceive the children of God"](#) (sound like a liberal pope to you?).

The Archbishop also came out against same sex marriage.:

"According to an article in...L'Osservatore Romano, Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio, the Archbishop of Buenos Aires and Primate of Argentina, has said that if a proposed bill giving same-sex couples the opportunity to marry and adopt children should be approved, it will 'seriously damage the family.'"

At stake, he stated is

*"... the identity and survival of the family: father, mother and children. At stake are the lives of many children who will be discriminated against in advance, and deprived of their human development given by a father and a mother and willed by God. At stake is the **total rejection** of God's law engraved in our hearts."*

To fight the bill, he called on the nation's Carmelites for "their [prayers and sacrifice, the two invincible weapons of Santa Teresa](#)." (Does it get more conservative than this?)

In spite of the Kirchner battles, ties between the Catholic Church and Argentine state have remained quite strong.

SO WHY ARGENTINA

In addition to a highly relevant apparition of Our Lady for our time, another reason Argentina is a place to watch is its

confrontation with neo-liberalism. **Will Argentina be for Latin America what Poland was for Eastern Europe?** That is, can Argentina be the vanguard against the many headed behemoth of liberalism controlled by Washington neo-cons and neo-liberals that Poland was against the behemoth of Muscovite Communism, and will Pope Francis and the Virgin Mary have some unique role to play as did the Virgin Mary and Pope John Paul II, until such time as the Church can weather the storm and be in a better position to advance the Gospel and build the Kingdom of God.

ARGENTINA SINCE 2010

Today [Argentina is experiencing a populist resurgence that is eroding liberal democratic institutions](#) in search of a new way toward the future. Scenes as those in the above video, serve only to reinforce national Catholic values and increase disdain for liberalism much as the so-called Trump-Effect is having in America. In Argentina, as elsewhere in Latin America, Argentines are

“...defining a chosen “enemy of the people” (businessmen, foreign and domestic – but especially foreign; the pantomime-devils of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank.”

Argentina also has a new president, Mauricio Macri, leader of the coalition “Let’s Change”. Macri was elected in November 2015. Although identified as a pro-market conservative, the political ramifications of this brand of conservatism

“...escapes the analytical simplifications suggesting a straightforward ‘conservative restoration,’ or a return to the ‘old’ 1990s’ neoliberalism. There is, no doubt, the birth of a new 21st Century’s Right-wing politics in Argentina, as well as in Latin America more generally, electorally competitive and which the nature of Right-wing politics is yet unfolding” ([International Policy Digest](#)).

In short, Argentina is experiencing a climate of change away from neo-liberalism and intent on retaining its Catholic patrimony. (92% of Argentines are Catholic; Argentina has seven Catholic universities and hundreds of elementary and secondary schools funded by the government.

" In Argentina, the connections between the Catholic and the political, the political and the Catholic, pervade, broaden and filter into many different spaces, worlds and spheres."

Thus, in September 2010, "thousands of (liberal) Argentines marched in Buenos Aires to protest the perceived corporate structure of the state and its corrupt ties with business interests, the military, and the Catholic Church. The march's organizer, university professor and political activist Luis D'Elía, proclaimed it "a disgrace that Catholic schools received state subsidies."

***Note:** "Historically, the Argentine church has positioned itself as a non-partisan political advocate, clashing with the government over education, marriage and sexual issues. Tension between church and state reached a high point during the government of Juan Perón, who intervened in religious schools and tried to legalise divorce and prostitution. Many of Perón's supporters suspected the church's hand in the 1955 coup that toppled him, which was carried out mostly by staunchly Catholic military officers" (The Economist).*

Argentina, is now undergoing a bout with neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism (the World Bank and IMF) that might spearhead change throughout Latin America. Will Argentinians play a role vis a vis liberalism that Poles played vis a vis Communism or will they contribute to the Church in some other way being revealed in the pontificate of Pope Francis?

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 Pharisees eshews “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/bP3wPbbFQ6k>

“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 You Tube 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.