

# Catholic Church Must Cooperate with State & Other Religions to Win Peace in Myanmar

[New Era World News and Global Intelligence](#)

POPE FRANCIS IS INVOLVED in a high profile pastoral visit to Myanmar (also known as Burma), a country of 52,000,000 people of whom 700,000 are Catholics (less than 2%) coexisting in a Sea of 46,000,00 Buddhists (almost 90%) and an increasingly distraught Muslim population of 2.2 million people all engaged in a difficult process of transitioning from military rule to democracy. During his visit, the pope met with **Gen. Min Aung Hlaing**, head of the country's military, **Htin Kyaw**, Myanmar's recently elected president, and with Prime Minister and Nobel Peace Prize winner, **Aung San Suu Kyi**, who is also Chairperson of the National League for Democracy, the ruling party that brought Htin Kyaw to power in the 2015 elections.

Suu Kyi has a long history among the ruling elite of her country. In 1947 her father, General Aung San Suu Kyi, fought to promote a federalist system but was assassinated as the country worked to gain independence from Britain, a goal it attained in 1948. Thereafter, the government groped here and there as a secular democracy until 1961 when the Prime Minister declared Buddhism to be the state religion thereby provoking civic unrest among the nation's many ethnic minorities in the north and west, which led to a military coup in 1962 and the establishment of a socialist regime; during which Suu Kyi was placed under house arrest. She was released and re-detained several times prior to her final release in 2010, the same year that a hard fought for democratic election brought a "*nominally*" civilian government to power followed by

the dissolution of the military junta in 2011.

Aung San Suu Kyi's party, the National League for Democracy (NLD), then won a remarkable 80% of the parliamentary seats in the 2015 election with the nation's military leaders retaining about a fifth of the seats. The new president, Htin Kyaw also rode to power on the coattails of the NLD. Although Htin Kyaw was elected president, some say that real power is in the hands of Suu Kyi. Kyaw in fact functioned for many years as the chief advisor to Kyi even as she rose from house arrest to national prominence as leader of their party.

Although Suu Kyi is extremely popular, she was constitutionally barred from being president due to her marriage to a British foreigner contrary to the nation's constitution. Most insiders agree that the constitution was purposefully amended to include this disqualifying provision by the previous military regime to keep Kyi from being president and to help it retain power. Kyi, nonetheless, has abided by the provision and although appointed by the president as "State Counsellor" (Prime Minister), she considers herself the head of state. Certainly, she remains among the most powerful and influential voices in the newly elected government. Thus, it is understandable why the pope would meet with military leaders and both the new president and state counsellor.

The pope's visit with military generals, democratically elected political and party leaders appears to be a politically motivated, the pope, however, is in Myanmar primarily as a pastor.

*According to Francis, the reason for his visit to Myanmar is "above all," to pray with the troubled country's "small but fervent Catholic community, to confirm them in their faith, and to encourage them in their efforts to contribute to the good of the nation."*

According to [Benedict Rogers](#), representing *Christian Solidarity Worldwide*, the Pope's visit is a historic event to confirm the nation's Catholic population and to highlight its contribution to Myanmar:

*"This is a truly historic visit—the first ever papal visit to Myanmar, coming not long after the appointment of Myanmar's first-ever cardinal, Myanmar's first ever beatification and the celebration of 500 years of Catholicism in Myanmar. For such a tiny Catholic population, this is a profoundly significant time."*

Racked by terrorism, political dissent, and sectarian religious division, the pope is there "above all" to strengthen the little Catholic flock and to encourage them to contribute to the good of the nation. **The pastoral nature of his visit is understandable in the broader context of the persecution of Christian minorities in Syria, Iraq, and throughout the Middle East.** Unfortunately, the situation in Myanmar shares some of the attributes associated with the persecution of small Christian communities elsewhere.

### **Why are Christians Threatened in Myanmar?**

Although Myanmar is a predominantly Buddhist country, it has been marred by ongoing civil conflict most recently associated with Sunni Muslims residing in its western provinces, primarily in one of its states named Rakhine a roughly 200 mile swath of land running north-south along the Bay of Bengal. The Muslim population in Myanmar is approximately 2.2 million people; they are referred to as the "Rohingya" by the native population.

Given what has happened to Christian minorities in Syria, Iraq and elsewhere, given that persecution of Christians has been exacerbated by foreign interference, disrespect for, and

limiting the ability of, sovereign nations to solve their own internal problems; given that persecution of Christians has been exacerbated by colonialism, foreign economic interests, political tensions fanned by terrorism, fake news reports and the arming of Islamic terrorists disguised as rebels, given all these things, Pope Francis is concerned about the security of his flock, concerned that the international process that racked the Middle East does not extend into Southeast Asia.

He has therefore become involved early, trying to nip the problem in the proverbial bud before it fatally mushrooms thereby drawing too much international attention and foreign interference, *esp* interference from foreign jihadists such as Al Qaeda, ISIS, Daesh and other Sunni terrorist organizations supported by unwelcome foreign governments and multinational corporate-business interests. The pope has clearly thrown his support behind the new and fragile Myanmar government; he understands that the best bet for the safety of Catholics is to continue cooperation with the legitimate government and by calling on Catholics to contribute to the country's ongoing economic, moral and political development.

The Vicar of Christ is there to remind his flock to seek peace and to ask the nation's leaders to establish justice and promote reconciliation among the nation's many ethnic groups, specifically its Muslim minority, the "Rohingya" whom he has been careful not to mention by name.

*"The future of Myanmar must be peace, a peace based on respect for the dignity and rights of each member of society, respect for each ethnic group and its identity, respect for the rule of law, and respect for a democratic order that enables each individual and every group – none excluded – to offer its legitimate contribution to the common good."*

On this topic, the Holy Father also met with **Cardinal Charles Muang Bo of Yangon**, who cautioned him against using the

inflammatory term “Rohingya” during his visit. Consequently, the pope has avoided using the taboo term to refer to the country’s persecuted Muslim ethnic minority. The government has exacerbated relations with the Muslim minority by failing to accord them full citizenship. These people are treated by the majority population as “interlopers” from nearby Bengal. Recognizing their marginalization, [Cardinal Bo has publicly stated](#) that the Rohingya are the:

*“...most marginalized, dehumanized, and persecuted people in the world ... They are treated worse than animals. Stripped of their citizenship, rejected by neighboring countries, they are rendered stateless. No human being deserves to be treated this way.”*



**Cardinal Archbishop Charles Muang Bo of Yangon Member of the Salesian order and First Cardinal of Myanmar**

According to [Cardinal Bo](#),

*“There is opposition from many in the Buddhist community to the idea of Rohingya citizenship. Even the use of the term Rohingya is a source of national tension. It is the name Rakhine Muslims use to describe themselves, apparently derived from Rohang, a Muslim term for what is now Arakan state in western Myanmar. Rakhine Buddhists object that the term confers historical legitimacy on the Muslim community.”*

The situation is purportedly so egregious that the United Nations (UN) has referred to the The Rohingya as a “persecuted ethnic minority”, victims of a systematic pogrom identified by the UN as “ethnic cleansing.” Although, it is true that the Myanmar government has *not* extended them citizenship, it is probably a stretch to claim that the Rohingya are victims of “ethnic cleansing”.

*“There is no genocide here; ethnic cleansing is not happening”* ([Cardinal Bo](#))

It might be more appropriate to understand the Buddhist majority government acting in defense of the common good against threats from radical Muslims. On this note, [the Rohingya are not welcome in India](#) which has been [systematically avoiding trouble by deporting them](#). Islamic extremists are becoming more vocal and threatening. According to ABC News

*“Al Qaeda has disseminated a statement urging Muslims around the world to send aid, weapons and military support to Rohingya Muslims in the majority Buddhist Rakhine state... Al Qaeda has warned Myanmar will face punishment for its “crimes against the Rohingyas”.*

*“The savage treatment meted out to our Muslim brothers ...*

*shall not pass without punishment," Al Qaeda said in a statement, according to the SITE monitoring group...The Government of Myanmar shall be made to taste what our Muslim brothers have tasted" ([ABC News](#)).*

Supposed genocide in Myanmar *might* be prompting Islamic terrorism or acts of terrorism *might* be prompting severe counter-measures; either way, **the pope's first concern is the safety and security of the Catholic population and, of course, peace among the broader population.**

As noted, Francis, comes to Myanmar as a peacemaker having full cognizance that the people of Myanmar have "*suffered greatly, and continue to suffer, from civil conflict and hostilities that have lasted all too long and created deep divisions.*" The pope realizes that in spite of the radicalization of many Muslims, grievances are rooted in poor economic opportunities and and political disregard culminating in the denial of justice and fair treatment. Despite their radicalization which is used to legitimize countermeasures taken against them, there are also reasons to believe that if the Muslim minority is treated more equitably and justly, they might be integrated into the broader national community.

Thus, the healing of the nation's ethnic wounds

*"...must be a paramount political and spiritual priority... Indeed, the arduous process of peacebuilding and national reconciliation can only advance through a commitment to justice and respect for human rights," he added.*

The situation is exceedingly fragile. Myanmar has been under military rule and is only now undergoing a transition to civil rule *albeit* still heavily dependent on the military to maintain peace. Myanmar's State Counselor, Aung San Suu Kyi, seems to appreciate the pope's command of the complexities embroiling her divided country. Like Francis, she too refrains

from referring to the Muslim minority as “Rohingya,” but rather referred to the current crisis as the “*situation in the (state of) Rakhine,*” that has “*captured the attention of the world.*”

Speaking to the pope, she said

*“As we address long standing issues, social, economic and political, that have eroded trust and understanding, harmony and cooperation, between different communities in Rakhine, the support of our people and of good friends who only wish to see us succeed in our endeavors, has been invaluable.”*

Aung San recognizes the threat of militant Islam, but also understands that it might be ameliorated by acts of social justice with support from the international community.

In other words, both she and the pope realize that any involvement by foreign elements intent on covert operations, or of supporting the Muslim minority by unwelcome political or economic activities is anathema. **Myanmar needs to solve its own problems and it can do best if it is assisted to work toward justice in a spirit of charity, healing wounds rather than exacerbating them** or having them exacerbated by unwanted outside interference such as US and EU involvement, which have caused significant unrest and devastation in the Middle East and North Africa.

Francis is helping lead a chorus of voices beginning to resound globally: **Sovereign nations have a right to determine their own futures.** The age of imperialism and colonialism seems to be waning. Likewise, the dignity of human beings and corollary recognition of the sovereign rights of nations to determine their own destinies as well as settle internal conflicts free of unsolicited political interference is an increasingly salient issue.

Myanmar needs to put its own house in order; in this process



its religious communities can be of great assistance. Thus, **Francis also held a private meeting with the Myanmar's religious leaders: Buddhists, Muslims, Protestants, Catholics and Hindus.** According to the pope,

*Myanmar's religious communities have a "privileged role to play" in the process of national reconciliation. Religious differences, he argued, don't need to be a source of "division and distrust," but a "force for unity, forgiveness, tolerance and wise nation building."*

The nation's religions, he said, "drawing on deeply-held values," can "help to uproot the causes of conflict, build bridges of dialogue, seek justice and be a prophetic voice for all who suffer."

In this regard, **Archbishop Bo's elevation to Cardinal is instrumental for reconciliation in Myanmar**: On November, 2014, the pope made him the first Myanmar bishop ever raised to the rank of cardinal, **an elevation that has positively affected his ability to facilitate peace in his own country.** Cardinal Bo stated that his elevation has been

*"... important in front of the government, and in front of the Buddhist community, and in front of the Muslims and the Hindus. They acknowledge my personal role in the country and especially for the uniting the different religious people."*

Consequently,

*"The Catholic Church in Myanmar is trying to help address the civil war and the plight of the Rohingya. The bishops' conference organized a two-day religious peace conference, from April 26 to 27, attended by 200 people from all religions, including Buddhist monks, Muslim and Hindu religious leaders, many ambassadors and various international non-governmental organizations...The conference established*

*working groups for nation building in five areas: education, peacebuilding, religious harmony, special care for children and women and development”*

The cardinal also stated that

*“Practically every month, we have meetings on peacebuilding, which include the Buddhist monks, the Hindus, Muslims and the other Christians. We work together.”*

[The Holy See](#), he says, “hopes that Myanmar will continue on the direction of democracy that it has taken in recent years.”

*“That is our hope, to..., “but how the church will promote the democracy is left also to us.” Right now, his main concern “is how we can help in building peace with the different ethnic groups, with the government, with the military, and how can we come up with a new constitution since there cannot be any amendment to the present one because of how the military framed it.”*

The pope lauded this mutual cooperation as a “great sign of hope.”

*“In seeking to build a culture of encounter and solidarity, they contribute to the common good and to laying the indispensable moral foundations for a future of hope and prosperity for coming generations.”*

On Wednesday, the pope will meet with the country’s Catholic bishops, say Mass at the Kyaikkasan Ground, and imaging Cardinal Bo, he will also meet the Buddhist Sangha Supreme Council. It is hoped the Myanmar can avoid the terrorism that has devastated the Middle East and be helped by *disinterested* foreign nations to establish democracy, economic viability, establish social justice and work for human development in pursuit of peace.

---

# Surprise UN Decision Backed by US: Sex Education Must Include Parents

[New Era World News and Global Intelligence](#)

UNEXPECTED MOVEMENTS TOWARD CHRISTIANITY and traditional moral-family values are occurring throughout [Poland](#), [Hungary](#), [Russia](#) and other European nations. Surprisingly, the United Nations (UN) is beginning to feel similar effects as emerging third world nations are successfully demanding respect for their sovereign rights as independent states, states endowed with indigenous cultural patrimonies often antithetical to the dominance of liberalism that has guided UN global policies for decades.

Late last week (November 24), Saint Lucia, an independent Eastern Caribbean nation [admitted to the UN in 1979](#) as its 152nd member, was the first nation to introduce an amendment signaling an unusual challenge and unexpected change to [UN program for Comprehensive Sexual Education](#). The **delegate from Saint Lucia boldly proposed to the UN General Assembly that parental guidance language be introduced into the section of UN global policies dealing with sex education of adolescents and youth ten years old and older.**

[The delegate noted](#) that **prevailing policies are “not adequate” because they disregard the primary role played by parents in the education and socialization of their own children:**

*“Parents and the family play an important role in guiding children.”*

Parents are the first educators of their own children; however, she noted, current and proposed UN legislation diminishes parents to the status of equal partners with informal state agencies such as health care providers and public school educators.

The African delegates were most vocal: “Any program committing states or the UN system to providing sex education should include a caveat on ‘appropriate direction and guidance from parents and legal guardians.’”

**The scene was epic;** according to the [Center for Family and Human Rights](#) (CFHR):

*“There were audible gasps from the floor of the UN conference room on Monday morning as the vote tally of the UN third committee appeared on the overhead screen. **The vote was close. Parental guidance in sex education unexpectedly won the day, with the United States voting in favor.**”*

Did you read the final clause: **“United States voting in favor.”** These words represent an equally unexpected break from the international norm: US votes in favor of family rights. What is going on? **Is the Trump effect resounding in the UN; is the victory promised by Our Lady at Fatima continuing to pick up momentum?**

It was *not* the United States which proposed the resolution, but they did support it. However unexpected and welcome that support might have been, [the greatest support came from among the African nations](#):

*“The Africans were adamant that any resolution committing states or the UN system to providing sex education should include a caveat on appropriate direction and guidance from parents and legal guardians.”*

Liberal voices that have dominated the UN for decades were

nonplussed:

*“Visibly frustrated European and Latin American delegates called for a vote on these amendments, a request only made in UN negotiations when the stakes are high. More often than not these delegations are able to use the rules of procedure to their advantage. This time they were outmaneuvered by the Africans in three resolutions” (CFHR).*

Representatives of the European Union disagreed as did delegates from Latin America who claimed the proposal was “highly problematic”, while those from Canada refused to accept it: “We cannot accept this.” The Norwegian delegate offered a more transparent evaluation, an evaluation that touches upon the core issue, the issue being put forward by the delegate from Saint Lucy and Africa. According to this delegate from Norway, the amendment is unacceptable because:

*“‘Children (ten years of age) should decide freely and autonomously’” on matters involving reproductive health and sexualuality.”*

A more sober minded Egyptian delegate voiced the more traditional Christian, Islamic, and Judaic perspective:

*“Our African culture respects parental rights,” and, “Egypt rejects attempts of certain countries to impose their education system on others.”*

Most notably,

*“The United States and the Holy See emphasized the role of parents in sex education and rejected abortion as a component of sexual and reproductive health.”*

Will the UN be able to enforce this new policy-program amendment as part of its comprehensive program for sexual

education? With the US and the Holy See supporting the amendment, it might have a chance. The greater question has to do with sovereign nations exercising their inalienable rights to choose for themselves what direction they prefer to advance. Is this not what liberals have been adamant about for centuries: free choice, self-determination, democracy, respect for the beliefs of others etcetera. If they are really advocates of these values why are they so upset in the UN?

---

# Giving Thanks for President Trump as He Launches A 'New Era' in Foreign Relations

[New Era News and Global Intelligence](#)

**NEW ERA NEWS AND GLOBAL INTELLIGENCE** was created to (1) report on global developments indicative of a perceptible New Era dawning on humanity, an Era of Peace as promised by Our Lady of Fatima and (2) to provide Intelligence Reports containing political, economic, historical-cultural, philosophical and theological analysis-synthesis indicative of the current international shift away from *Global Liberalism* toward a universal Era of Peace, an Era of Cooperation away from the conflict and inordinate economic development that has favored a few while working to the human detriment of many, something Saint John Paul II referred to as a "degradation" and "pulverization" of the human person perpetrated by the ideologues of hedonistic and atheistic materialism.

New Era has been reporting on international developments

indicative of an emerging global shift since its inception; this little recognized intelligence perspective is catching on. At once perceptible only to the trained eye, changing world events have gained such magnitude that other news and intelligence agencies are NOW reporting the same things (*albeit* from different perspectives). Thus, on November, 17 the LaRouche PAC released an Executive Intelligence Report entitled: **“Trump Visit Launches New Era in U.S.-China Relations”**. Just a few days later, November 20, Covert Geopolitics released a follow up article entitled *“Chinese Ambassador Sets the Record Straight on Importance of Xi-Trump Meeting”* in which they embedded the LaRouche pronouncement: **“Trump Visit Launches New Era in U.S.-China Relations”**.

President Trump, despite relentless attacks within his own country and within his own party, despite the unprecedented animus aimed at him by liberals and ultra-conservatives alike, despite these things, the president is gaining strength in the international arena. This is a rapidly changing arena in which many countries are looking for an alternative to liberal democracy and hedonistic capitalism, **a new way forward, a way of shared cooperation, a way of prosperity and peace for all nations**, not just a few, a way that Our Lady referred to as an Era of Peace from which our own intelligence agency took its name: *“New Era News and Global Intelligence”*.

New Era forecast a bludgeoning of the new president until such time that he would enter the international arena, an arena in which he would become more deeply exposed to, and informed about, global developments, *developments antithetical to the liberalism that is smothering him at home*. Once the President of the United States moved beyond the confines of domestic politics and waded into international waters, once he began to rub shoulders with his international peers, once he got out from under the barrage of crippling criticism, once he did these things, he would acquire strength from his relations

with other newly emerging leaders from Poland-Hungary to the Philippines, China and Taiwan, **a unique group of men and women offering a new anti-liberal perspective, an anti-liberal perspective that is being unsuccessfully opposed by liberal leaders like George Soros in Hungary and in the broader international arena by the same people who are successfully opposing the president at home.** These Neocon war hawks and advanced Liberal ideologues remain committed to an outdated program of economic-political-moral liberalism, the liberalism that is bankrupting any nations both financially and morally as well as spiritually; in fact, John Paul II indicated that the etiology (origin) of this liberalism is more spiritual than moral:

*“This evil is even much more of the metaphysical than of the moral order.”*

This, most likely, being the case, its cure rests more on a spiritual movement than on a moral or political movement; nonetheless both the spiritual and temporal are integral to the new frontal assault against the gates of hell that is emerging, a new offensive against which the gates of hell cannot prevail:

*“And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Matt 16:18).*

THE SLAVIC LEADERS OF EASTERN EUROPE AND THE ASIAN LEADERS OF PHILIPPINES, CHINA AND TAIWAN ARE SUCCESSFULLY OPPOSING LIBERALISM AROUND THE GLOBE thereby setting off a delirious liberal assault of unprecedented proportion (see video below) including a vicious attack on Pope Francis in Argentina and by Neocon Conservatives, Radical Traditionalists and frenzied Liberals worldwide:



Despite the frantic frenzy that has agitated and united opposition legions, despite this broad panoply of evil arrayed against Christianity, President Trump, other newly emerging world leaders, and men and women of goodwill, are rising to the occasion. Despite this onslaught of distraught liberalism, [something new is on the horizon; it is being forwarded by emerging leaders beginning with the rise of Catholicism in Poland as Our Lord foretold to Saint Faustina early in the twentieth century.](#)

The political forces that Mr. Trump faces falsely present themselves as adamant conquerors; however, in reality, they are being defeated all over the globe as one fed-up leader after another rises up to the challenge. These men and women are drawing spiritual strength from prayer and political strength from each other; these newly emerging world-leaders share a vision similar to that of the American President: **a vision of international peace, of global cooperation, of more broad spread prosperity, respect of religion, a commitment to cultural traditions and indigenous values and broad scale human development, while mutually opposing the stranglehold of globalism** favored by the ideologues and adepts of left-over liberalism.

Although Mr. Trump does *not* appear to be as instructed or politically adroit in these matters as his contemporaries, he appears to be learning fast and gaining strength through his association with them. [Donald Trump, like Vladimir Putin, might soon have to watch what he eats and drinks.](#) Like other emerging leaders, Mr. Trump is in danger from many forces, forces that are disturbing his presidency; nonetheless, [he has recently spoken about their unconstitutional endeavors to sideline him.](#) The president recently spoke up in wake of his his impromptu meeting with President Putin while traveling in Asia; his words came just days prior to his three day visit with the Chinese President, Xi Jinping. New Era felt that the

American President would draw strength from his encounter with world leaders; apparently he has; nonetheless he still faces stiff opposition at home, an opposition that is weakening and resorting to increasingly ineffective fake news narratives, funded protests, and by now old and worn strategies that are less and less convincing to the American people.

It is no longer New Age alone that is reporting the emergence of a broad group of newly minded world leaders opposed to liberalism; below are excerpts from the article released by LaRouche and then also ran by Covert Geopolitics, ["Trump Visit Launches New Era in U.S.-China Relations."](#)

### **Trump Visit Launches New Era in U.S.-China Relations.**

**"The three-day visit of President Donald Trump to the People's Republic of China for talks with Chinese President Xi Jinping has laid the basis for an entirely new type of relationship between the United States and China, and built the framework for cooperation for a policy of global development.**

Before President Trump left on his 11-day trip to Asia, the media and the pundits were filled with articles claiming that the President was going to create a provocation against the DPRK (North Korea), give a dressing down to the South Korean President for being soft on the DPRK, and wrangle on trade issues with the Chinese President.

But none of that happened. On the contrary, in his encounters with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, with South Korean President Moon Jae-in, and most decisively with Chinese President Xi Jinping, President Donald Trump proved himself an eminent statesman, leaving each leader with the clear feeling that this visit by the U.S. President had been a tremendous success.



White House/Andrea Hanks President Xi (left) and President Trump being greeted Nov. 10 during his visit to China.

While President Trump's task on his lengthy Asia tour was in part to reassure allies that the United States was not turning its back on this all-important region of the world, he did *not* come in as the belligerent leader of some threatening coalition, but rather as a friend and collaborator with each leader. While he minced no words in speaking to the South Korean National Assembly about his disdain for the policies of the North Korean leadership, at the same time he pointed out that there could be a "brighter path for North Korea," if it were willing to relinquish its nuclear ambitions. More important, he came to Asia with the understanding that the rising importance of China in the world community was not a threat but **an opportunity—an opportunity to change the direction of politics, toward a more peaceful and prosperous world for all peoples.**

What the media and the pundits also ignored in their ominous predictions, was the fact that the U.S. President had already established a substantial and close relationship with the Chinese President, as a result of their four personal meetings and numerous phone calls and messages. President Trump had sent congratulations to President Xi after the 19th Party Congress accepted Xi's new direction in policy with **his proposal for a "New Era" in China's foreign policy,** and had

incorporated the goals of President Xi's seminal Belt and Road Initiative into the Communist Party's constitution. And President Trump's unusual invitation earlier this year to President Xi and his wife to visit him at his home in Mar-a-Lago, provided an extraordinary personal touch, the significance of which did not go unnoticed by the Chinese leader.

## More Than a State Visit



First Lady and President Trump being welcomed by China President Xi Jinping (center) and his wife, Peng Liyuan (right) at square outside the East Gate of the Great Hall of the People in Beijing

The Chinese President more than reciprocated this kindness in the welcome he gave to President Trump and his wife, Melania, in Beijing. It was labeled a “state visit-plus” by the Chinese Ambassador to the United States, Cui Tiankai, and a “state visit-plus-plus” by President Xi! Neither level of welcome has ever occurred before.

In an extraordinary gesture, the historic Forbidden City, previously the home of the Chinese emperors, was entirely closed, and it was prepared as the venue for a private dinner

with a foreign dignitary Nov. 8. While many major foreign guests, and in particular heads of state, often visit the Forbidden City when they first come to Beijing, this was the first time since the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949 that a foreign dignitary was invited to dine in a palace of the Forbidden City.

The guide for the President and his wife on a tour of the Palace Museum located in the Forbidden City, was none other than President Xi himself. Both President Xi and his wife, Peng Liyuan, took President Trump and his wife, Melania, on a tour through the Forbidden City. And what better guide for such a tour than the Chinese President, whose keen sense of the history of the Chinese people is so much a fabric of his own being. More than a tour through a famous monument, this was undoubtedly an extremely important exposure for the U.S. President to the long arc of Chinese history and culture—a culture which most profoundly shapes the attitudes and the policies of China today.

President Trump in turn showed President Xi and his wife a videotape of his 6-year old granddaughter, Arabella Kushner, who started learning Chinese when she was 18 months old. Arabella had already performed for President Xi and his wife when they visited President Trump in Mar-a-Lago in April, and has become quite a celebrity in China ever since. The couples viewed the video on an iPad while in the Forbidden City. Arabella greeted “Grandpa Xi” and “Grandma Peng” in Chinese, characterizing the closeness and respect exhibited by Trump family members toward the Chinese couple following the Mar-a-Lago visit. She then sang several songs and recited from a number of Chinese poems which she knew by heart—to the delight of her audience.

The next day, President Trump and the First Lady arrived at the Great Hall of the People for President Trump's formal meetings with President Xi. He was greeted at the bottom of the steps by President Xi and Madame Peng, and was then

escorted by the Chinese President to a reviewing stand outside the Great Hall where he reviewed military formations assembled there in his honor and received a 21-gun salute. The two presidents then individually greeted all the members of both delegations lined up before the Great Hall, before proceeding into the building for the formal discussions.

The major issues to be covered, and those most reported on in the media were: trade, the DPRK nuclear program, and the future development of U.S.-China relations. But they also touched on the Middle East, Afghanistan, counterterrorism, anti-drug cooperation, non-proliferation, and nuclear security. The two presidents committed to make the most of the four high-level dialogue mechanisms: the diplomatic and security dialogue, the comprehensive economic dialogue, the social and people-to-people dialogue, and the cyber-security dialogue, in order to achieve greater results in their cooperation.

In remarks to the press conference following their meeting, President Xi underlined the importance of the enhanced economic cooperation between the two countries.

*“It is necessary to formulate and launch an economic cooperation plan for the next phase to have continued in-depth discussion on trade imbalance, export, investment environment, market openness, and other issues, and work to support practical cooperation in energy, infrastructure, the Belt and Road Initiative, and other areas.”*

Following the meeting, the **two presidents signed agreements and memoranda of understanding worth \$250 billion**. China agreed to purchase 300 aircraft from Boeing. China has also signed an agreement to purchase natural gas from Alaska. In this agreement between the State of Alaska and Alaska Gasline Development Corporation, on the one side, and Chinese Sinopec, China Investment Corporation, and the Bank of China, on the

other, **China will invest \$43 billion, which is expected to create 12,000 new jobs in the U.S.A.** There is also an **\$84 billion plan for China to invest in shale gas and chemical manufacturing projects in West Virginia.** A memorandum of understanding was signed to that effect. Another deal involves China purchasing Liquified Natural Gas from Louisiana. All in all, **over 37 major deals were signed**, including deals by three companies heavily involved in the Belt and Road Initiative—Caterpillar, Honeywell, and General Electric—and Dow Chemical Company.”

According to the LaRouche Intelligence Report:

“During the meetings, President Xi Jinping and President Donald Trump “held an in-depth exchange of views and reached an important consensus which set the tone and the direction for the relationship.”

*“The two leaders agreed to stay in close contact with each other and to provide strategic guidance for the bilateral relationship. And the two sides decided to enhance high-level exchanges and make best use of the high-level dialogues established. The two also agreed to increase mutually beneficial cooperation in various fields and manage possible differences on the basis of mutual respect. The two also agreed to promote mutual understanding and friendship between the two peoples and to promote even better cooperation at a sub-national level,”*

Both presidents also agreed to join hands in response to global, international and regional issues, including the Korean Peninsula nuclear issue.” They signed many economic agreements totalling \$250 billion of the as cited above. The Chinese Ambassador to the United States Cui Tiankai reiterated the fundamentals of China’s foreign policy. China, he said

*“...will never seek hegemony, nor will we pursue expansionist policies.” China’s foreign policy “aims at a new type of*

*international relations featuring mutual respect, fairness, justice and win-win cooperation. China is ready to make greater contributions to world peace and development.”*

## **Partnership and Dialogue of Cultures**

But far more important than the individual trade deals coming out of these negotiations, was the strengthening of the personal relationship between the leaders of two of the most important countries in the world. In his comments to the press following the meetings, President Trump underlined the real significance of the visit:

*“The United States, working with China and other regional partners, has **an incredible opportunity to advance the cause of peace, security, and prosperity all across the world.** It’s **a very special time**, and we do indeed have that very, very special opportunity. A great responsibility has been placed on our shoulders, President—it’s truly a great responsibility—and I hope we can rise to the occasion and help our countries and our citizens reach their highest destinies and their fullest potentials.”*

In his comments at the banquet, President Xi himself compared Trump’s visit to the visit of President Nixon 45 years ago, noting the tremendous importance of that visit in re-establishing U.S.-China relations:

*“President Trump, the state visit to China is another event of historic importance. Over the past two days, we have had in-depth exchange of views on how China and the United States should seize the opportunity, rise up to the challenges, and open up new grounds in our relations. Together, we have mapped out a blueprint for advancing China-U.S. relations. We both agree that China and the United States should remain*



*partners, not rivals. We both agree that when we work together, we can accomplish many great things to the benefit of our two countries and the whole world."*

President Trump iterated the emerging anti-liberal global vision:

*"This moment in history presents both our nations with **an incredible opportunity to advance peace and prosperity alongside other nations all around the world...** I am confident that we can realize this wonderful vision, a vision that will be so good and, in fact, so great for both China and the United States."*

Take time to reflect upon these statements by the two presidents. "The implications of what we are witnessing are historic, and contain the potential to change the life of every person on this planet for the better. [It is a potential for moving the entire world into an "Era of Peace" and economic development.](#)"

President Trump wants to collaborate with China and with Russia in order to begin to tackle those world problems that can only be resolved through such collaboration." [Will President Trump be an instrumental agent in bringing about political peace. The congressional elections this coming November will be instrumental in his plans to do so.](#)

**Watch US Media Try to Discredit Foreign Policy Initiatives of President Trump who Prefers Peace rather than Aggression of Neocons and Liberals**

---

# A Nation Built on God? Christian Pilgrims versus Masonic Founders

[New Era World News](#)

[ACCESS E-Book](#)

**Intelligence Report  
American Foundations #1**

**CONSTITUTION DAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1787** was an auspicious day on which the people of the United States celebrated the ratification of their constitution and inauguration of their new government. Strangely, the laws by which the new Christian nation would govern itself were *not* drawn from Christian inspiration, nor was the church involved, to any significant degree, in the debates leading to ratification of the United States Constitution.

*“Where a hundred years before (before ratification of the constitution) every case, whether civil, political or criminal, was decided by a reference to the Old or New Testament ... in “The Federalist” the Bible and Christianity, as well as the clergy, are passed over as having no bearing upon the political issues being discussed.”* [\[1\]](#)

**The American idea that constitutional law, rather than divine law is the supreme law of the land, and that other ideas such as the separation of church and state (condemned as a “pernicious error” by Saint Pope Pius X, [Vehementer Nos](#)); popular sovereignty (versus sovereignty of God) [\[2\]](#); the**

subordination of the church in educational affairs (versus the primacy of the spiritual over the temporal); and the constitutional approval of worship of false gods (approved by the first amendment) **were not drawn from the bible**. They were all drawn from the revered writings of Ancient pagan philosophers and European philosophers of the Enlightenment.

The United States Constitution is *not* a compilation of Christian principles of law and governance; neither Jesus Christ nor the idea of a “Christian nation”, are mentioned anywhere in the Constitution. **According to the first amendment, the national government cannot advance Christian ideas** (such as the existence and primacy of the Holy Trinity, the divine commandments to have no other gods and to keep the Sabbath holy and the command to honor your parents); **yet Jesus said, “If you love me, keep my commandments. (John 14:15)”**.

Neither the name of Jesus nor the idea of Holy Trinity can be found anywhere in the nation’s supreme governing document, even the amorphous, syncretic, and eclectic idea of “Nature’s God[3]” proclaimed in the [\*Declaration of Independence\*](#) is absent. God is absent, and more importantly, Christ is absent. **Most importantly and contrary to Christian doctrine and sacred scripture**, which teach that all law and authority come from God (Ephesians 1:21-22; Matthew 28:18; John 19:11), **the Preamble to the US Constitution informs us that power and authority are derived from the will of the people**, as if truth in moral and political matters could be determined by majority consensus. By the time we advance to Article Six, we are informed that the Constitution is the *supreme law of the land*. Clearly, Jesus is no longer honored as the lawgiver as He had been in the eyes of the original colonial founders, whose ideas, sentiments, and political ideas are proclaimed in the original legal charters that bear His name.

Subsequent to the ratification of the new federal constitution, one by one, fledgling state governments, following the lead of the Washington crowd, removed the name

of Jesus Christ (found in 9 of the 13 original colonial charters) from their newly fashioned state constitutions. And then, over the course of the next century, they would further remove state constitutional requirements that an office holder be a "Christian" from their respective constitutions in acquiescence to the United States Constitution's mandate against "religious tests" for office:

*"Senators and Representatives...and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States" ([Article VI](#)).*

Therefore, the religious test provision of this article and any other anti-Christian provisions contained in, or purported to be implicit in any other article (for example, the highly questionable and ambiguous right to privacy purportedly implicit in the ninth, third, first and fourth [amendments](#)[4]) , would be slowly "incorporated" into the state constitutions, *as decided by the United States Supreme Court*, over the course of years by recourse to the [14th amendment](#) (Due Process, Equal Protection, and Privileges and Immunities Clauses) and to the "Supremacy Clause", Article VI:

*"This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."*

By the dawn of the 18th century (before the United States Constitution ever existed), 8 of the 13 original colonies had

instituted [some form of monetary-state-support for Christian religion](#) in their *Founding Charters* (Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, New York, Virginia, Maryland, South Carolina, and North Carolina). The other five (Pennsylvania, Georgia, New Jersey, Delaware, Rhode Island) did not offer monetary-support, but were Christian by *Charter*.

Some of the more notable *Charters* were:

The [Connecticut Charter](#) (1662), which clearly favored the Christian faith: Residents were required to have “the knowledge and obedience of the onely true God and Saviour of mankind, and the Christian faith.”

The [Charter of Delaware](#) (1701), which required belief in Jesus Christ to serve in public office: “All Persons who also profess to believe in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the World, shall be capable...to serve this Government in any Capacity, both legislatively and executively.”

Likewise, King Charles II in issuing the [Charter of Rhode Island](#) (1663) recognized the Christian intentions of its founders: “They, pursueing, with peaceable and loyall minces, their sober, serious and religious intentions, of ...edifieing themselves, and one another, in the holie Christian faith and worship.”

The [Charter of Massachusetts Bay](#) (1629) clearly explains the intention to establish a Christian “Plantation”: Whereby our said People...may be soe religiously, peaceable, and civilly governed, as their good Life and orderlie Conversation, maie wynn and incite the Natives of Country, to the Knowledg and Obedience of the onlie true God and Savior of Mankinde, and the Christian Fayth, which in our Royall Intention... is the principall Ende of this Plantation.

At the dawn of the Revolution and in the aftermath of the 18th century, the following *State Constitutions* contained a specifically Christian religious requirement for citizenship

or to hold office:

**Constitution of Delaware** (1776) Oath of Office:

“I \_\_\_\_\_, do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, One God, blessed for evermore.”

**Constitution of North Carolina** (1776):

“No person, who shall deny the being of God or the truth of the Protestant religion, or the divine authority of the Old or New Testaments ...., shall be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit in the civil department within this State.”

**Constitution of Maryland** (1776) Article XXXIII:

“As it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to him; all persons, professing the Christian religion, are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty...”

**Constitution of New Jersey** (1776):

“All persons, professing a belief in the faith of *any Protestant sect*, who shall demean themselves peaceably under the government, as hereby established, shall be capable of being elected into any office of profit or trust...”

**Constitution of Pennsylvania** (1776) Oath for Representatives:

“I do believe in one God, the Creator and Governor of the Universe, the rewarder of the good and punisher of the wicked. And I do acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine inspiration.”

**Constitution of Georgia** (1777) Article VI:

“Representatives shall be chosen out of the residents in each county, who shall have resided at least twelve months in this

State...and they shall be of the Protestant religion.”

[Constitution of Vermont](#) (1777) Frame of Government, Section 9:

“And each member [of the legislature],...shall make and subscribe the following declaration, viz.:

‘I do believe in one god, the Creator and Governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and punisher of the wicked. And I do acknowledge the scriptures of the old and new testament to be given by divine inspiration, and own and profess the Protestant religion.’”

[Constitution of South Carolina](#) (1778) Article XXXVIII:

“God is publicly to be worshipped. That the Christian religion is the true religion. That the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are of divine inspiration, and are the rule of faith and practice”.

[Constitution of Massachusetts](#) (1780) Chapter VI “Article I”:

Any person chosen governor, lieutenant-governor, councillor, senator, or representative, shall, before he proceed to execute the duties of his place or office, make and subscribe the following declaration:

“I, A.B., do declare that I believe the Christian religion, and have a firm persuasion of its truth.”

“The people of this commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the *public worship of God*, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily.  
(Article III)

Constitution of New Hampshire (1792) Section XIV required all legislators to be Protestant (Christian).

“Every member of the house of representatives shall be chosen by ballot, and for two years at least next preceding his election shall have been an inhabitant of this State, shall have an estate within the district which he may be chosen to represent, of the value of one hundred pounds, one-half of which to be a freehold, whereof he is seized in his own right; shall be at the time of his election an inhabitant of the town, parish, or place he may be chosen to represent; shall be of the Protestant religion, and shall cease to represent such town, parish, or place immediately on his ceasing to be qualified as aforesaid.

Section XXIX made the same religious rule applicable to all senators and Section XLII required the governor to be Christian.

Article VI guaranteed all Christians equal protection of the law:

*“Every denomination of Christians demeaning themselves quietly, and as good subjects of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the law: and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another, shall ever be established by law.*

After the Founding Fathers crafted the supreme governing document, the United States Constitution, things began to change rather quickly. George Mason, a member of the Virginia delegation that met in Philadelphia for the Constitutional Convention, smelled a rat; he was one of three delegates who refused to sign the finished document. Instead, he became an anti-federalist *and fought* ratification of the Constitution. According to Mason, the plan was

*“...totally subversive of every principle which has hitherto*



*governed us. This power is calculated to annihilate totally the state governments."*

It appears that Mason's fears were realized. **In the aftermath of the United States Constitution, the specifically Christian characteristics of these colonial charters and state constitutions were either removed or slowly amended to reflect the more eclectic and amorphous "god", which of course can be any "god" pagan, Christian, Hindu, Islamic etc.** By 1818 Connecticut, along with all the other Christian states, was holding on by a string. Its governing elite had managed to remove religious tests for office and were in the process of completely ending state support for Christian churches. This complex maneuver was accomplished by adroitly recognizing *all* denominations and permitting each to levy a tax to support its own projects (by such *apparent* support, the state was reducing the sting):

*"And each and every society or denomination of christians (sic) in this state, shall have and enjoy the same and equal powers, rights and privileges; and shall have power and authority to support and maintain the ministers or teachers of their respective denominations, and to build and repair houses for public worship, by a tax on the members of any such society only, to be laid by a major vote of the legal voters assembled at any society meeting, warned and held according to law, or in any other manner."* [\[5\]](#)

By ignoring Jesus Christ and secularizing religion, the Framers treated Christ with an arrogant air of indifference as if He had never founded a kingdom or as if the one He had founded had somehow become irrelevant. In the process, they opened the doors to future full scale apostasy. If they had established a Christian government, as many ultra-nationalist Christians proclaim, they should have founded it on Him as the cornerstone and provided the nation with a Christian document

and with Christian laws rooted in the revealed divine law, specifically the Decalogue and the Gospels as the basis for constitutional and statutory law.

Pope Pius XI recognized this social and political verity in his encyclical, [Quas Primas](#) (1925) He quotes the Prophet Daniel:

*“The kingdom that the God of heaven shall found, ‘shall never be destroyed, and shall stand forever.’”*

Then after the resurrection,

*“...when giving to his Apostles the mission of teaching and baptizing all nations he took the opportunity to call himself king, conforming the title publicly, and solemnly proclaiming that all power was given to him in heaven *and on earth.*”*

Pope Pius reminds us moreover that,

*“It is a dogma of faith that Jesus Christ was given to man, not only as our Redeemer, but also as a law-giver, to whom obedience is due.”*

*“Manifold evils in the world were due to the fact that the majority of men had thrust Jesus Christ and his holy law out of their lives; that these had no place either in private affairs or in politics...As long as individuals and states refused to submit to the rule of our Savior, there would be no really hopeful prospect of a lasting peace among nations.”*

Unfortunately, by lobbying for the acceptance of the *first amendment*, which permits the free exercise of almost any religion and prohibits state support of, or public avowal of the Christian faith as the foundation of its institutions and laws (as it had been for the states), the federal government rejected the ceremonial requirements of the Decalogue and in so doing violated the first three commandments[\[6\]](#) and in

effect had “thrust Jesus and his holy law out of their lives.” A nation that violates even one of the commandments can hardly be called a Christian nation – yet before the ink was dry on the first amendment, we had already violated about a third of them.

The **Sixth Article of the US Constitution** contains the provision most at odds with the contention that the American Government is the result of Christian inspiration. **According to this article, it is the Constitution rather than the law of God, which is to be accepted, ratified, and affirmed as the “supreme law” of the land.** If America were a Christian nation it would not permit laws contrary to the law of God and would have instituted a government under the kingship of Christ ([as Church and State leaders of Poland recently did](#)). But, the Framers, contrary to the colonial founders, had an aversion to kings and a reluctance to build a new nation on Christian principles. According to McGuffey’s 1800 reader (used in almost every colonial school in America), wherever they settled, **America’s original founders established governments that were:**

*“Theocratical insomuch that it would be difficult to say where there was any civil authority among them distinct from ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Whenever a few of them settled a town, they immediately gathered themselves into a church; and their elders were magistrates, and their code of laws was the Pentateuch... God was their King; and they regarded him as truly and literally.”*

**They wanted to build the kingdom of God based upon the laws of God.** John Cotton, the first minister of Boston insisted that

*“...the government might be considered as a theocracy, wherein the Lord was judge, lawgiver and king; that the laws which He gave Israel might be adopted...”* [\[7\]](#)

Consequently, Cotton was asked to frame a set of laws using the laws of Moses as his model.

But according to the new constitution,

*“No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state” (Article 1, Section 9).*

Thus, from the very beginning, the Kingship of Christ is ruled out, because **according to thinkers such as Thomas Jefferson, “The Christian God is a being of terrific character – cruel, vindictive, capricious, and unjust”** (Jefferson to William Short, August 4, 1820, in [L&B, 15:260](#). [Transcription](#) available at Founders Online.) And again, “The day will come when the mystical generation of Jesus, by the Supreme Being as his father in the womb of a virgin, will be classed with the fable of the generation of Minerva in the brain of Jupiter” (<https://www.monticello.org/site/research-and-collections/jeffersons-religious-beliefs>).

Jefferson’s writing buddy, John Adams, in a letter to Jefferson regarding the Holy Trinity stated,

*“Tom, had you and I been 40 days with Moses and beheld the great God, and even if God himself had tried to tell us that three was one...and one equals three, you and I would never have believed it. We would never fall victim to such lies.”*

And Thomas Paine:

*“I do not believe in the creed professed by the Jewish church, by the Roman church, by the Greek church, by the Turkish church, by the Protestant church, nor by any church that I know of. My own mind is my own church” (Age of*

Reason).

According to James Madison, the Father of the Constitution”:

*“The civil government functions with great success...by the total separation of the Church form the State.”*[\[8\]](#)

Pope Pius XI did not think so:

*“If...the rulers of nations wish to preserve their authority, to promote and increase the prosperity of their countries, they will not neglect the public duty of reverence and obedience to the rule of Christ...With Jesus Christ...excluded from political life, with authority derived not from God but from man, the very basis of that authority has been taken away...The result is that human society is tottering to its fall, because it is no longer secure on a solid foundation.”*

Clearly, the US Constitution is a “man-made” law crafted by men who such as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, etc. free thinkers who had replaced Jesus Christ and the Holy Trinity with a “strange god” of the Enlightenment manifest in such diverse beliefs as Socinianism, Unitarianism, Deism and Gnosticism all of which are antithetical to the Holy Trinity and to the Divinity of Jesus as the only begotten Son of God consubstantial with the Father or by men who had maintained a belief in Christ but relegated Him to the private sphere where His impact on law would be minimized. The “God” in whom the majority of these men trusted, is not Jesus Christ or, if it is, He is not considered the giver of revealed divine laws that are above every law, even constitutional law. Consequently, Jesus is left out of the document; they did not think enough of divine law to find a way to work it into the Constitution because they were concerned about offending non-Christians who made up less than one percent of the population, but not concerned enough about

offending the Holy Trinity.

*“Christ, who has been cast out of public life, despised, neglected and ignored, will most severely avenge these insults; for his kingly dignity demands that the State should take account of the commandments of God and of Christian principles, both in the making of laws and in the administration of justice, and also in providing for the young a sound and moral education” (Pope Pius XI, Quas Primas).*

The secularization of America began with the secularizing of its federal government, and the rejection of divine law as the basis for all subsequent statutory laws and ordinances. As the influence of the federal government increased, so too did its inherent secular ideas, that is, ideas often times antithetical to divine and natural law, laws which, with the ratification of the Constitution, increasingly became things of America’s Christian past

---

#### ENDNOTES

\* PAINTING: *“The Embarkation of the Pilgrims”* (Robert Walter Weir)

[1] Thomas Cumming Hall, *The Religious Background of American Culture* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Co, 1930) pp. 184-85, quoted in Gary DeMar, *America’s Christian History: The Untold Story* (Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, Inc., 1993/2008) pp. 83-84: <http://www.missiontoisrael.org/biblelaw-constitutionalism-pt3.php#endnote35>

[2] There is no power but from God and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore he who resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God” (Romans 13).

[3] God? What God. Is this the Trinity, Allah, a Gnostic deity, the Hindu Trimurti, Jehovah? The term is too amorphous to connote any specific deity, yet it stands for them all or any one you want to believe it stands for.

[4] Fourth Amendment: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

**In his dissenting opinion Justice Brandeis (Olmstead v US, 1928) stated that: "The makers of our Constitution understood the need to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness, and the protections guaranteed by this are much broader in scope, and include the *right to life* and an *inviolable personality* – the *right to be left alone* – the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men. The principle underlying the Fourth and Fifth Amendments is protection against invasions of the sanctities of a man's home and privacies of life. This is recognition of the significance of man's spiritual nature, his feelings, and his intellect."**

Unfortunately, in the case of abortion, the place to be searched is a woman's body and the person to be seized and killed is a defenseless baby who has taken up temporary residence therein. Of course, if a woman consents, no warrant to search and kill is necessary.

The Supreme Court (1920), found a right to privacy implicit in the 14th amendment to prohibit states from interfering with the parental right to privacy regarding the education of their children (Meyer v Nebraska).

Then, in 1969 the court used the right to privacy to defend possession and viewing of pornography in the privacy of one's

home (Stanley v Georgia) More recently, in 1972 (Roe v Wade) the court extended the right to include defense of parental choice to kill their children.

The womb is the home of a child who is a human person protected from violation of her right to privacy and her inviolate right to life. If anyone should be secure in life and limb and whose house should be protected by a right to privacy, it is an infant. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court ruled in Roe v Wade, that a developing human baby is not a "person" and therefore not blessed with a constitutional right to privacy, because the 14th amendment (through which the Bill of Rights is applied to the states), applies only to "persons".

[\[5\]](#)

<https://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/Content/constitutions/1818Constitution.htm>

[\[6\]](#) The third commandment corresponds to the 4th commandment in most Protestant listings.

[\[7\]](#)

<http://www.missiontoisrael.org/biblelaw-constitutionalism-pt3.php>

[\[8\]](#) From "A Memorial and Remonstrance," addressed to the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1785.

---

# **Trump Wants Peace with Russia but Must Battle His Own Party**



# & Avoid Impeachment

[New Era World News and Global Intelligence](#)

FOLLOWING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S November 11, 2017 exchange with Russian President Vladimir Putin, the US Commander in Chief seems to have recalled his election promises to seek friendly cooperation with Russia necessary to defeat terrorism and bolster chances for world peace thereby signaling a personal decision to take more vigorous control of his office, to more firmly exercise his executive powers and to more resolutely direct foreign affairs. If he fails to do so and continues to let himself get browbeat by Congress, he risks looking like an impotent "lame duck" to his executive peers in the international arena.

Pursuant to his impromptu conversation with Putin, President Trump declared ([CNN Nov. 12, 2017](#)):

*"We have to get to work to solve Syria, to solve North Korea, to solve Ukraine, to solve terrorism... People don't realize Russia has been very, very heavily sanctioned. They were sanctioned at a very high level, and that took place very recently. **It's now time to get back to healing a world that is shattered and broken.**"*

To secure peace and healing for a broken and shattered world requires that the United States first establish peace with Russia. Thus, [Newsweek \(Nov 12, 2017\)](#) also recorded the president advocating friendly terms with Russia:

*"I feel that having Russia in a friendly posture, as opposed to always fighting with them, is an asset to the world and an asset to our country, not a liability."*

President Trump has indicated that the way forward is to show good will and a prudential amount of trust for the Russian

leadership. Wanting to take the high road, and act as the bigger man, the president indicated his willingness to take the necessary first steps forward by hinting at reducing the impact of sanctions recently imposed by the US Congress and by offering his hand in trust to the Russian President. Referring to the accusation that President Putin interfered in the US Presidential Election, Trump revealed his willingness to extend a modicum of trust to his Russian peer:

*“Every time he sees me he says, ‘I didn’t do that,’ and I really believe that when he tells me that, he means it,” Trump told reporters. “I think he is very insulted by it.”*

Yes, President Putin is insulted, very insulted and perplexed. Thus according to the Russian President:

*“Relations between the United States and Russia are at a ‘state of crisis’” (Video 2:41-2:46).*

Relations are at a “state of crisis” because Congress under the influence of Neocon war hawks and liberal democrats are interfering with the president’s ability to engage productively in foreign affairs. Unable to fend them off, the president reluctantly agreed to enforce a new round of sanctions recently imposed by Congress. However, President Trump noted that Congress has blatantly interfered with his powers as Chief Executive, thereby insulting him. According to the new Congressional Legislation the president is *not* permitted to amend or lift any of the provisions imposed by Congress without Congressional approval (see video below 40 sec – 1:00) Thus, the [New York Times](#), reported that President Trump is not satisfied with the Congressional sanctions and might ignore them. According to Mr. Trump, the congressional

legislation contains:

*“‘...Clearly unconstitutional provisions.’”* Thereby leaving  
*“open the possibility that he might choose not to enforce them as lawmakers intended.”*

The president's ire was also reported by [NBC News](#) who recorded his telling words:

*“The Framers of our Constitution put foreign affairs in the hands of the President. This bill will prove the wisdom of that choice.”*

According to [Radio Liberty](#), Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev rejoined:

*“‘The hope for improving our relations with the new U.S. administration is now over,’ after Trump reluctantly signed the bill he once opposed, calling it “significantly flawed” and signaling that he might not fully implement the sanctions....’Trump’s administration has demonstrated total impotence by surrendering its executive authority to Congress in the most humiliating way,’ Medvedev said adding; ‘The American establishment has won an overwhelming victory over Trump. The president wasn’t happy with the new sanctions, but he had to sign the bill.’”*

Prime Minister Medvedev seemed totally surprised at the ability of Congress to tie an American President's hands:

*“The U.S. establishment has fully outwitted Trump – the president is not happy about the new sanctions, yet he could not but sign the bill,” he added. “New steps are to come, and they will ultimately aim to remove him from power” ([NBC News](#)).*

Nonetheless, for these sanctions to be successful, the President as the Executive arm of government must be willing to enforce them. His threat *not* to do so is *not* without precedent; he could always pull an Andrew Jackson and refuse.



President Trump in the Oval Office with Picture of President Andrew Jackson Conspicuously Hovering over His Executive Desk

### **Andrew Jackson and The Trail of Tears**

Andrew Jackson, Trump's esteemed predecessor, was caught up in a similar political imbroglio that involved the removal of Cherokee Indians from their native lands in Georgia onto reservations located on the westbank of the Mississippi River. Jackson displayed his Executive Power by ignoring a Supreme Court ruling in a historic move that became known as the "Trail of Tears". The State of Georgia claimed it had rights to the lands inhabited by the Cherokees. The Cherokee Indians, on the other hand, argued that the land was private property belonging to them and therefore could not be legally

alienated. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Cherokee, the land was theirs and they could stay on it.. The court's decision, however, meant little without the executive arm of the President to enforce it. President Jackson favored moving the Indians westward into the Oklahoma Territory and therefore opposed Chief Justice John Marshall's decision. When the decision came across Jackson's desk he vehemently uttered his famous landmark words:

*"Mr. Marshall has made his decision. Now let him enforce it!"*

In other words, "Tough s-t; This decision means nothing if unbacked by the my Executive arm." The indians were forcibly removed to Oklahoma.

As much as President Trump might admire the strong arm abilities of his nineteenth century predecessor, it is doubted that he will resort to Jacksonian politics. Mr. Trump will most likely have to find an alternative route to normalize relations with Russia thereby obtaining his desire for a significantly amended foreign policy emphasizing cooperative relations with the Kremlin as a means toward world peace. One possible route toward this end involves winning support in the upcoming (Nov 2018) Congressional elections.

If Mr. Trump lacks congressional support (as he currently does), and likewise chooses *not* to enforce the sanctions of the Congressional Act that imposes, *against his will*, additional stringent sanctions on Russia, if he chooses to refrain from enforcing these sanctions, he will surely spark legitimate flames intended to immolate his presidency by impeachment. Nonetheless, a man like President Trump, a man used to careful calculations related to getting it his way, a man such as this, might be willing to risk impeachment if he has enough pull in the Senate – This maneuver is also with precedent: [President Clinton was impeached by the House but acquitted in the Senate](#). Moreover, **there was plenty of animus**

**to impeach Andrew Jackson but the House could never muster enough votes necessary to make it happen.** The Republicans currently hold majorities in both the House and the Senate; depending upon how the upcoming Congressional Elections turnout, President Trump might be willing to risk impeachment and avoid acquittal.

### **Facing the Intelligence Community – Neocon Warhawks and their Liberal Allies**

With impeachment looming in the background and lacking necessary support from his own Intelligence Community, Mr Trump is facing an uphill battle, a battle that will require an adroit foreign policy maneuver, one which carries unusual risks. The risks are unusual because President Trump is in an unusually weak position *vis a vis* many members in his own party in addition to stiff opposition from the American Intelligence Community which, based upon paltry, some would say, non-existent, evidence continues to rally against and demonize Russia.

Despite all the verbose and daily rhetoric about Russia hacking American elections, **the best US Intel has come up with (so far) is to blame Russian news outlets such as Sputnik and RT for writing articles that offer a contrary perspective than that put forward by CNN and other US agencies.** Russia does have its propaganda mouthpieces and Sputnik and RT appear to be in the forefront of their propaganda efforts; nonetheless, **the US also has its propaganda outlets such as [Foreign Policy](#), [Foreign Affairs](#), [Radio Free Europe](#) and [Radio Liberty](#)**, to name a few, all operating on foreign soil under the penumbra of 'Freedom of the Press". Thus, if the US wants to charge Russia with interference by Sputnik and RT, then it must be ready to admit its own guilt – **the US runs covert operations and overt news agencies thereby interfering in the elections of sovereign nations worldwide.**

US interference in the political affairs of sovereign nations has reached such a fever pitch that both [Poland](#) and [Hungary](#) are risking sanctions by endeavoring to nationalize their own presses, purging them of foreign influence and liberal values that run contrary to their own traditional values; both Poland and Hungary are fed up with Western interference and are insisting that they have the right as sovereign nations to control their own media outlets. In response, the EU, US and UK have labeled the Polish and Hungarian governments as autocratic threats to European liberal values and therefore deserving of economic sanctions and judicial review. It seems that the liberal [Western nations demand freedom of the press and defend it to the hilt when it involves their interests, but when it works against their interests it is somehow a bad thing](#). This is the type of hypocrisy that has inflamed Euroscepticism, the type of hypocrisy that brought Trump to power in the USA. Poland and Hungary simply want freedom over their own presses. If the US wants to operate in Poland and elsewhere under the shield: "Freedom of the Press", they are going to have to permit others to do the same and admit that Russia's freedom to operate Sputnik and RT is legal, and licit; it does *not* constitute criminal interference in American elections; **Freedom of the Press is a legal inalienable freedom available to all nations, not just some.**

If the US can employ its propaganda arm operating freely within other nations as a basic democratic right, why is it *not* a democratic freedom when Russia does the same? Why is it a crime for Russia to voice its political opinion in another country and not a violation of freedom when the United States does so, and continues to do so even over the voice of executive and parliamentary opposition in countries such as Poland and Hungary who are being denied freedom of the press in their own countries while Germany, the US and UK operated on their soils under the shield of free press. The United States even operates its press and propaganda campaigns within Russia itself. If the US can do so, it is overt hypocrisy to

deny Russia the same right? In other words, there is no case against Russia as Trump has continually stated – the intel community has come up with nothing but the Sputnik – RT accusations.

The lack of a compelling evidence to support the allegations of Russian espionage affecting the US election is so weak that President Trump has called those who advocate increased tensions and pressure on Russia as “haters” and “fools”:

*When will all the haters and fools out there realize that having a good relationship with Russia is a good thing, not a bad thing. There always playing politics – bad for our country. I want to solve North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, terrorism, and Russia can greatly help!*

– Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) [November 12, 2017](#)

## **Trump's Desire for Peace is Risky in a Political Milieu Wherein Major Players Profit by War and Propagation of a Liberal Agenda**

By indicating his willingness to trust Putin and perhaps reduce sanctions against Russia, Trump risks alienating himself from his own intelligence community. He is fully aware of the risks, **but clearly trying to balance them:**

*“I believe that he (Putin) feels that he and Russia did not meddle in the election. As to whether I believe it or not, **I am with our agencies**, especially as currently constituted with the leadership... I believe that our intel agencies, our intelligence agencies, **I work with them very strongly... as currently led**, by fine people, **I believe very much in our intelligence agencies.**”*



Clearly, Trump recognizes the risks and is trying to play both sides of the coin. He would benefit by a cooperative intelligence community, one that promotes the interests of the American people, not one that spies on them, by a foreign policy that advances global peace rather than political and military interference in the affairs of other sovereign nations in the name of liberal democracy. He is being hindered by an ideology that produces ongoing conflict instead of long desired peace. Warhawks such as Senator McCain who serve the interests of special lobbies and an outdated global vision, a vision locked in World War II-Viet Nam nostalgia and Soviet espionage, warhawks such as these are a plague to peace initiatives. Although they continue to exercise strong influence, in the last analysis it is President Trump who is Commander in Chief; it is he who will decide when and where to commit American Troops and when to use them to back sanctions and engage in military operations. Despite stern opposition to his Russian peace initiatives, Mr. Trump has the large swathe of the American electorate behind him.

In this regard, he seems to have broad support of the **American people** who, according to a recent [Rasmussen Poll](#) (November 13-14, 2017), **agree by nearly a two-to-one margin that a friendly relationship with Russia is of greater value to the United States and the international community than the current hawkish policy that exacerbates relations with Moscow.**

The specific question asked by Rasmussen pollsters was lifted from Trump's own statement about Russia. They asked: *"Do you agree or disagree with the following statement:"*

*"Having Russia in a friendly posture, as opposed to always fighting with them, is an asset to the world, and an asset to our country, not a liability."*

[The results](#) (according to the Rasmussen ) [indicate that a "sharp turnaround" has occurred among the American electorate](#)

since the Cold War years during which the broad majority were against improved relations with Russia. Today however,

*“Voters by a two-to-one margin agree with President Trump that it’s better for the United States – and the world – to have Russia on our side.”*

Looking further into the issue, Rasmussen found that

*“79% of conservatives agree that it’s better to be friends with Russia, but just 27% of liberals share that view.”*

The **21% of Conservative Republicans who oppose friendly relations** are drawn from Neocon Warhawks such as Sen. McCain. The **73% of Liberal Democrats who also oppose friendly relations** with Russia are drawn primarily from those who are opposed on moral grounds: [their liberal freedoms such as abortion and homosexuality are being combatted in Russia.](#)

**Although 79% of all Republicans agree with President Trump,** the 21% who disagree represent POWERFUL LOBBIES in the Arms Industry and Intelligence Community supported by Neocon War Hawks in Congress who are further emboldened by a strange alliance with a broad spectrum of liberals (73%), who, like [Hillary Clinton,](#) are hawkish about American Foreign Policy as are Republican Neocons (Republican [Neocon Hawks surprisingly preferred and voted for Hilary Clinton](#) NOT Trump). The **Neocon Republicans and Liberal Democrats; are both purveyors of broadscale liberalism.** Both insist, contrary to President Trump, that America should be the world’s police force and its moral majority, the strong arm enforcer of its liberal moral policies and neoliberal economic initiatives.

**The 21% Republican and 73% Democratic cohorts should *not* be considered separately; ON THE ISSUE OF FOREIGN POLICY, THEY ARE IN AGREEMENT. One desires American Foreign Policy to protect its economic hegemony and the other to advance its**

## **liberal moral agenda.**

Although the president has the majority of his party with him, and a two to one majority among the American electorate (on the Russian Issue) he nonetheless is operating from a near minority. His **opponents consist of 73% Liberal Democrats and a very strong 21% of his own Party.** What this means is that the 2-1 advantage in the American electorate reported by Rasmussen is negated in reality.

## **Conclusion**

The reason for the 2-1 result is based on the fact that, according to Rasmussen, a full **21% of the American electorate** (Republican and Democratic) **are still "undecided"** about relations with Russia. **This 21% will be pivotal in the struggle over US relations with Russia.** A small group rose to catapult Trump into the presidency, now he needs a similar small group to advance his peace initiatives. Will warhawks, neocons, and their liberal allies continue to get their way, continue to keep America in a constant posture of global policeman threatening war and economic sanctions on all nations that disagree with their neoliberal economic and moral policies, or will President Trump who is seeking a new path toward peace prevail?

**Judging from the corrected Rasmussen numbers** (corrected by the 21% undecided), the President is in a difficult position. He wants peace, which he sees is contingent in many ways upon cooperation with Russia. He has the support of a large segment of the American population, while a lesser but very powerful group of Republicans and Democrat warhawks representing the Intelligence Community, Arms Industry, and Ideological Left are opposed to peace with Russia while another 21% of the electorate remain undecided. The President will have to assume more oversight of the intelligence

community, reign in his generals, somehow deal with the greed of those men and women economically invested in expanded military operations, and, of course, deal with the liberal left who stand opposed to any *rapprochement* with a Christianizing Russia that threatens their hard won “liberal freedoms”.

Although it looks daunting, Rasmussen did report a 2-1 advantage. **If a majority of the undecided 21% support Trump candidates in the upcoming (Nov. 2018) Congressional elections, the scenario becomes much more favorable for a *rapprochement* with Russia and global peace.** In the context of the Virgin Mary’s promises at Fatima for an Era of Peace, New Era forecasts a victory for the US President and looks forward to cooperation between the United States and Russia, cooperation that will result in the defeat of terrorism and a real possibility for an Era of Peace..

As concluded in a [December 2016 article](#):

*“The age of liberal global hegemony is coming to an end. Increasingly, the nations of the world are opting for national sovereignty and a restoration of traditional family values as the Era of Peace promised at Fatima continues to dawn upon the nations.”*

If the US continues down its overworn, liberal, neocon path, a path heavily trodden by both Democrats and Republicans, by both Presidents Bush and Obama, if it continues down this path, the US will continue to suffer one foreign policy embarrassment after another – it is opposing the Queen of Heaven who has promised an Era of Peace.