

# Robert Coerver Bishop of Lubbock Texas Weighs in on Sanctuary City Ordinance

Today, April 6, 2021 Bishop Robert M. Coerver released a surprising [Official Statement](#) regarding Planned Parenthood and the Lubbock Sanctuary City Ordinance. The Statement is available on the [Diocesan Website](#) and will be published in the South Plains Catholic.

It is time to take concerted action beginning with the May 1 vote on the Ordinance to ban abortions within the City of Lubbock. It is clear that the bishop cannot tell his people how to vote, but he encourages “Catholics and all citizens of Lubbock to get informed and exercise their right and duty to vote”. He concludes this surprising [Statement](#) with what might be interpreted as an *episcopal exhortation* – it is certainly an unexpected and highly unusual conclusion.

[Access the Statement here](#)

---

## May 1 Historic Vote: Lubbock Sanctuary City Ordinance and Catholic Social Teaching

CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING is the fruit of a long line of thinking about man and society. Its roots are burrowed deeply in the natural law tradition of Aristotle and Cicero and in

the moral and judicial precepts of the Old Testament perfected by the commandment to love as God loves ([John 15:12](#)) revealed in the New. Ultimately, it is grounded in the inscrutable mystery of the individual and communal dimensions of the Holy Trinity and the corollary mystery of the human person made to the image of the Trinity, that is, the individual and communal dimensions of the human person.

Being made to the image of God implies that every human being is by nature Trinitarian; that is, every human being is by nature both individual and communal. The perfection of God consists in the individuality of the Persons united as one Substance – the Father cannot be separated from the Son or the Spirit without doing damage to the Divine Persons and to their Unitive (communal) Love which is the very essence of God ([1 John 4:8](#)). Likewise, the individual and communal dimensions of human existence cannot be separated without doing damage to both man and society. No one is perfected alone. Find one saint and you will inevitably find another (Mary and Joseph, Francis and Clare, Benedict and Scholastica, Augustine and Monica etc.) each contributing to the common good (Matt 10:28) through individual acts of love.

**“Being made to the image of God implies that every human being is by nature Trinitarian”.**

Since human beings are simultaneously individual and communal beings, any society that disregards one or the other ends up working against human nature. As such, both Communism and poorly or unregulated Capitalism (to the extent that they promote the communal good to the neglect of the individual or the individual good to the detriment of the communal) are criticized by the Church as destructive partial truths rooted in a materialistic world view. Thus, when asked to compare Communism and Capitalism [Padre Pio replied](#):

*“They are both indescribably evil. In the East they deny God from the head to the belly button. In the West, they*

*deny Him from the belly button to the feet”.*

The East under Communism was guilty of “Scientific” or “Atheistic” Materialism. That is, intellectual materialism, materialism in the head, *i.e.*, the radical refusal to think about God and thus intellectually ascribe everything to a material cause. The West under Liberal Democracy has been guilty of “Hedonistic Materialism”. That is, materialism from the belly button to the feet by which Padre Pio meant the stomach and sex organs, *i.e.*, the failure to think about God because more weight is given to sex, food and material pleasures than to serious philosophical thought and spiritual progress. In other words, although apparently different, Atheistic Communism and Hedonistic Capitalism are two sides of the same coin, *viz.*, the coin of *Materialism* – Atheistic Materialism and Hedonistic Materialism.

Echoing Padre Pio, [Pope John Paul II](#) also pointed out that materialism is the destructive bond common to both Capitalism and Communism:

*“While... it is true that this social model (Capitalism) shows the failure of Marxism to contribute to a humane and better society... insofar as it (Capitalism) denies an autonomous existence and value to morality, law, culture and religion, it agrees with Marxism, in the sense that it totally reduces man to the sphere of economics and the satisfaction of material needs” (materialism).*<sup>[2]</sup>

Thus, when discussing whether or not the Church’s critique of Capitalism was positive or negative, [John Paul II stated](#):

*“...if by ‘capitalism’ is meant a system in which freedom in the economic sector is not circumscribed within a strong juridical framework...the core of which is ethical and religious, then the reply is certainly negative.”* [\[3\]](#)

What capitalist economy that you know of is regulated by a juridical framework the core of which is “ethical” and “religious” (that is, rooted in divine and natural law)? Market economies would look much different if regulated by the natural precept of justice and the divine precept of charity. Unfortunately, none are, and that is precisely the main economic problem.

“What capitalist economy that you know of is regulated by a juridical framework the core of which is ‘ethical’ and ‘religious’?”

Contrary to free-market ideologues who would have everyone believe that the market is regulated by its own laws (as if God made economic laws just as He made laws of nature such as gravity), the truth is: No such laws exist. The market is *not* a living organism; it cannot regulate itself. Like everything else entrusted to human ingenuity, the economy is a human construct, the creation of redeemed but fallen human beings who are too often dominated by concupiscence and self-love. If the economy is not regulated by just laws drafted to serve the common good, it will end up serving the individual good of a few contrary to the Trinitarian communal dimension of human existence (the common good). Thus,

*“It is the task of the State to provide for the defence and preservation of common goods... which cannot be safeguarded simply by market forces...The State and all of society have the duty of defending those collective goods”.* [\[4\]](#)

The Church, however, looks favorably on market economies when they are *properly* regulated, that is, when they are circumscribed by laws derived from the precepts of justice and charity and therefore serve both the individual and common good. However, this is rarely the case. Because market

economies are too often regulated by laws created by politicians who profit from the market they are supposed to be regulating, the free market as it now exists is proscribed by the Church. A market economy unregulated by the Divine and Natural Law can be “indescribably evil”.

This fact is difficult to accept because most of us have been educated and formed to believe that Capitalism is somehow sacrosanct – few of us have been taught the truth that the Church teaches otherwise. The truth remains hidden for many reasons including the fact that we have a two party system in which we must choose between one of only two political alternatives. The problem is that each contains significant error such that voting in America has become a choice between the lesser of two evils resulting in partial evil no matter which side is chosen.

Because many Catholics place their politics on par with their religion, the church has been rent by political polarization. Most of us find ourselves on one side or the other identifying as Republicans or Democrats and thus divided against our Catholic brothers and sisters when we should be working together to make Lubbock and the world a better place.

“Because many Catholics place their politics on  
par with their religion,  
the church has been rent by political  
polarization”.

Neither political party is blest with the fullness of Catholic truth – each contains partial half truths. The Republican Party rightly promotes Christian family values, limited government and the dangers of a welfare-state killing individual initiative and impeding the action of intermediary institutions that should act as major players in the realm of social reform. Unfortunately, it also promotes fundamental Christian errors because its basic economic premises are rooted in the promotion of rugged individualism and

enlightened self-interest rather than the genuine disinterested service of others, because it mistakes legality for morality (laws rooted in natural and divine law), ignores the precepts of economic justice and of charity mandated by Christ, and fails to recognize the Church as the new Israel.

The Democratic Party promotes social justice, a fair wage, fair lending practices and environmental stewardship, but incorrectly advances illicit ideas about sexuality and the family. In short, it tends to over-stress the social dimensions of human existence to the detriment of individual human initiative thereby creating over-dependence on the state.

Unlike either the Democratic or Republican parties, the Church does not teach partial truths about man and society; she teaches the total truth that is divided between the two parties while avoiding all of their respective errors. These truths rest on seven integrated pillars all included in Catholic Social Teaching: Financial Justice; Economic Justice; Environmental Stewardship; War and International Relations; Abortion and Related Life Issues; Sexuality, Marriage and the Family; Immigration and Racism.

Each party advances some of the above seven while at the same time erring on some of the others, which is one of the primary reasons that the Church refrains from politics: As it now stands, neither party is fully endorsable; both promote some moral good and some moral evil. The problem is that most of us do not get our ideas about politics, economics and the common good from the Church. Instead, we often give more time to Sean Hannity, Rachel Maddow, CNN and Fox News. In the process, we end up becoming mouth pieces for a political platform that is at odds with what the Church teaches while believing ourselves to be fully professing Christians. As a consequence, some of us try to reform the Church according to our political beliefs rather than correct our political ideas based upon what the Church actually teaches.

The truth about man and society articulated by the Church is, like the Divine Persons of the Trinity, one, whole and undivided. Each part is integrally related to every other part; if any part is missing both society and the individual human beings (that together constitute the social body), will suffer. If the individual body is to function properly, every organ and part are needed. Likewise, for the social body to function correctly, the complete truth about man and society must be articulated and applied.

Regarding the body and the way its various parts work together as one, I have had an eye-opening experience serving as a strength and conditioning coach for two national championship football teams: The University of Florida and the University of Notre Dame. At Notre Dame and Florida we produced championship teams (social dimension) because we first produced champion caliber athletes (individual dimension). As experienced athletes and strength and conditioning coaches, we knew the importance of identifying and training all seven physical components of the body (strength, power, muscle endurance, cardiovascular endurance, agility, speed and flexibility).

Although one or two of these physical components are dominant in each sport – regardless of the sport – to produce champions all seven must be trained. A team is only as strong as its weakest link. You can almost always tell an inferior team by the way their athletes are conditioned; some get winded easily; others lack muscle and or cardiovascular endurance, which shows in the fourth quarter; some lack flexibility and are plagued by too many injuries; some are very strong but too slow etc. Rather than making the all too common mistake of over emphasizing one component, such as strength, to the detriment of the other six, we focused simultaneously on all seven and in the proper balance; we produced champions.

“Rather than making the all too common mistake  
of over emphasizing one

component, to the detriment of the other six, we focused on all seven”.

Likewise, no program of social renewal will be successful if it over emphasizes any one of the seven pillars of human life and development while neglecting or damaging the others. An integral Catholic political platform does *not* weaponize one moral issue, such as protection of the unborn, in order to advance *other* immoral economic and financial issues that work to the benefit of a few while acting as a detriment to the common good. Catholic Social teaching alone provides a platform that unites all seven pillars. If we continue to let politics divide us, we will fail to accomplish the *solidarity* necessary to advance a comprehensive Catholic world view, a view that truly benefits the common good while simultaneously benefiting the individual good from which the common good is derived. When Catholics (and Protestants) finally overcome political polarization and join hands in solidarity, we will be the strongest force for good (both individual and common) in Lubbock and in America.

### **Sanctuary City for the Unborn**

On May 1, the City of Lubbock will hold an historic vote to make Lubbock a Sanctuary City for the unborn by outlawing abortion within city limits. This is *not* a partisan election; moreover, only one life issue is being voted on – the other six are not in play. Because abortion is the only issue being voted on, because this is a non-partisan vote and because the vote is so critical – murder is taking place in Lubbock – we must focus our current efforts on ending abortion.

The Sanctuary City initiative provide us with an unprecedented opportunity to overcome political polarization and work together as one body in Christ to make Lubbock a more Christian city. To do so will require self-scrutiny followed by honest and concerted efforts to erase city lines and political barriers that have polarized us, weakened our voice



and nullified our efforts for too long.

The time has come for Lubbock to rise as a Champion of Christ, which requires mending and strengthening His broken and divided body. To be successful in the long-run we must broaden our limited social and political perspectives in light of Catholic Social Teaching. Nonetheless, we must first learn to cooperate; then after we learn to work together to end abortion in Lubbock, we can proceed to the other six life issues. Viewing our politics through the broad lens of Catholic Social Teaching will have a revolutionary effect on Lubbock. The process begins by working together and voting for the Ordinance on May 1, 2021. Then, we can proceed to strengthening and conditioning the rest of the body necessary to build a champion.

---

#### NOTES:

[\[1\]](#)

<https://newera.news/intelligence-report-fatima-tradition-family-property-error-on-the-right/>

[\[2\]](#)

[http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_enc\\_01051991\\_centessimus-annus.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centessimus-annus.html)

[\[3\]](#) John Paul II also stated: ““The Church...recognizes the positive value of the market and of enterprise, but which at the same time points out that these need to be oriented towards the common good”.

Pope John Paul II Centessimus Annus para 42-43

[\[4\]](#) Centessimus Annus para 40.

---

# Pope Francis Correct about Inadmissibility of Death Penalty in “Context of the Gospel”

[New Era World News and Intelligence](#)

POPE FRANCIS IS BEING FALSELY ACCUSED once again. On [August 2, 2018](#), the pope announced a revision to the Catechism of the Catholic Church regarding the death penalty. Detractors are wrongly claiming that the pope declared the death penalty has ceased to be a valid moral option. Rather, many report, that Francis stated that the death penalty is “intrinsically evil” and anyone employing it NOW is involved in a sinful act. Life Site News, 1 Peter Five, the Lepanto Institute and other “Catholic News Agencies” continue to paint Pope Francis as a sinister or weak-minded pretender, an “Antipope” who confuses issues thereby introducing moral error and step-by-step leading the Church into apostasy. But do not worry they assure us, there is a “[Papal Posse](#)” (led by EWTN’s Raymond Arroyo, the self-appointed sheriff) out to round him up and bring him to trial before he can do any more damage.

The Church does not need supposed Catholic News Agencies to identify the pope’s theological errors because the pope is *not* guilty of any theological errors. In fact, if such news agencies continue *acting* as papal judges, they might risk bringing condemnation upon their own heads. They act as though they alone are capable of guiding the flock because they alone are able to “see.” **It would be better for them if they were blind. Then they would at least have a valid excuse, but they**

## claim to see – therefore their guilt remains:

*“Jesus said to them: If you were blind, you should not have sin: but now **you say: We see.** (Therefore) **Your sin remaineth**” ([John 9:41](#)).*

The Lord refers to such men as “blind guides” ([Matt 23:24](#)) and cautions his humble followers, those who hear His voice ([John 10:26-27](#)), to ignore false shepherds who are consciously or unconsciously doing the work of their father, the devil.

“My sheep hear my voice: and I know them, and they follow me. And I give them life everlasting; and they shall not perish” ([John 10: 27](#)).

*“Why do you not know my speech (Jesus asks)? Because you cannot hear my word. You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and he stood not in the truth; because truth is not in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father thereof” [John 8 42-47](#)).*

Jesus speaks in ways that are impossible for false prophets to speak: He is an excuser ([Matt 26:28](#)), the devil is an accuser ([Rev 12:10](#)). The Pharisees followed and talked like the latter ([Mark 2: 15-16](#)). Therefore they failed to heed the Lord’s words, failed to grasp the centrality of Mercy ([Matt 9:10-13](#)) and then wrongly accused Jesus of teaching error ([John 10:33](#); [Matt 26:59-64](#)). Wise men should think twice before repeating pharisaical accusations against Christ or His Vicar, especially when they should know that Jesus taught Peter that he would be falsely accused, that his accusers would come from his own house, and that the false accusers would be condemned as blind guides. To the extent they are conscious of their malady, the more they are culpable. Nonetheless, in reality (conscious or unconscious) men who falsely cry wolf, as the

pharisees did regarding Jesus ([Luke 11:16](#)) and as these men are regarding His vicar, men such as these will eventually be devoured by the wolves ([Matt 24-21](#)) along with those who have had the great misfortune of listening to and believing them.

No, it is *not* the pope who is a wolf in sheep's clothing; it is not the pope who is introducing confusion by twisting texts, employing subtle vocabulary, introducing foreign teachings; it is not the pope who is stealthily misrepresenting the magisterium. NO, IT IS NOT THE POPE THAT EMPLOYS THESE METHODS BUT THE ANTI-PAPAL FAKE NEWS MEDIA THAT EMPLOYS THEM TO MISLEAD THEIR UNSUSPECTING "SHEEPLE." Those eager to trip the pope up either are unaware of, ignore, or overlook their own errors and then in the name of truth, zealously foist error on their readers, such as the errors introduced recently by [Life Site News](#), [One Peter Five](#), [Professor Robert de Mattei of Lepanto Institute](#) (cited by the [Remnant](#)) and [Dr. Edward Feser](#):

Life Site judges itself so completely competent that it even dares to call the pope a "heretic":

*"Pope Francis has shown himself to be openly heretical on a point of major importance, teaching a pure and simple novelty" ([Kwasniewski Aug 2, 2018](#)).*

The only question, according to sources such as these, is if Francis is a *formal* heretic (a heretic that is aware that what he is teaching is contrary to Catholic doctrine and yet remains pertinacious in his error despite rebuke) or only a *material* heretic:

*"Whether Francis is a formal heretic – and proves pertinacious in maintaining his position in spite of rebuke—is a matter to be adjudicated by the College of Cardinals" ([Kwasniewski Aug 2, 2018](#)).*

Either way, according to Kwasniewski and the editorial staff at Life Site that approved his blog, Pope Francis is a heretic that must be opposed:

*“No doubt exists, however, that orthodox bishops of the Catholic Church must oppose this doctrinal error and refuse to use the altered edition of the Catechism or any catechetical materials based on it.”*

Like the others, Dr. Edward Feser (whom [National Review](#) cited as “one of the best contemporary writers on philosophy”) does not make necessary and proper distinctions and then proceeds to make egregious mistakes followed by false accusations:

[According to Dr. Feser.](#)

*“To say, as the pope does, that the death penalty conflicts with ‘the inviolability and dignity of the person’ insinuates that the practice is **intrinsically contrary to natural law**. And to say, as the pope does, that ‘the light of the Gospel’ rules out capital punishment insinuates that it is **intrinsically contrary to Christian morality**,*

If they took time to carefully analyze the news, and to properly understand the terms employed, the detractors might get it right. As it is, they consistently get it wrong – and with condemning arrogance. As such, they might be surprised to learn that Pope Francis, like his predecessors, **never stated that capital punishment is intrinsically evil nor has he contradicted his predecessors as they falsely claim**. The detractors seem more interested in fighting with a papal straw man (that they can easily knock down in front of an audience of indiscreet admirers) than they do with ascertaining the truth. If they actually possess the intellectual tools needed to critique a pope, they should be able to clarify what the pope actually said; something they consistently seem unable to do.

Gentlemen, the pope *never* said that the death penalty is “*intrinsically evil*”; please stop misrepresenting him.

## What Exactly did the Pope Say?

According to the [Prefect for the Congregation of the Doctrine of Faith](#), “The Supreme Pontiff Francis, in the audience granted on 11 May 2018 to the undersigned Prefect... has approved the following new draft of no. 2267 of the Catechism of the Catholic Church, arranging for it to be translated into various languages and inserted in all the editions of the aforementioned Catechism.”

Regarding the Death Penalty, para 2267 of the New Catechism should be amended to read:

*Recourse to the death penalty on the part of legitimate authority, following a fair trial, was long considered an appropriate response to the gravity of certain crimes and an acceptable, albeit extreme, means of safeguarding the common good.*

*Today, however, there is an increasing awareness that the **dignity of the person** is not lost even after the commission of very serious crimes. In addition, a new understanding has emerged of the significance of penal sanctions imposed by the state. Lastly, more effective systems of detention have been developed, which ensure the due protection of citizens but, at the same time, do not definitively deprive the guilty of the possibility of redemption.*

*Consequently, the Church teaches, **in the light of the Gospel**, that “the death penalty is **inadmissible** because it is an attack on the inviolability and dignity of the*

person", [\[1\]](#) and she works with determination for its abolition worldwide" (Papal Rescript "[Ex Audienta SS.MI](#)").

Flexing his intellectual muscle, Professor Robert de Mattei President of Lepanto Institute stated that, "The lawfulness of the death penalty is a truth *de fide tenenda* defined by the ordinary and universal Magisterium of the Church, in a constant and unequivocal manner." Then, after striking a side-chest pose, he implies that Pope Francis is a heretic:

*"Whoever affirms that capital punishment is in itself an evil, falls into heresy ([Remnant News](#))."*

To defend his damning claim, he quotes Pope Innocent III (Innocent III, DS 795/425):

*"The teaching of the Church was clearly expressed in a letter dated December 18, 1208, in which Innocent III condemned the Waldensian position with these words, reported by Denzinger:*

*'With regard to the secular power, we affirm that it can exercise a judgment of blood without mortal sin, provided that in carrying out the punishment it proceeds, not out of hatred, but judiciously, not in a precipitous manner, but with caution.'*" (*Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declaratum de rebus fidei et morum*, edited by Peter Hünemann S.J., n. 795).

It is surprising that an esteemed doctor of philosophy could make such a sophomoric mistake, surprising that he could fail to note the fundamental distinction between the Natural Law and the Divine Law and the fact that Francis was not speaking to leaders of the state but to faithful Catholics. The Pope made it very clear that he was NOT speaking within the context of the Natural Law but within the context of Divine Law, (in

the context of the GOSPEL). The Gospel is the GOOD NEWS of salvation, the GOOD NEWS of MERCY *not* of judgement. In the context of Gospel Love and Mercy, sinners are forgiven.

POPE INNOCENT WAS REFERRING TO [ROMANS 13](#) REGARDING THE “BLOODY SWORD” OF JUSTICE WIELDED BY THE EMPEROR. POPE FRANCIS IS SPEAKING OF THE GOSPEL SWORD OF MERCY, THE ONE THAT JESUS TOLD PETER TO “PUT AWAY” ([MATT 26:52](#)). They are two very different swords, two very different standards of dealing with sins and crimes.

Pope Innocent was clearly speaking about the authority of the state as derived from the Natural Law as is clear from the use of the words “judgement” and “blood”. Those however who fall under the Divine Law of Love are not judged, instead they plead for mercy and avoid judgment, avoid the bloody sword of justice and death:

*“For God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him, may not perish, but may have life everlasting. **For God sent NOT his Son into the world, to judge the world, but that the world may be saved by him. He that believeth in him is NOT judged.** But he that doth not believe, is already judged: because he believeth not in the name of the only begotten Son of God([John 3: 16-18](#))*

Natural Law follows the dictates of natural reason culminating in human wisdom and acts of natural justice; Divine Law exceeds the dictates of human reason and is guided by the dictates of supernatural reason culminating in Divine Wisdom perfected by acts of Divine Love. The former is bequeathed by the gift of FAITH in Jesus the WORD of God and in His GOSPEL; the latter in the gift of the Holy Spirit conferred in Baptism and Confirmation. Wisdom (human or Divine) is an intellectual virtue that is *not* perfected until it reaches its end (unity of lover and beloved) in ACTS of Love.

*“For my thoughts (INTELLECT) are not your thoughts: nor your*



ways (ACTS) my ways, saith the Lord" ([Isaiah 55:8](#)).

Dr. Feser, quoted above, makes a similar mistake. He stated that Pope Francis "insinuates that the practice (the death penalty) is **intrinsically contrary to natural law**." Obviously, the death penalty is NOT contrary to Natural Law (it is not even contrary to the Divine Old Law) but it is contrary to the Gospel of Mercy as Pope Francis correctly teaches. Feser is simply fighting a "straw man" of his own making!

Next, he fails to recognize that **the Gospel does in deed rule out the death penalty**:

*"To say, as the pope does, that 'the light of the Gospel' rules out capital punishment insinuates that it is intrinsically contrary to Christian morality,"*

Mr. Fesser, Christian morality is rooted in the GOSPEL. Natural morality though it leads to Christian morality is *not* the same thing. It is the morality discovered by unaided natural reason known even to the PAGANS (Aristotle) – it is not specifically Christian. It might be proto-Christian, but it is NOT Christian per-se, in itself, that is substantially. It is merely a human standard, not the Divine standard rooted in Love ([1 John 4: 7-8](#)).

At least Mr. Fesser is a reputable philosopher, Life Site consists mainly of untrained laymen most of whom are not even competent to be in the discussion. Thus, [Life Site reported](#) that this amendment of the Catechism is "bold" and "reckless" move and that Francis' pontificate is "out of control."

*"In the boldest and most reckless move to date in a pontificate that was already out of control and sowing confusion on a massive scale, the Vatican has announced Pope Francis's substitution, in the Catechism of the Catholic Church, of a new doctrine on capital punishment."*

It should be clear who is “reckless” and “out of control.” Francis has not altered the fact that under the Natural Law, the state retains the intrinsic power and authority to impose the death penalty. As Vicar of Christ, however, he is pointing them to the Gospel and asking, that *in its context*, heads of state show mercy by not admitting the death penalty into their tribunals. If they fail to do so, judges and heads of state can still impose the death penalty without incurring moral guilt, if they do so correctly; that is, within the confines of natural justice as was always the case. However, by continuing the practice of imposing the death penalty, heads of state are reducing their judgements to the lower moral standard of natural justice. The pope is appealing for them to raise their hearts and eyes to the realities of the higher GOSPEL STANDARD of Divine Mercy, which is at the heart of his pontificate.

In short, the pope is *not* a schoolboy to be spanked by a group of neophyte philosophers. Francis is a well seasoned priest, a man who both knows the principles and has the experience necessary to apply them correctly in widely varying circumstances and in an environment such as the present one, an especial time of supernatural grace in which the King of Kings has pronounced His desire for an Hour of Mercy, an Hour of Mercy before the dread hour of vindictive justice from which no man can escape. [Just about everything that Francis speaks of must be interpreted within the context of Mercy.](#)

***“Today I am sending you with My mercy to the people of the whole world. I do not want to punish aching mankind, but I desire to heal it, pressing it to My merciful Heart. I use punishment when they themselves force me to do so; My hand is reluctant to take hold of the sword of justice. Before the Day of Justice, I am sending the Day of Mercy. ... I am prolonging the time of mercy for the sake of [sinners].”*** (Jesus’ message to Saint Faustina; Diary, 1588 and 1160).

Because he is presenting the death penalty in the context of mercy, he is easily misunderstood by those who fail to recognize the context. Thus, **Pope Francis never stated that the death penalty is “intrinsically evil”** nor did he ever say that it is morally ILLICIT. What Pope Francis did say is that the death penalty is **“INADMISSIBLE.”** **When something is inadmissible it implies that it can also at times be admissible.** Inadmissible is a *procedural* not a *substantive* term – inadmissible is a legal term dealing with procedures that govern evidence, trial protocol, and sentencing *etcetera*. That is, it has to do with correct procedures employed in a criminal or civil case *not* with the substantive moral facts of the case. According to [Black’s Law Dictionary](#), inadmissible refers to:

*“That which, under the established rules of law, cannot be admitted or received: e. g., parol evidence to contradict a written contract.”*

When the pope teaches that the death penalty is *inadmissible*, a reasonable person might be expected to ask: Where or when is it inadmissible. The answer: In the Tribunal of Mercy (or in an Ecclesial Court – the death penalty has always been inadmissible in Ecclesial Courts). **The death penalty is certainly admissible in a Tribunal of Justice** (a secular Criminal Court or the Court of the Eternal Judge) in which a person can be found guilty by a temporal judge and sentenced to death. or by the Eternal Judge and sentenced to hell, to what eschatological literature refers to as the “Second DEATH” ([Rev. 20: 13-15](#)). However, **the Second Death is not possible for any person judged in the Tribunal of Mercy.** Such people will never taste death again! When a person refuses to avail himself of God’s Mercy, he places himself outside the Tribunal of Mercy and is handed over to death which is OUTSIDE the Kingdom of Heaven – Death is not admissible in Heaven.

*“Then shall the king say to them that shall be on his right hand: Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry, and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink; I was a stranger, and you took me in: Naked, and you covered me: sick, and you visited me: I was in prison, and you came to me.... Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand: **Depart from me**, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels” ([Matt 25:34-41](#)).*

Instead of saying they were sorry, those sentenced to the Second Death in the above scripture, complained of their innocence. Thus, instead of mercy and eternal life, they received justice and eternal death, the death penalty. Had they availed themselves of mercy they would have known life because the death penalty is inadmissible in the Tribunal of Mercy!

**Detractors, please be very careful, those who clamor for the sword of justice, risk having the death penalty imposed upon themselves:**

*“JUDGE not, that you may not be judged, For with what judgment you judge, you shall be judged: and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again” ([Matt 7:1-2](#))*

The only reason people are sentenced to the “Second Death” is their radical refusal to ask for forgiveness, the radical refusal to say, “sorry.” If they did so, they would find themselves forgiven and inheritors of eternal life. The Lord, Himself, does NOT ADMIT the death penalty into His Tribunal of Mercy – the death penalty is INADMISSIBLE!

Pope Francis is pleading with modern men and women to save their brothers and sisters from the Second Death and

showing them how to avoid it themselves. This is something that the Mother of God also taught at [Fatima. She showed Jacinta, Francisco and Lucia](#) a momentary vision of hell to inspire them to save souls from being sentenced to its endless caverns.

*“You have seen hell where the souls of poor sinners go. [To save them](#), God wishes to establish in this world devotion to my Immaculate Heart.”*

The death penalty is clearly “*inadmissible*” in a Tribunal of Mercy as Pope Francis correctly teaches. However, the death penalty is not “*intrinsically evil*”, nor did Pope Francis ever say that it is. The death penalty can surely be imposed in a Tribunal of Justice, which is exactly what those risk who clamor that sinners be subjected to justice and who falsely accuse the pope of being a wolf by misrepresenting his words.

It would be better for them to humbly admit their ignorance:

*“Jesus said to them: If you were blind, you should not have sin: but now you say: We see. (Therefore) Your sin remaineth”*  
([John 9:41](#)).

---

# Italy's New Government Strongly Christian – Soros

# Accuses Putin of Collusion

[Newera Global Intelligence Report:](#)

ITALY HAS TAKEN A MAJOR STEP into the future. Governed by a new coalition of two populist parties ("*Northern League*" and "*Five Star*") the beleaguered nation has taken its first major step away from liberalism and EU diktat toward national sovereignty. Following Austria in Central Europe and Poland and Hungary in Eastern Europe, Italy is the first Western European country to elect populist leaders committed to much needed systemic economic, political and cultural change. As such, it did not take long for liberal billionaire financier and philanthropist, George Soros to drum up the his brand of conspiracy theory invoked whenever Christians get elected – [Putin did it:](#)

*"There is "a strong threat and I'm really worried" says Soros. "There is a close relationship between Matteo Salvini and [Russian President Vladimir] Putin... I do not know if Putin actually finances his party, but Italian public opinion has the right to know if Salvini is in Putin's pay check."*

Emanuele Fiano, deputy of the ousted Democratic Party, also weighed in on the debate, telling *Radio Cusano Campus* listeners that:

*"Parliament should have some more certainty about the relations between the League, M5S and Russia."*


Matteo Salvini, head of the newly elected Northern League, strongly denied the allegations:

*"I have never received a lira, a euro or a rouble from Russia," adding, "I am ashamed that a speculator like him is invited to speak" at the Trento Festival of Economics."*

Soros' rhetoric is worn and increasingly ineffective; Italy's problems will not be solved by giving time to his brand of dying liberalism. Italy stands in dire need of an alternative economic plan that could very well emerge throughout the Peninsula. Although the third largest economy in the European Union, and historically a major player in both European and world affairs, Italy is racked with overwhelming economic challenges effecting its current and future stability. Italian debt is now the second highest in Europe after Greece – it has reached 132% of GDP.

## Italian debt is the second highest in Europe

Debt as percentage of national GDP





Source: Eurostat, AMECO European Commission

BBC

Italy is suffering an economic crisis, a crisis exacerbated by pressures from foreign powers who have successfully persuaded Italian leaders to curtail trade with Russia, a move supported by the government of Prime Minister Matteo Renzi. To compound its trade and debt problems, unemployment has skyrocketed in some areas (primarily in the south) to nearly 30%.

## Italian unemployment rate in 2017

Unemployment rate  
by provinces



Source: ISTAT

BBC

Economic facts such as these help account for the resignation of Prime Minister Renzi (December 2016) following a Renzi sponsored referendum to reduce the powers of the Senate thereby increasing those of his left-leaning Democratic government by making it easier to enact legislation through the lower Chamber of Deputies without having to face resistance from the various regions represented in the Senate. Italian voters soundly rejected the proposal and then threw their votes to Italy's two new populist parties, Five Star (M5S) and Lega Nord (Northern League), which emerged as Italy's *two most influential parties* following the country's general election in March, 2018.

Despite their success, neither Lega Nord nor M5S were large enough to form a majority and thus had to look for coalition partners. The Five Star Movement refused to form a coalition with any of its rivals, but acknowledged that if forced



to, it would partner up with the Northern League. Eventually forced, the two combined having well over the 40% threshold needed to govern.

#### Election Results:

- Five Star Movement 32.22
- Democratic Party 18.9
- Lega 17.69 (Lega was part of the Right-Centre Coalition" [Forza Italia, Fratelli, and Lega Nord] that garnered 37% of the vote)
- Forza Italia 13.94
- Fratelli d'Italia 4.35
- Free and Equal 3.38

*Northern League garnered 124 seats in the Chamber of Deputies (lower house) out of a total of 630 and 58 in the Senate out of a total of 315.*

*M5S attained 227 seats in the Chamber of Deputies and 112 in the Senate.*

Together they have

- 351 seats in the Chamber out of 630 and
- 170 seats in the Senate out of 315

Most pundits ruled out or fretted a Five Star-Northern League alliance. According to the [UK Business Insider](#), such a coalition would be "worst case scenario for markets." Likewise, [BBC](#) Europe Editor Katya Adler said such an alliance would be the "EU's nightmare result to come true." According to the [Guardian](#),

*"Many analysts believed the left-wing of M5S would revolt were there a hookup with the League."*

However, if a coalition had not be formed, Italians would have been forced to vote all over again, in which case both the League and M5S would risk *not* repeating at the polls. Short of that, there were two options: (1) Form a broad “grand coalition” of cross spectrum parties or (2) Form a “Euro-skeptic anti-establishment alliance.” Surprisingly, Northern League and Five Star chose the latter option.

League Leader Matteo Salvini approached M5S leader Luigi Di Maio with a deal: Northern League would form a coalition with M5S if League ally *Forza Italia*, headed by ex-premier Silvio Berlusconi was part of the ruling coalition.

*“Di Maio refused the deal, saying Salvini was “choosing restoration instead of revolution” because “Berlusconi represents the past.” He added that his movement was “not interested in remaining stuck or in looking to the past, we want to look to the future.”*

To drive the point further, [Alessandro Di Battista](#), a prominent Five Star member, staunchly opposed any alliance with *Forza Italia*, describing Berlusconi as the “[pure evil of our country](#).”

Finally, on May 13, Feast of Our Lady of Fatima, the two reached a surprising agreement to form a coalition government drafting a contract in which they refer to themselves as “[the government of change](#)” (*Contratto per il governo del cambiamento*).

## **Who is the Northern League or Lega Nord**

Lega Nord represents the underdog that no one took seriously. According to [Politico](#):

*“When Matteo Salvini took over the leadership of the Northern League at the end of 2013, Italian politicians and the media*

*said his job would be to officiate at the party's funeral. Two years later, it is back from the near dead – and stronger than ever."*

The party's complete name is **Lega Nord per l'Indipendenza della Padania** (Northern League for the Independence of Padania). Born as a regional party in wealthy northern Italy, Lega Nord initially campaigned for independence from the poorer south. However, once Salvini assumed the helm, Lega softened its aspirations to succeed from Italy to that of more local or regional autonomy. Realizing the possibility of becoming a national party, it was re branded as **Lega** or simply *League* for the 2018 elections during which it focused heavily on the Islamic refugee crisis, the negative effects of the Euro and of continued membership in the European Union. According to [Reuters](#),

*"The Northern League...would aim to pull Italy out of the European Union if Brussels refused to re-negotiate fiscal and immigration rules."*

Allied with other European populist parties in the European Parliament, such as Marine Le Pen's *National Front* in France, Northern League advocates resumed trade with Russia and returning to EU's status *before* the 1992 signing of the [Maastricht Treaty](#) (which laid the foundations for a single currency) thereby signaling a move away from the Euro.

In this regard, Salvini recently hosted a *Milan Conference* for a new group in the European Parliament known as [Europe of Nations and Freedom Group](#) (ENF), which includes Marine Le Pen and other Euroskeptic party leaders from throughout the continent. ENF is working to establish a "[Europe of free nations in which power is fully returned from the European Union to the voters of sovereign states.](#)" The group's commitments are to **sovereignty, democracy, freedom** and ending mass **immigration** so that members may advance their own

interests at the domestic level. Along these lines, the League, promotes Italy's **cultural values**, supports the **traditional family**, is **opposed to same sex union**, **globalism**, and the spread of **liberalism**.

In the words of Marine le Pen VP of ENF:

*"Each day, the Europe of Brussels unveils its fatal design: deconstructing nations to build a new globalist order, dangerous for the security, prosperity, identity, the very survival of the European peoples."*

*"Faced with the proponents of federalism, we are the guardians informed of the national spirit and the defenders of the interests of European peoples."*

*"An opposing force that embodies the patriotic alternative to the globalist Europe, Brussels..."*

*"This pole of resistance, which today unites the elect of eight European nations, pursues a compelling purpose: to free Europe from the chains of servitude...and build a continent of peace and prosperity."*

At the close of the Milan meeting of ENF, Salvini had a photo taken with Le Pen and others containing the caption:

*"We will not surrender to the clandestine invasion."*

Whether it was the refugee crisis, the [Marine Le Pen](#) bandwagon or what party insiders prefer to call the "*Salvini Effect*", the party that sank to an historic low of 4 percent in the 2013 election is now part of the ruling coalition leading

Italy into the future.

Following the 2018 elections Salvini exclaimed:

*“It’s a fantastic victory which fills us with pride.” He claimed Italian voters had “made a step forward to be free from the cages and ties that are bringing back hunger and insecurity in Europe”.*

## Who is Five Star

Five Star is a **“populist, anti-establishment, anti-globalist, increasingly popular”** movement in Italy. The party was established by an Italian comedian, Beppe Grillo and web strategist [Gianroberto Casaleggio](#) in 2009. It is named Five Stars because it coalesces around five primary issues:

1. Transportation
2. Water (Green technology – anti-pollution – environmentalism)
3. Development (social justice oriented – the common good) it is anti-capitalist and anti-consumerist
4. Internet Access
5. Non-violence

Five Star is in favor of direct digital democracy (direct participation of all citizens in public affairs by use of computer technology). It rejects foreign military intervention in the Middle East and specifically American intervention in Syria. It also proposes “drastic” cuts to corporate taxes, slashing red tape by abolishing 400 “useless” laws and guaranteeing a minimum income of up to [780 euros for the poor](#).

It opposes

1. Extreme concentrations of wealth
2. *Neoliberalism*

As such, M5S favors limited but sustainable growth, reduced production and consumption, promotion of the arts and more humane use of leisure time.

Five Star *might* be populist, peace minded and social justice oriented, *but it is also a left wing movement committed to an aberrant moral agenda* and therefore has the backing of the liberal members of the [EU whose Constitution](#) “stipulates that countries draw inspiration from Europe’s cultural, religious and (liberal) humanist heritage.”

Realizing the rise of populist parties throughout Europe, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) had a choice in Italy: Back Northern League, back Five Star or bash both. BBC pinned its hopes on Five Star thereby presenting the movement as another populist party like those coming to the fore throughout Europe. Although Five Star has an innovative *political* and *economic* reform package, *morally* Five Star appears to be just another appendage of British liberalism. [In 2014 the party voted for gay rights and same sex unions](#). They also support euthanasia and artificial insemination

That was 2014, during the 2018 elections, Five Star back peddled on the issue. According to the [Guardian](#):

*“After seemingly supporting the legislation for months, Beppe Grillo, the former comic who heads the protest party (Five Star), announced that members of his party could vote their conscience on the bill (advocating same sex unions).”*

*“It was a reflection, analysts said, of the changing political landscape in Italy. The country’s [conservative and right-wing parties are largely in disarray](#) and Grillo likely sees an opportunity to pick up conservative voters in*

*upcoming local elections if he can scupper or weaken the civil unions bill."*

*"They are also opportunistic. There is an opportunity to grab votes from centre-right parties, which at this point cannot even put forward candidates in key cities," said Wolfango Piccoli, an analyst at Teneo Intelligence in London."*

The "opportunistic shift," politically motivated as it might be, might forebode good things to come as the two coalition partners make accommodations for each other. The League is, by definition, Conservative. It has a traditional Christian moral agenda and gives signs of being under the influence of old conservative economic policies such as those represented by Silvio Berlusconi whom M5S leader Luigi Di Maio rejected as an artifact that "represents the past." M5S, he said, is "*not interested in remaining stuck or in looking to the past, we want to look to the future.*" Berlusconi, according to another M5S stalwart represents the "[pure evil of our country.](#)"

Both parties are **populist, anti-globalist and are skeptical of the EU.** In addition, "both parties are actively declaring that they are in favor of rapprochement with Moscow and the abolition of anti-Russian sanctions. The leader of the "League" Matteo Salvini has repeatedly visited Moscow, where he met with Vladimir Putin, State Duma deputies and journalists."

**This might be enough "new thinking" to hold them together. Quite simply, they need each other in the struggle against more powerful globalist forces.**

**Will this Coalition Work?**

On the surface Five Star and the League appear to be a good

fit; however, on closer examination, the fit does *not* appear so good. On third look, however, the match might be made in Heaven. Although both the League and Five Star oppose immigration (see note below), globalism, European dictates and approve of economic relations with Russia, they are deeply opposed on several, key moral issues. Nonetheless, both are percipient enough to realize that If one losses the support of the other, they are both losers. Simply stated, they need each other – They are the only two members in the coalition. Since they also have a common core to build upon, dialogue followed by compromise is expected.

Five Star is the more liberal of the two, their liberalism however includes economic ideas that have the support of the Catholic Church: opposition to deregulation, materialism and hedonistic capitalism, to wealth concentration, to excessive individualism and lack of social conscience for the “common good.” Although often anathema to economic conservatives, the foregoing list contains morally sound attributes in tune with Christian individual-communal anthropology rooted in the Holy Trinity favorable to moral conservatives.

The League is the more conservative of the two. It is opposed to same-sex marriages, homosexuality etc. It also holds both economic and cultural paradigms opposed by Five Star. Something is going to have to give or there will be no cooperation and further dissolution – something Italy can no longer afford.

If the League is going to get along with its new coalition partner, it is going to have to learn some new economic thinking. M5S is definitely liberal by conservative eyes. It promotes homosexuality, stands for social justice, fair distribution, serving the common good etc. Although **social** and **distributive justice** have long been associated with socialism or communism, with hippies on the left etc., they are in actuality moral issues advocated by the Catholic



Church, which is certainly *not* liberal. In the light of Italy's failing economy, the League might be persuaded to at least quasi accept Five Star's economic platform – this task can be made easier if League leaders can be persuaded that they are not communist or socialist ideas *per se* – in fact, they are plain old Christian. If League leaders can grasp this, it becomes perhaps the key for compromise. The League can adopt innovative forward looking economic proposals and remain true to its Christian values at the same time. This compromise is based on the League moving first; something which should be much easier for them since they are both the minority in the coalition and able to maintain their Christian stance while moving in the direction of Five Star's economic proposals.

Leaving the European Union or attaining more sovereignty while remaining in the EU will *not* be enough to solve Italy's problems. The problem is more deeply rooted than the euro; there is no simple way out of the euro. "An extreme crisis in Italy would most likely result not in euro exit but a debt restructuring. And the costs of that wouldn't fall on the European Central Bank, as the coalition partners fondly imagine. They would fall on the Italian savers and pensioners—and, yes, voters—who hold 70% of the country's debt" ([Wall Street Journal](#)).

Realizing this, Five Star has "steadily rowed back on an early plan to hold a referendum on whether Italy should leave the common currency zone, and this month its new, moderate leader Luigi Di Maio said it was no longer a party policy" ([Reuters](#)).

The problem is not the euro, it is systemic. Five Star has the stronger moral hand *economically*. The old model of usurious finance, unrestricted concentration of wealth, mass consumer society, speculation that benefits a few to the detriment of the common good are all associated with economic liberalism, which Five Star wants to modify, regulate or abandon.

The League might be willing to give some slack in this domain, if M5S softened its objectionable moral agenda and becomes more amenable to traditional family values. If Five Star expects compromise from the League it too will have to compromise; family morality seems the likely choice. Five Star might be loathe to so compromise, but the future of Italy, and of their remaining in power, depends upon it. In return Five Star gets their way on Russia and agreement about EU diktat; they also gain support for their economic program and predictable clash with the financial establishment; all they have to do is compromise on family values. The League also gets their way on Russia, agreement about EU diktat and their cherished family and traditional values; all they have to do is compromise on the economy – something discussion with Pope Francis and the Italian episcopate can speed along.

[Cardinal Parolin, Secretary of State for the Vatican](#), summed up the situation well: the Holy See, he said, would continue its “work of education”

---

#### NOTE:

The pope hasn't retracted any Catholic doctrine, but he expects mercy and compassion, respect, and welcome. When it comes to homosexuality, his response: “Who am I to judge?” When it comes to immigration both Francis and Salvini might have to compromise – there seems to be ample room. Salvini is strongest anti-immigrant voice in Italy. He crossed Francis by leading the charge against the *ius solis* (*right of the soils*) or birthright citizenship meaning anyone born on the soil or territory of a state has the right of citizenship. On this point, Francis seems to hold the stronger hand, without it children could be separated from parents. On the broader question, Salvini seems to hold the stronger hand. Not everyone is admissible; even the Jews knew that: Relations with people who had been hostile, such as the Ammonites and Moabites, Aquinas says ([First Part of Second Part Q 105](#))

*“Were never to be admitted to citizenship; while the Amalekites, who were yet more*

*hostile to them, and had no fellowship of kindred with them, were to be held as foes in perpetuity: for it is written ([Ex. 17:16](#)): "The war of the Lord shall be against Amalec from generation to generation."*

---

# **Korea Blest as Pope Francis Sends Marian Group on Urgent Worldwide Peace Mission**

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

**THIS YEAR THE CHURCH IS CELEBRATING** the centenary of the appearance of the Mother of God at Fatima, Portugal in 1917. Since that time Fatima has become the world's most prominent center of Marian devotion, a place that John Paul II referred to as the "Marian capital of the world." Our Lady of Fatima precisely foretold the outbreak of World War II, the rise of Communism, the persecution of the Church and the world-wide spread of Communism before the Bolshevik Revolution ever occurred, Her other prophecies concerning the conversion of Russia to be correlated with a promised "Era of Peace" are of especial importance since, unlike the former that have already occurred, these prophesied events are in the process of occurring. Any impartial observer of global events can

discern the Hand of God at work in the world as [Russia is being converted](#) and the **nations of the world are one by one in the process of rejecting global liberalism while many are reasserting their Christian identities** ([Eastern Europe](#), [Africa](#), [Poland](#), [Hungary](#), [Slovakia](#), [France](#), [Austria](#), [Asia](#), [Argentina](#), [Middle East](#)).

As stated, the universal church is in the midst of celebrating the 100th Anniversary of Our Lady's appearance at Fatima. Perhaps one of the most astounding events of the the centenary is the reconciliation of North and South Korea following a visit of a pilgrim statue of Our Lady of Fatima to the Korean demilitarized zone. Although not reported by any of the mainstream media, on January 11, 2017 Pope Francis conducted a ceremonial blessing of six statues of Our Lady of Fatima to be sent on a world-wide mission of Peace and Reparation to the six populated continents of the world. During the blessing of these pilgrim statues, Pope Francis also renewed his declaration that the Centenary of Fatima be a Jubilee Year, with plenary indulgences available under the normal conditions for those who participate in memorial celebrations, including pilgrimages, public veneration and rosary prayers before any image of Our Lady of Fatima and also for the infirm and elderly who unite their suffering and prayers to those of Jesus ([Colossians 1:24](#)).

This video is an essential watch during this 100th Anniversary of Fatima:

### **Broiling Problems in Korean Conflict**

According to [Professor Americo Lopez Ortiz, International President of the World Apostolate of Fatima](#),

*"The Message of Fatima has it all: The doctrinal richness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; its freshness, images, gestures*

*of the primitive Christian catechesis; the calls to penance from Saint John the Baptist, preparing the way for the Redeemer; the strong eschatological accents of Christ before the ruins of Jerusalem ([Luke 19:41-44](#)); the didactic force of Jesus' parables; the simple life of the villagers, their emotional gestures and learned prayers; the prophetic contents of the Book of Revelation with the confrontation between "the [Woman clothed with the sun... and the red dragon](#)"; as well as God's seal with the [Miracle of the Sun October 13, 1917 \(video 5:32\)](#) and the profound spiritual peace found in that holy place where heaven and earth meet for the welfare of humanity."*

Our Lady of Fatima also promised [the conversion of Russia and an Era of Peace](#):

*"In the end, My Immaculate Heart will triumph. The Holy Father will consecrate Russia to Me, and she will be converted, and a period of peace will be granted to the world."*

The conversion of Russia and the promised Era of Peace are contingent upon two things:

1. The faithful performance of [First Saturday Devotion](#) (see note below), which has called the "hidden part of the Message of Fatima" and
2. The Papal Consecration of Russia to her Immaculate Heart, which was accomplished by Pope John Paul II on March 25, 1984.

Following the 1984 papal consecration, as promised, Communism was toppled, the Solidarity movement gained momentum in Poland, the Berlin wall came down and one after another the nations behind the "Iron Curtain" were given political and then religious freedom – [Russia is being converted as Our Lady of Fatima promised](#).

Communism, however, continues to influence North Korea. Its influence was manifest in 1950 when Communist Soviet and Chinese leaders supported North Korea's invasion of South Korea. Within two years, United States led UN forces suffered horrendous casualties: 93,000 prisoners of war, 118,000 dead and another 265,000 wounded; by the time UN troops withdrew, over 3,000,000 men had died on the battlefield. After the fighting ceased, Korea became a pivotal state in the global cold-war fought between the United States and the Soviet Union (USSR). Americans lined up behind South Korea while North Korea became a proxy of the USSR.

The cold-war conflict in the Korean peninsula has been exacerbated by another little recognized fact: The war never officially ended; a final peace treaty has never been achieved. Instead, facilitated by the United Nations, North Korea and South Korea agreed to an armistice, which was signed by representatives of the three parties on July 27, 1953. Since that time, the US has maintained a significant troop presence and, along with South Korea, has manned what has become known as the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). The DMZ is a 2.5 miles wide and 160 miles long area that divides the Korean Peninsula in half. Although referred to as a demilitarized zone, a large contingent of troops are amassed along each side of the line within 2.5 miles of each other. The conflicting zones are surrounded by barbed wires, fortified by walls and protected by mines.

From its inception until the year 2000, over 50 US soldiers, 500 South Korean soldiers, and 250 soldiers from North Korea have been killed along the DMZ. Both sides have violated the territorial integrity of the other: South Korea has discovered four tunnels crossing the DMZ that have been dug by North Korea. In 1976, William Clements, the US Deputy Secretary of Defense reported to US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, that South Korea had conducted 200 raids into North Korea from the South.

As stated above, the war between North and South Korea never formally ended. Instead, it has been the front of a Cold War that is recently growing hot. In September, 2017, North Korea launched a ballistic missile over northern Japan thereby triggering a widespread emergency alert across that island nation. Nikki Haley, US Ambassador to the United Nations, then warned [North Korea](#) to relinquish its nuclear weapons programmes, emphasizing that the regime faces “destruction” if it continues its threatening behaviour and forces the US to defend its allies.


*“If North Korea keeps on with this reckless behavior, if the United States has to defend itself or defend its allies in any way, North Korea will be destroyed” ([Washington Post](#)).*

President Trump then referred to North Korean President Kim Jong Un as “[Rocket Man](#)“. The President of North Korea, however, could not humble himself to be upstaged; [Kin Jong fired back](#):

*“Action is the best option in treating the dotard who, hard of hearing, is uttering only what he wants to say” ([BBC News](#)).*

He ended his analysis of President Trump and summarized his intentions toward him:

*“I will surely and definitely tame the mentally deranged US dotard with fire.”*



[Pre-Fatima Press Release: Grasp Global Events. A fascinating account of Fatima & Triumph of Mary's Immaculate Heart](#)

As stated above, the definitive Triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary has two requirements. The pope has fulfilled his requirement. However, the other part, the part concerning First Saturday Devotion, requires the participation of the lay faithful. Prof. Ortiz has referred to First Saturday Devotion as the “forgotten part of the Message of Fatima”

*[“The forgotten part of the Message of Fatima”](#), that is, the Eucharistic and Marian reparatory practice of the **First Saturdays Devotion**, (is) the missing link needed to pass from one stage of the Message of Fatima to the next and **definitive one**, making possible the announced Triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.”*

Neither God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, nor the pope, are expected to bring about an Era of Peace all by themselves. Jesus will not build His Kingdom by Himself. He expects His people to participate – to be co-creators of His kingdom ([Ephesians 4: 11-12](#); [1 Corinthians 12: 24-26](#); [Matt 28: 18-20](#); [Matt 24:14](#)). Likewise, from the beginning of the Fatima Message, the Virgin Mary has asked for the



participation of the Church, both the pope and all the faithful.

She both commissioned the pope to make the consecration of Russia, and asked the rest of her children to participate by engaging in First Saturday Devotions, by praying the rosary, wearing the brown scapular, making reparation (especially Eucharistic Reparation) and offering sacrifices united to those of Jesus for the “conversion of poor sinners.”

Eyes have been so focused on what the pope was supposed to do that the people of God forgot what they were supposed to do. Thus, Profesor Ortiz refers to First Saturday Devotion as the “forgotten part of the Message of Fatima.” [The pope did his part, and the effects are clearly manifest](#). The more that the people of God do theirs, the more quickly the full effect of the promised Triumph of the Immaculate Heart will be felt.

### **Pilgrim Statue Comes to Korea on Peace Mission**

The 100th Anniversary of Our Lady’s appearance at Fatima is also the [50th Golden Jubilee of the World Apostolate of Fatima’s appearance in Korea](#). Korea is among the fastest growing Catholic nations in the world. It is a land soaked with the blood of [Catholic martyrs](#), over [8,000](#) along with 103 [saints](#) whom Pope John Paul II canonized in 1984. Thirty years later, before a throng of [800,000 Koreans](#), Pope Francis [beatified](#) 123 more. Korea thus exalts in having the [fourth largest](#) number of saints of any country in the world. Because the martyrs are also viewed as patriots liberating Korea from injustice, Francis beatified them on Korea’s National Holiday celebrating its liberation.

Three years following his pastoral visit to Korea, Pope Francis commissioned one of the six Fatima statues he blest for the Fatima Centenary to tour Asia. The statue began

its Asian journey in January by traveling to Hong Kong; it then proceeded to Taiwan, Indonesia and the Philippines. It arrived in Korea on May 17, 2017. Our Lady was greeted by an enthusiastic crowd at the Jesuit Sogang University. Then on June 5, after touring the country, she proceeded to the Demilitarized Zone. Rather than write about the events, I prefer and request that you watch the embedded video. Please do not stop at the 4:00 mark but continue to the end.

**Leaders of North and South Korea Proclaim They are Ushering in an “Era of Peace” (5:56 in Video):**

## **Korea Today**

Today, [roughly one third of Korea is Christian](#). The Catholic church is booming. Between 1997 and 2007, it increased its membership by a phenomenal 70%.

*“‘Over the past ten years, the Catholic Church in Korea has gone from three to five million faithful’. Cardinal Nicholas [Cheong Jin-suk, archbishop of Seoul](#), has said in an interview. The Catholic Church in South Korea is the one that is growing most vigorously in Asia.”*

But, according to the [New York Times](#), “Not everyone in South Korea welcomed the pope” or is happy about the exponential growth of the Catholic Church:

*“And it is not Buddhists or Confucians (the country’s two major non-Christian religious groups) who publicly expressed unhappiness with his visit, but members of Protestant groups who fear Catholic encroachment in a country where Christians make up 29 percent of the population.”*

A fundamentalist pastor named Rev. Song Choon-gil, could not restrain his dispensational and apocalyptic anti-Catholicism:

*"The enemy king has appeared at the center of our nation!", (he) shouted during a rally of hundreds of Protestants who gathered a few blocks from the papal Mass on Saturday. Accompanied by a band, the evangelical Protestants sang hymns and danced, shouting that they were sounding "the trumpets of spiritual war" against the "idol worship" and "satanic forces" they said Roman Catholicism represents" ([New York Times](#)).*

In addition to, and perhaps related to, these troubles, Jeong Se Hyun, South Korea's unification minister from 2002 to 2004 and a former envoy to North Korea stated that:

*"In order for the [peace treaty](#) (signed by the two Korean leaders) to be an effective safeguard that can prevent U.S. military action against North Korea, there needs to be more than a two-party deal....**China needs to be a signatory, in addition to the United States, South Korea, and North Korea,**"*

Peace is a very real possibility, but will the Neocon warhawks in the Trump administration, the deep-state bureaucrats and pro-Zionist Christian Fundamentalists (the vocal core of Trump's Christian supporters) support a [Peace Treaty](#) that is intended to initiate a "[New Era of Peace](#)"?

Our Lord and Our Lady want peace, but dispensational fundamentalist preachers in Korea (as throughout Latin America), along with the warmongers of the world, are intent to spread their rapidly fading tide of neoliberalism. They want to hold onto their solipsistic money machine. They seem to prefer the Gospel of Prosperity to the Gospel of Jesus Christ who commanded his followers to [love](#) all men and to [lay down their lives](#) for each other; they seem to forget or ignore the fact that Jesus was born into poverty and died naked on

the Cross, and that He preached that it was easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven ([Mark 10:25](#)). Francis, who has criticized capitalism and alluded to it as the “dung of the devil,” is clearly not to their liking. [Speaking in Bolivia, the pontiff said:](#)

*“There is the stench of what Basil of Caesarea called ‘the dung of the devil’. An unfettered pursuit of money rules. The service of the common good is left behind. Once capital becomes an idol and guides people’s decisions, once greed for money presides over the entire socioeconomic system, it ruins society, it condemns and enslaves men and women, it destroys human fraternity, it sets people against one another and, as we clearly see, it even puts at risk our common home.”*

Francis might not be the friend of neoliberalism and warmongers who support it, but the important thing is that he is the friend of Jesus and His mother, the Virgin Mary.

[As indicated in article after article during this 100th Year anniversary of Fatima:](#) Liberalism is failing. First challenged in Eastern Europe, the challenge is spreading to Western Europe and rapidly taking root in Africa and Latin America as well. The peace process has now reached the Christian blood-stained Korean Peninsula. However, just last week, National Security Advisor Robert Bolton in an interview with FOX News, stated that the US has not made any commitment to remove its military presence from the Korean peninsula.

*“There’s nobody in the [Trump administration](#) who’s **starry-eyed** about what’s happening here (in Korea).”*

Men and women who want peace are anathema to those who want war. Being anathema, the warmongers can’t stand looking at the peace advocates, especially if they carry a rosary. If so, they certainly have disdain for the Mother of God, the “Queen

of Peace” who has been decreed by the Holy Trinity to bring and an end to war, to usher in an Era of Peace and triumph over the world’s greatest warmonger:

*“And the Lord God said to the serpent: Because thou hast done this thing, thou art cursed among all cattle, and the beasts of the earth: upon thy breast shalt thou go, and earth shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.”*

*“I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel” ([Genesis 3:15](#)).*

The enmity between Satan and the Woman was decreed at the beginning of time (Genesis). It is to be fulfilled at the end:

*“A great sign appeared in the sky, a woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars” ([Revelation 12:1](#)).*

NSA Bolton does not see any stars in Korea – “no one” he says, “is starry-eyed about what’s happening” in Korea. Neoliberal warhawks are apparently not looking in the Virgin Mary’s direction. [The stars that grace her crown are not hard to miss.](#)

*North Korea and South Korea’s Nine-Point Reconciliation Plan:*

- Declaring the Korean War over
- Setting denuclearization as a common goal
- Hosting President Moon in North Korea’s capital by year’s end
- Ending hostilities on land, air and water
- Stopping propaganda broadcasts
- Establishing a joint liaison office

- Holding reunions of families separated by the Korean War in August
- Reconnecting an inter-Korean railroad; and
- Participating in the 2018 Asian Games together

---

## NOTE:

“The First Saturday’s Devotion in reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary is a devotional practice that includes sacramental reception of Confession (at least one per month), Holy Communion on Five Consecutive First Saturdays of the month; meditation of the Holy Rosary, including 15 minutes reflecting on its Mysteries, to accompany Mother Mary in her solitude, with the intention of reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.”

“The Apparitions began on December 10, 1925 while Sister Lucia was at the Dorothean Convent in Pontevedra. **Our Lady of Fatima in the company of the Sacred Heart of Infant Jesus appeared to her while the Child Jesus said to Lucia:** “Have compassion on the Heart of your most holy Mother, covered with thorns, with which ungrateful men pierce it at every moment, and there is no one to make an act of reparation to remove them.”

**“Then, the Most Holy Virgin said:** “Look, my daughter, at my Heart, surrounded with thorns with which ungrateful men pierce me at every moment by their blasphemies and ingratitude. You at least try to console me and say that I promise to assist at the hour of death, with the graces necessary for salvation, all those who, on the first Saturday of five consecutive months, shall confess, receive Holy Communion, recite five decades of the Rosary, and keep me company for fifteen minutes while meditating on the mysteries of the Rosary, with the intention of making reparation to me” ([Quoted from Americo Lopez Ortiz](#)).

---

# OPCW Completes Inspection in

# Syria Beginning to Look More Like Fake News

FOLLOWING THE ALLEGED APRIL 7 chemical attack laid at the feet of Syrian President Bashar al Assad, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW – an independent international organization that works in conjunction with the UN but is governed by its own Executive Council.) sent a team to Syria to investigate the allegations. However, *before* they could conduct their investigation, the combined forces of the United Kingdom, France and the United States launched an April 14 missile attack on Syria.

After the attack, the OPCW team was delayed from initiating their investigation. [Liberal media outlets accused Russia of being behind the delay's](#). Their motive, according to media sources was time needed to clean up the chemicals left behind, the residue of Assad's alleged attack.

This scenario, while interesting and highly provocative, does *not* make much sense, especially when it is realized that it was the Russians who asked for the original investigation launched by the OPCW. On April 10, following the allegations of a chemical attack by Assad and prior to the missile attack by the US, Vassily Nebenzia, [Russian Ambassador to the UN](#) issued a draft resolution at the UN calling for a special mission to investigate the allegations. In the resolution, it is stated that:

*“OPCW experts had conducted a field mission. On 10 April, when his country's draft resolution (Russia's) on the OPCW special mission had been blocked, he (the Russian Ambassador) had been assured that such a document had not been needed, and that the (OPCW) mission would visit and investigate the sites. However, the 13 April aggression (US missile attack) had laid bare that that was not the issue (missiles were*

*launched before the mission commenced)... ‘This is how you want international affairs to be conducted,’ he asked. ‘This (he said) is hooliganism’ from major nuclear powers” ([United Nations Official Documents](#)).*

The Russian ambassador was referring to the fact that **an internationally recognized team was already on the ground and in place ready to investigate the alleged chemical attack, but before they could investigate, The United States, France and Great Britain launched their missile attack** thereby impeding the investigation, which *might* have turned up nothing, thereby exonerating Assad, had it been permitted to investigate.

Similarly, the Syrian Ambassador to the UN stated that his country had:

*“...officially invited OPCW to send its fact-finding mission to investigate alleged chemical weapons use. Syria welcomed that visit and stood ready to cooperate fully, and it looked forward to the fact-finding mission conducting its work with transparency and professionalism while relying on evidence. The fact-finding mission would get full access to a liberated Douma” ([United Nations Press Releases – April 10, 2018](#)).*

The US launched the airstrike on April 14, but on April 9th the Russian delegate to the UN was (as stated above) pleading for an independent investigation to be conducted by the OPCW going so far as to assure that Russian soldiers would protect the OPCW team and facilitate the mission:

*“[The Russian envoy](#) called for the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) investigative team to conduct a thorough inquiry surrounding the allegations of chemical weapon use, saying these teams could be escorted by Russian and Syrian forces as soon as Tuesday” (April 10).*

Ambassador Nebenzia iterated the fact that:



*“The draft by his country had also reflected the Government of Syria’s invitation to the OPCW fact-finding mission in order to carry out its investigation in line with that organization’s standards” ([UN Press Release](#)).*

[UK Envoy to the UN, Karen Pierce](#), even expressed her interest in pursuing this course of action:

*“I was very interested to hear the Russian offer that OPCW fact-finding mission could visit and would have the [protection](#) of Russian forces.... I believe that this is an offer worth pursuing but it would of course be necessary for the OPCW mission to have complete freedom of action and freedom of [access](#).”*

Most importantly, the OPCW itself announced the fact, that both Syria and Russia had called for an investigation after the allegations that Assad had deployed chemical weapons and before the US led missile strike:

*“Today (April 10), the OPCW Technical Secretariat has requested the Syrian Arab Republic to make the necessary arrangements for such a deployment. This has coincided with a request from the Syrian Arab Republic and the Russian Federation to investigate the allegations of chemical weapons use in Douma. The team is preparing to deploy to Syria shortly” ([OPCW Website](#)).*

In short, it is *not* likely that the Russians or the Syrians impeded the *post-missile strike* investigation, they both desired a *pre-missile strike* investigation. It was the France, the UK and US that impeded the investigation by launching a large scale missile attack hours before it was to be conducted thereby making a pre-strike investigation impossible.

**Here is a Concrete Example of Fake News “Cherry Picking” to**

## Manufacture a False Story from Partial Truths

The CBS news report cited in sentence two above is an example of fake news by means of partial truths. Despite a full two page letter drafted by Ahmet Üzümcü, the Director General of the OPCW regarding its investigation, [CBS](#) reported only one sentence from the two page report, the only one that in any way supports their case:

*“The Syrian and the Russian officials who participated in the preparatory meetings in Damascus have informed the FFM (Fact Finding Mission) Team that there were still pending security issues to be worked out before any deployment could take place.”*

Focusing on this one sentence, CBS simultaneously disregarded the remaining letter that negates their illusory case. The [actual entire letter](#), reveals a quite different story. It contains sentences such as the following:

*“On Tuesday 10 April, we (the OPCW) handed to the Syrian delegation a note verbale notifying them of our decision to deploy the FFM as early as possible, as well as the names of the team members for issuance of visas. **On the same day, the Syrian delegation submitted to the Secretariat a note verbale requesting the FFM to be dispatched. We also received a letter from the Ambassador of the Russian Federation supporting the Syrian request. Following these communications which are circulated to the States Parties on 10 April, I received a letter from the Syrian Vice Foreign Minister expressing his government’s support for the deployment of the FFM**” ([OPCW Executive Council](#)).*

And

*“An advance group of three experts from the FFM arrived in Beirut on Thursday (three days before the missile firings),*

*while the remaining six members joined them on Friday. The full team received a security briefing from the UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) in Beirut on Friday. On Saturday the team proceeded to Damascus (hours before the missile attack), where they met with officials of the National Authority to work out a plan for the deployment."*

The fact is that both Russia and Syria were the initiators of the investigation, both favored and asked for it as well as made plans to facilitate it. Three days prior to the missile attack the OPCW team was already in Lebanon (Beirut); on Saturday they were moved to the Syrian capital in Damascus from which they were to proceed to Douma pending final arrangements by the Syrian military. Before final plans could be implemented, US-UK missiles rained over the city and province thereby directly affecting the ability of the OPCW to carry out the Russian-Syrian requested investigation of the alleged chemical site.

If the US, the British, French and Israeli intelligence communities were unaware of the OPCW presence on the ground in Syria and Jordan, it is a failure of gross proportions – the whole reason of the OPCW's existence is to investigate chemical sites. Or did they know the OPCW team was on the ground undertaking an active investigation, and that is precisely the reason they bombed Syria – that is, to interrupt the investigation? If so, this is tampering of ultimate proportion.

Moreover, the tweet employed by CBS to distort the news and chastise Russia and Syria is merely an irrelevant tweet, an unidentified opinion emanating from the Official Twitter account of the [#UK](#) Delegation of the OCDF, a delegation that stands in opposition to Russia and Syria. In short, it is a nonsense tweet from an unidentified source from a highly biased UK delegation, a delegation of a nation engaged in war with Syria.

[https://twitter.com/UK\\_OPCW/status/985816921395298305?tfw\\_site=CBSNews&ref\\_src=twsrc%5Etfw&ref\\_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cbsnews.com%2Fnews%2Frussia-opcw-syria-alleged-chemical-attack-after-us-strikes-2018-4-16%2F](https://twitter.com/UK_OPCW/status/985816921395298305?tfw_site=CBSNews&ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cbsnews.com%2Fnews%2Frussia-opcw-syria-alleged-chemical-attack-after-us-strikes-2018-4-16%2F)

## **Future Investigation**

Regardless of the above situation, over two weeks have passed since the missile attacks; finally, OPCW inspectors have entered Douma and taken [samples](#) from the site of the alleged April 7 chemical attack. [According to the OPCW itself](#),

*“...samples collected will be transported to the OPCW Laboratory in Rijswijk and then dispatched for analysis to the OPCW’s designated labs” ([Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons Website](#)).*

The findings will have to wait until analysis is completed, but anticipation is growing as the UK, France and US have all made claims that both the Syrians and Russians have “tampered” with the site and [delayed](#) the OPCW investigation.

The OPCW, however, has stated that the [only obstacle](#) to their post-missile investigation of Douma was the UNDSS. Moreover, experts are highly skeptical about the possibility of removing all chemical evidence from the site. That is, if chemicals were used, evidence will be found. According to Dr. Homer Venters, Director of Programs for Physicians for Human Rights, which investigated Halabja, Iraq, in 1992 (four years after a chemical weapons attack), despite the passage of four years, samples still showed evidence of a chemical attack on Kurdish villages in Iraq. Therefore,

*“It is unlikely”, he said, “that all traces of evidence could be removed” (in Syria or anywhere) [NBC News](#).*

In conclusion, no matter how much the news is twisted, an

objective analysis reveals that Russia and Syria did *not* impede the investigation of Douma prior to the firing of missiles by the US cohort; rather, **they asked for and facilitated that investigative mission.**

Given the fact that both Russia and Syria asked for, and fully cooperated with, the UN investigation team prior to the missile attacks seems to negate any further allegations of tampering with the alleged crime scene.

It is more likely that the forces behind the missile attacks, attacks that occurred just *prior to* the planned on-site investigation, are the same forces that delayed efforts *following the missile attacks*. First the Syrians are accused of using chemical weapons and then of delaying tactics employed to buy time necessary for the removal of evidence. Unfortunately, they are being accused by the very forces that *obviously*

- (1) ignored the UN plans for an investigation by firing over 100 missiles thereby

- (2) obliterating the OPCW investigation, an investigation that would have been much different prior to the firing of missiles than after.

Yes, the whole thing is beginning to look a whole lot more like “fake news”.

---

**Either Assad Must be the  
Dumbest Dictator on the**

# Planet or Maybe He Didn't Do It

THE WORLD IS PASSING THROUGH a unique time, a time characterized by a burgeoning global reaction against unipolar liberal hegemony exercised by a powerful international coterie in countries such as France, the United Kingdom and the United States. These three nations cooperated to launch a major missile attack against a beleaguered Syria using the pretext of war crimes allegedly perpetrated by Bashar al Assad who they have accused for the third time of employing chemical weapons against his own people. Unfortunately (for the international coterie), many people are wising up; they prefer peace to ongoing war and threats of war. The tide is clearly turning, and Syria is the turning point. The international arena is significantly changing, but the globalists cannot humble themselves enough to accept the fact that their self-serving liberal hegemony is no longer palatable.

Astutely recognizing the mounting discontent, Donald Trump ran for office on a populist ticket touting a foreign policy consisting of attractive goals such as cessation of regime change, pulling troops out of the Middle East and Syria, reduction of NATO, *rapprochement* with Russia, non-interference in the affairs of sovereign nation states and, corollary with these goals, the reduction of US military bases around the globe. However, due to internal pressures from Neoconservatives, warhawks in both parties, EU Globalists, deep-state bureaucrats, and Zionist lobbies such as the *American Israel Public Affairs Committee* (AIPAC), due to pressure from groups such as these, the new president has been unable to advance his foreign policy objectives. Recently, however, it appeared as if he might be taking control of the executive office. On March 29, 2018 he stated:

*"We're knocking the hell out of ISIS. We'll be coming out of Syria, like, very soon. Let the other people take care of it now" ([Politico](#)).*

Less than a week later (April 3), he was stressing the same theme:

*"I want to get back, I want to rebuild our nation. It's time. We were very successful against ISIS; we'll be successful against anybody militarily, but sometimes it's time to come back home. And we're thinking about that very seriously" ([NBC News](#)).*

During the time he was voicing these sentiments (sentiments he had professed during his presidential campaign), it was becoming increasingly clear that Russian and Iranian backed Syrian forces were also winning the war against the terrorists and that Bashar al Assad would be remaining in power. This is an eventuality that is anathema to Zionist Israel, Neocon warhawks, deep-state bureaucrats and pro-Zionist Christian Fundamentalists, the vocal core of Trump's Christian supporters. More importantly, it raises a vital question about Assad's domestic support and his military and political capabilities, capabilities that have kept him in power despite a seven-year onslaught backed by the globalists. If Trump gets his way, and the United States withdraws, Assad will remain in power, Iran will be on Israel's borders and Russia will be emboldened. In short, the Zionists who rule Israel find themselves in a frightening situation, *ergo*, America must remain. The only thing keeping Trump engaged in Syria is the allegation of a chemical attack, [the same allegation that took the US to war in Syria in the first place and then kept them engaged under President Obama](#). Now, the accusation is being used again. However, the allegation is problematic. It is so problematic that it prompted US Senator Rand Paul to opine:

*"I still look at the attack and say, you know, either Assad must be the dumbest dictator on the planet – or maybe he didn't do it. I have yet to see evidence that he did do it."*

<https://youtu.be/K4V3jQCi8-o>

**"Either Assad Must be the Dumbest Dictator on the Planet – or Maybe He Didn't Do It." – US Senator Rand Paul (0:50-1:18).**

On March 19, [Reuters](#) reported that despite a seven-year international effort to depose him, President Bashar al-Assad is securely in power. In fact, Reuters (by no means friendly to Assad) distributed a video showing the Syrian president driving to meet frontline [soldiers](#) near Ghouta. Describing a road previously riddled by sniper fire Assad can be heard saying:

*"The road is open... everything is running now in the city and in Syria."*

According to [Reuters](#) :

*"While Assad has increasingly been shown traveling around Syria in recent years, it is unusual for him to visit areas close to the battlefield, as he did on Sunday, meeting cheering soldiers as well as civilians who had escaped the fighting. There have been numerous other signs of his increasing confidence, including the release last year of a banknote bearing his image for the first time since he became president in 2000."*

The senator from Kentucky is right: Assad must be the dumbest dictator on the planet; he is winning the war and decides to drop chemical weapons. The real story is that the Syrian army has routed the majority of terrorists operating in Syria and is defeating US backed terrorists in Ghouta. The end of ISIS is in reach, but each time Syria advances to this point, a chemical weapons charge is employed against them.



## Is Syria Winning the War?

In September of 2017, Robert Ford, the former US ambassador to Syria, announced that [President Bashar al-Assad had “won” the war](#).

*“This stark assessment was endorsed this week by the United Nations special envoy to Syria, Staffan de Mistura, who called on rebel forces to accept that they had lost. Citing “critical” military gains made by government forces over the past nine months, and the involvement of numerous countries such as the US and Russia by proxy, De Mistura said the war was now almost over.”*

Highlighting this point, in December 2017, Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered the withdraw of Russian troops from Syria because, as he stated,

*“Russia’s task force and the Syrian government troops have routed “over slightly more than two years,” the “most combat-capable groups of international terrorists” ([Jewish Press](#)).*

In short, the war was in its final stage; essentially all that was left was the Ghouta District, a district that was captured by US backed rebel forces in 2013 thereby trapping 400,000 Syrian civilians inside. The main US backed rebel faction, **Jaysh al-Islam** – an al Qaeda affiliate – was then harbored in eastern Ghouta in a town named Douma. They were embedded amidst a dense civilian population, which resulted in large number of civilian casualties. There were many reports of theft of food and emergency supplies intended for civilians, the imposition of Sharia law, and the keeping of women and children inside cages to be exploited as human shields to inhibit Syrian the air force from bombing the city.

Eventually Assad’s forces were able to bring Jaysh al-Islam to its knees and then to the bargaining table to negotiate their

surrender ([Veterans Today](#) – [AMN](#)). In short, the war was over, the battle for Ghouta was complete; the terrorists were even being evacuated from the city ([BBC News](#)). Even [Newsweek](#) announced, “The Worst of the War is Over, As ISIS nears Defeat.”

Then, strangely, hundreds of civilians were reportedly killed in Douma by chemical weapons allegedly employed by Syrian forces. This political *non-sequitur* prompted Senator Rand, and a host of others, to reject the allegation against Assad prompting him to ask can any political leader be so stupid: The war is over; Assad is securely in power and then he acts to bring the whole world against him by unleashing chemical weapons. It does not make sense.

Assad seems to gain nothing and risks losing everything; he has no apparent motive, but the Zionists ruling Israel have a clear motive: If things continue the way they are going, *including the ongoing global demise of liberalism*, the Zionists are about to lose control of their own country.

Mr. Trump might be gloating about a victory over ISIS, but so too is Assad (at least until the allegations were levelled against him); he is (was) poised to win the war. However, as stated above, unlike Trump and Assad, the Zionists are *not* gloating; they are *not* excited about Assad’s prospects. They are frightened by the shifting topography of the Middle East battlefield: Iran is now united to Syria *via* Iraq and an existential threat to the Zionists. Due to American foreign policy bungling in Iraq, Iran is *now* a greater threat to the Zionists than they were before the war in Iraq began under President Bush. In addition to external degradation, the Zionists are facing mounting discontent and resultant opposition at home: [Sixty percent of Orthodox men in Israel are unemployed](#):

*“They are a real danger to Israel,” said Omer Moav, economics professor at the University of London and the Hebrew*

*University in Jerusalem. "If we go bankrupt it's the end of the story for us. Our strong army rests on a strong economy" ([Reuters](#)).*

Israeli economist Omer Moav thinks the situation is so dire that he suggests the use of force to bring the Orthodox (Haredim) into compliance with Zionist social-cultural standards:

*"As long as the government won't make a dramatic change, things will get worse. One cannot reach an agreed upon solution, it has to be forced upon the Haredim," he said.*

Surprising to many, Israel is the most impoverished nation in the Western world:

*"The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [released a report](#) showing that, of the world's thirty-four economically developed countries, Israel is the most impoverished and has one of the highest rates of inequality. With a poverty rate of twenty-one per cent, Israel has a higher percentage of poor people than Mexico, Turkey, or debt-ridden Spain and Greece" ([The New Yorker](#)).*

Not only is there an economic problem, Tel Aviv might be considered the [world capital of homosexuality](#) and Israel is denounced as a Zionist puppet state by its Orthodox rabbis:

Things are simply worse for the Zionist faction in 2018 than they were in 2011 or 1990. The Zionists do *not* want to be left alone to face Iran, Syria and Hezbollah. Supported by Dispensational think tanks such as Christians United for Israel (CUFI) and lobbies such as AIPAC, they expect American blood will be spilled in their defense. Pastor John Hagee

would have Americans believe that being killed on the battlefield for Israel is a holy cause:

*"I'll bless those (Americans) that bless you (Israel) and I'll curse those that curse you," [said Hagee](#), quoting from the book of Genesis. "That's God's foreign policy statement, and it has not changed."*

The Zionist campaign has been lauded by South Carolina [Sen. Lindsey Graham](#), who speaking at a Hagee gathering thundered:

*"Here's a message for America: Don't ever turn your back on Israel, because God will turn his back on us."*

Given ideological support such as this and news reports such as those quoted above, it is not surprising that just hours following President Trump's March 3, 2018 meeting with his national security team in which he announced his firm intention to "bring the troops home", the president reluctantly did an about-face and agreed to keep American troops in Syria for an unspecified amount of time to "complete the mission", "defeat ISIS" and "secure gains". In the process of acquiescing, President Trump asked his defense team:

*"If you need more time, how much more time do you need? Six months? A year?"*

His team responded that they couldn't put a time frame to how long it will take to defeat ISIS and to train local forces to maintain their gains after the U.S. leaves. Trump clearly wants out, but his advisors have persuaded him to remain. According to his Defense Secretary, James Mattis,

*"The president made his displeasure clear about any kind of long-term presence in Syria," adding that the president was trying to "light a fire" under his team to get the military mission wrapped up ([NBC News](#)).*

Although he was “trying to light a fire” to get the mission wrapped up, in the end, he followed their counsel. He “wasn’t thrilled” according to Mattis, but “agreed to give the (war) effort more time.”

Then, a few days later, French President Emmanuel Macron sealed the deal:

*“Ten days ago, President Trump was saying the United States of America had a duty to disengage from Syria, I assure you, we have convinced him that it is necessary to stay for the long-term”* ([The Times of Israel](#)).

President Trump had promised to withdraw, his security advisers seconded by the President of France, convinced him to stay and then Syria was bombarded. Just when it looked as if he might actually make some headway toward implementing his foreign policy objectives, the president turned around and ordered a massive missile attack.

According to Macron the attack (despite its *not* being sanctioned by the UN) is justified by International Law because “under a 2013 UN resolution, Syria was supposed to destroy its chemical weapons arsenal” ([Times of Israel](#)). International Law, however, clearly specifies that the only time a nation may employ force is when it has a unanimous resolution by the UN Security Council authorizing use of force to rectify a violation of international peace and security or in the limited case of dire need for self-defense. Regardless of agreement or disagreement with the point, International Law does *not* permit the use of military force (even to punish or prevent chemical weapons attacks) without U.N. Security Council approval ([New York Times](#)). Absent such approval, the use of military force is prohibited for any reason except self-defense.

Thus, regarding the UK’s justification for the missile attack, Former British Ambassador, Craig Murray said it is “utter bullshit”.

*When the government's legal justification for bombing is 1,000 words long, yet contains no reference to the UN Charter, Security Council, to any international treaty or to any international court ruling, you know it is complete and utter bullshit <https://t.co/vmk8733bde>*

– Craig Murray (@CraigMurrayOrg) [April 15, 2018](#)

Even Fox News has turned in favor of Assad:

<https://youtu.be/U0niyl-vDBk>

**“All the geniuses tell us Assad killed children, but do they really know that? Of course they don’t – They are Making it Up” (2:29 – 2:37).**

Trump’s order to attack (April 2018) was defended by Secretary Mattis who stated that the president had “legal authority” to launch the attack on his own, citing Article II of the United States Constitution and international laws banning chemical weapons.

Likewise, British Prime Minister Theresa May cited reports that the Syrian government employed a “barrel bomb” to deliver the chemicals used in the Douma affair. Consequently, she too concluded the decision to use force was “right and legal.”

International law does ban the use of chemical weapons, however, in this case, it was *never* determined that chemical weapons were ever used. Trump ordered a strike *before* analysts could begin their work. He **ordered an attack hours before the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) was to launch its investigation.**

According to Vassily Nebenizia, [Russian Ambassador to the UN](#)

*“On 14 April local time, the United States, supported by its allies, had launched air strikes against Syria. Without a mandate from the Council and in violation of the Charter and*

*international norms, an aggressive act against a sovereign State had been carried out. Just as the action taken one year earlier when an air base had come under attack, the United States had used as a pretext a staged chemical attack, this time in Douma."*

*"OPCW experts had conducted a field mission. On 10 April, when his country's draft resolution (Russia's) on the OPCW special mission had been blocked, he (the Russian Ambassador) had been assured that such a document had not been needed, and that the (OPCW) mission would visit and investigate the sites. However, the 13 April aggression had laid bare that that was not the issue (missiles were launched before the mission commenced)....'This is how you want international affairs to be conducted,' he asked. 'This is hooliganism' from major nuclear powers" ([United Nations Official Documents](#)).*

The Russian ambassador is referring to the fact that **an internationally recognized team was already on the ground and in place ready to investigate the alleged chemical attack, but before they could investigate, The United States, France and Great Britain launched their missile attack** thereby impeding the investigation, which *might* have turned up nothing, thereby exonerating Assad, had it been permitted to investigate. Had it found him guilty, they might have been surprised to see Russia enter the camp in favor of deposing Assad, but this scenario was never tested. Instead, the United States, the UK and France launched an April 14 missile attack on Syrian government facilities, which they believe were used to produce chemical weapons. The Syrian authorities have repeatedly stated that the entire chemical arsenal was taken out of the country years before under the eyes of the international community monitored by the same OPCW whose investigation was negated by the recent missile attack. In this regard,

[American Secretary of State John Kerry Kerry](#) stated in a television interview that:

*"We got 100 percent of the chemical weapons out."*

Contrary to Ambassador Nebenzia quoted above, his American counterpart, Nikki Haley (US Ambassador to the UN) stated that

*"The targets selected were at the heart of the Syrian regime's illegal chemical weapons programme, and the action taken by the three countries was legitimate and proportional. Diplomacy had been given chance after chance, she said, recalling that, in 2013, the Security Council had passed a resolution requiring Syria to destroy its chemical weapons stockpile (the stockpile that Secretary of State Kerry said was "100% out"). The President of the Russian Federation had said that his country would guarantee Syria's compliance. It had been hoped that diplomacy would succeed, but that had not happened, and while Russia was busy protecting the Syrian regime, that regime knew it could act with impunity, and it did."*

*"We cannot stand by and let Russia trash every international norm that we stand for and allow the use of chemical weapons to go unanswered," she said.*

Haley in referring to international norms was careful to state that she considered *only* norms or standards the US agrees with or "stands for", not those adumbrated by the UN. Likewise, "Mad Dog Mattis" cited Article II of the US Constitution. Article II, however, is irrelevant since it authorizes the president to act when vital US interests are endangered, not those of the rest of the world.

In this regard the Russian Ambassador pointed out:



*"It was shameful that, in justifying its aggression, that Government (United States) had cited its Constitution. Washington, D.C, must learn: The international code of behaviour regarding the use of force was (is) regulated by the (UN) Charter", not the United States Constitution, however great a document it might be.*

The proper mode of action would have been permitting the OPCW to conduct its investigation. Then, *subject to its findings*, Assad could have been either exonerated or punished. The triple alliance, however, acted *before* any investigation could be carried out and in this way **proceeded without any evidence except hearsay** and thus seems to have violated International Law. That is, even though International Law forbids the use of chemical weapons, any allegations of such use **must be confirmed** before the Security Council can be expected to give a green light for punitive or deterrent actions. Absent such an investigation, Russia could *not* bring itself to cooperate. Perhaps if the US would have let the investigators investigate, and if the OPCW team had found chemical weapons pointing to Assad, they might have been surprised to see Russia cooperate to reign in Assad and perhaps work toward his removal. But this hypothetical scenario was never given a chance. Instead: Guilty before investigation and trial. This is a form of international vigilantism based on the premise that might makes right contrary to both the United States Constitution and the nation's Declaration of Independence; it is the type of unilateral hegemony that the rest of the world increasingly finds wearisome.

Thus, Syrian TV called the attacks a "blatant violation of international law that shows contempt for international legitimacy." President Trump responded by lambasteing Russia and Iran, for supporting "murderous dictators." Putin, however, reaffirmed Russia's position that the chemical attack in Douma was a fake. He then chastised the US for initiating a strike without waiting for inspectors from the international

chemical weapons community to conduct an investigation.

Nonetheless, President Trump has carefully avoided striking Russian assets and Russian personnel in Syria. Instead, he has *again* indicated his “desire for improved relations with Moscow and possibly Tehran”, thereby leaving diplomatic channels ajar and avoiding a larger confrontation while leaving the door open for a graceful exit on a double high note: (1) The defeat of ISIS and (2) the whacking of Assad. But, it is Assad who has the greater victory. And it is Israel that now finds itself in a seemingly impossible imbroglio. Perhaps, the region will finally find its way to peace, but that will require the negation of Zionism in Israel and whatever forces are on the horizon to bring such an eventuality to fruition.

---

## **Nations of World Want Peace – Against Jerusalem being the Capital of Israel**

[PART ONE OF THIS ARTICLE](#) traced the history of Palestine from the 1917 Balfour Declaration (which declared to the world Britain’s support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine) up to the 1947-48 Israeli War that followed the withdrawal of British troops and cessation of British responsibility for the governance of Palestine, which was transferred to the United Nations (UN). It was then that Zionist forces occupied areas of Jerusalem and the West

Bank that were designated by the UN as belonging to the Palestinians. Based upon this original designation of the West Bank to the Palestinians, the Palestinians, like the Israelis, had hopes of forming a future state in areas the international community with full US backing had ceded to them.

Anticipating the (47-48) evacuation of British forces and transfer of governance from the UK to the UN, the UN drafted a two state solution, one Israeli and the other Arab (Christian and Muslim).

According to the 1947 [UN Resolution 184](#):

*“Independent Arab and Jewish States and the Special International Regime for the City of Jerusalem, set forth in Part III of this plan, shall come into existence in Palestine two months after the evacuation of the (British) armed forces of the mandatory Power (UK) has been completed but in any case not later than 1 October 1948.”*

*“The period between the adoption by the General Assembly of its recommendation on the question of Palestine and the establishment of the independence of the Arab and Jewish States shall be a transitional period.”*

The idea of two states was firmly established in directives given to the UN Commission charged with overseeing the transition from British control to the establishment of independent Israel and Arab states in Palestine:

*“The Constituent Assembly of each State shall draft a democratic constitution for its State and choose a provisional government to succeed the Provisional Council of Government appointed by the (UN) Commission. The constitutions of the States shall...include inter alia provisions for:*

*(a) Establishing in each State a legislative body elected by universal suffrage and by secret ballot on the basis of proportional representation, and an executive body responsible to the legislature;*

*(b) Settling all international disputes in which the State may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered;*

*(c) Accepting the obligation of the State to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations;*

*(d) Guaranteeing to all persons equal and non-discriminatory rights in civil, political, economic and religious matters and the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion, language, speech and publication, education, assembly and association;*

*(e) Preserving freedom of transit and visit for all residents and citizens of the other State in Palestine and the City of Jerusalem, subject to considerations of national security, provided that each State shall control residence within its borders.*

Fighting broke out almost immediately following the UN partition into Arab and an Israeli zones. Jewish nationalists backed by International Zionist Organizations, British support, and modern weaponry simply out gunned their poorly equipped and under-trained peasant opponents (remember this was 1947-48). Zionists forces caused over 700,000 Arab Christian and Muslim refugees to flee lands that were ceded to them in Palestine and seek what they thought would be

temporary shelters in refugee camps established in Jordan and elsewhere. Seventy years later, descendants of original refugees are still living in Lebanon and some can still be found living in Jordanian refugee camps. They are living as refugees because Israeli leaders refuse to honor their right of return as [required by International Law](#), although the [idea is contested](#).

The history of Israeli-Arab relations in Palestine has been one of continual land confiscation on the part of the former to the ongoing determinant of the latter. Thus, two decades following the 1948 imbroglio Israel claimed both the Golan Heights and additional land in the West Bank.

The UN In resolution after resolution (the latest being [Resolution 2334](#)) has repeatedly referred to these illegally held lands as “occupied territory” or territory illegally occupied by an invading army, much like the illegal land grab perpetrated by President Andrew Jackson who simply ignored the Supreme Court’s ruling that private property in Georgia legally belonging to the Cherokee Indians. Jackson wanted their land and therefore ordered federal troops to force them off of it and onto reservations in the Oklahoma Territory. The American Indians, however cruelly they were treated, did not have to suffer the additional humiliation of having walls built around their reservations enhanced by lethally armed soldiers to check their coming and going. In Palestine offense has followed offense; Palestinian civilians have been forced to flee their homes in fear for their lives and then never permitted to return as required by International law.

This ongoing series of violations has been summed up in [UN Resolution 2334](#) thereby

*“Condemning all acts of violence against civilians, including acts of terror, as well as all acts of provocation, incitement and destruction”,*

***“Reiterating its (UN) vision of a region where two democratic States, Israel and Palestine, live side by side in peace within secure and recognized borders”,***

***“Stressing that the status quo is not sustainable and that significant steps, consistent with the transition contemplated by prior agreements, are urgently needed in order to***

*(i) stabilize the situation and to reverse negative trends on the ground, which are steadily eroding the two-State solution and entrenching a one-State reality, and*

*(ii) to create the conditions for successful final status negotiations and for advancing the two-State solution through those negotiations and on the ground”,*

*1. **“Reaffirms that the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace”;***

*2. **“Reiterates its demand that Israel immediately and completely cease all settlement activities in the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and that it fully respect all of its legal obligations in this regard”;***

*3. **“Underlines that it will not recognize any changes to the***

*4 June 1967 lines, including with regard to Jerusalem, other than those agreed by the parties through negotiations”;*

*4. “Stresses that the **cessation of all Israeli settlement activities is essential for salvaging the two-State solution**, and calls for affirmative steps to be taken immediately to reverse the negative trends on the ground that are imperilling the two-State solution”;*

*5. “Calls upon all States, bearing in mind paragraph 1 of this resolution, to **distinguish**, in their relevant dealings, **between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967**”;*

*6. “Calls for immediate steps to **prevent all acts of violence against civilians**, including acts of terror, as well as all acts of provocation and destruction, calls for accountability in this regard, and calls for compliance with obligations under international law for the strengthening of ongoing efforts to combat terrorism, including through existing security coordination, and to clearly condemn all acts of terrorism.”*

Israel has consistently refused to abide by the norms of international law; it has not ceased from illegally claiming Palestinian lands and homes in the “occupied” West Bank and elsewhere – this seems to be the root cause of hostilities within its borders today.

*“The refusal to recognize the Palestinians’ right to self-determination and statehood proved over the years to be the main source of the turbulence, violence, and bloodshed that came to pass” ([Israeli author, Simha Flapan, “The Birth Of](#)*

[Israel](#)).

Consequently, over the years (1955-2013) Israel has managed to bear the brunt of nearly seventy UN condemnations including violation of human rights, illegal confiscations, deportations, illegal settlements, refusal to abide by the original 1949 UN Charter and the Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Some of these resolutions are listed below. For a full list, visit [If Americans Knew](#).

### **Israeli Condemnations by Resolution**

Resolution 106: "condemns' Israel for Gaza raid"

Resolution 111: "condemns' Israel for raid on Syria that killed fifty-six people"

Resolution 171: "determines flagrant violations' by Israel in its attack on Syria"

Resolution 237: "urges' Israel to allow return of new 1967 Palestinian refugees"

Resolution 248: "condemns' Israel for its massive attack on Karameh in Jordan"

Resolution 250: "calls on' Israel to refrain from holding military parade in Jerusalem"

Resolution 256: "condemns' Israeli raids on Jordan as 'flagrant violation"

Resolution 262: "condemns' Israel for attack on Beirut airport"

Resolution 265: "condemns' Israel for air attacks for Salt in Jordan"

Resolution 270: "condemns' Israel for air attacks on villages in southern Lebanon"

Resolution 280: "condemns' Israeli's attacks against Lebanon"

Resolution 298: "deplores' Israel's changing of the status



of Jerusalem”

Resolution 316: “condemns’ Israel for repeated attacks on Lebanon”

Resolution 332: “condemns’ Israel’s repeated attacks against Lebanon”

Resolution 337: “condemns’ Israel for violating Lebanon’s sovereignty”

Resolution 425: “calls on’ Israel to withdraw its forces from Lebanon”

Resolution 446: “determines’ that Israeli settlements are a ‘serious obstruction’ to peace and calls on Israel to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention”

Resolution 452: “calls on’ Israel to cease building settlements in occupied territories”

Resolution 476: “reiterates’ that Israel’s claims to Jerusalem are ‘null and void’

Resolution 497: “decides’ that Israel’s annexation of Syria’s Golan Heights is ‘null and void’ and demands that Israel rescind its decision forthwith”

Resolution 592: “strongly deplores’ the killing of Palestinian students at Bir Zeit University by Israeli troops”

Resolution 605: “strongly deplores’ Israel’s policies and practices denying the human rights of Palestinians

Resolution 904: “strongly condemns’ the massacre in Hebron and its aftermath which took the lives of more than 50 Palestinian civilians and injured several hundred others”

Resolution 1405: “emphasizes’ the urgency of access of medical and humanitarian organizations to the Palestinian civilian population”

Resolution 1435: “demands’ that Israel immediately cease measures in and around Ramallah including the destruction of Palestinian civilian and security infrastructure”

There seems to be a clear problem with Israeli occupation, a

problem recognized by virtually the entire world. Israel has been abbbbnce with UN resolutions because Israel has had the backing of the United States, one of five nations that sits on the [UN Security Council](#) thereby wielding veto power over any action decided upon by the rest of the world represented in the UN General Assembly. [The US has used its veto power 43 times to shield Israel from International Justice.](#)

Since the inception of Russia, the US has used its veto power more than any other nation. According to the [Huffington Post](#), “a little perspective is required here”:

*“Since 1970, China has used its veto power eight times, and Russia (and the former Soviet Union) has used its veto power 13 times. However, the United States has used its veto power 83 times.... Forty-two of these US vetoes were to protect Israel from criticism for illegal activities, including suspected war crimes. To this day, Israel occupies and colonizes a large swath of southwestern Syria in violation of a series of UN Security Council resolutions, which the United States has successfully blocked from enforcing.”*

This hegemonic veto verity, however, seems to be nearing an end as more and more nations are taking up the banner of opposition to unilateral decisions made by the US in defiance of the rest of the world. The opposition to what is perceived as totalitarian strong arm tactics by the United States has come into clear perspective with the recent US recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel in violation of all UN mandates and resolutions regarding Jerusalem since the UN's inception nearly seventy years ago.

According to [The Atlantic](#) (a Boston based monthly moderate magazine), the United States has undertaken to promote, defend and sustain global liberalism by adopting a worldview based upon a “hybrid” of Vladimir Lenin's analyses: The United States is engaged in promoting International Liberalism as Lenin promoted International Communism. According to [The Atlantic](#) “Washington's ambition to create a U.S. dominated world order” or what they also refer to as a “global liberal economic regime”

*"...cannot be maintained simply by an internationalized economic elite's desire for it to exist; it can be maintained only by American power."*

That is a proposition that the rest of the world is increasingly questioning and that President Trump has exacerbated with his Jerusalem pivot. All the other nations voted 139 – 7 against the idea.

In response to this negative vote, the American President decided to show the rest of the world some US *"realpolitik"* – that is persuasion by force, bribes and intimidation. Normally, such political moves are made behind closed doors and then covered in the press by a veil of democracy and respect for human rights. But President Trump is not known for being *"politically correct"*, not even on the world stage. In another foreign policy blunder, he has decided to show rest of the world how the US does business: When things do not go its way, the world leader in democracy and individual rights, rather than accepting majority rule, acts like a totalitarian dictator when others exercise their legal right to disagree.

President Trump needs to learn rather quickly that he is making the US look like a hypocrite. Third world nations are rapidly maturing, rising to the reality that they too have rights and liberties. Supported by other more advanced nations tired of liberal hegemony, they increasingly resent being bullied. All over the globe voices are echoing in cadence; they are regurgitating their resentment to the force-feeding of economic, cultural and political liberalism that has become economically, politically and culturally nauseating and therefore being burped up before being expelled from their malnourished national bodies. Liberalism has long hid behind a veil of democracy. Beginning with Woodrow Wilson, US and UK plutocrats have expanded their word-wide reach behind the shibboleth of *"universal education"* and *"making the world safe for democracy"*....

Something, however, has gone wrong; the IMF- World Bank liberal diet that has been fed to under-developed nations is beginning to turn in their stomachs. In response, the not so benign face of democracy is beginning to show. Following the

lead of her boss, US Ambassador to the UN Nikki Haley, is setting her face like flint in defiance. She and President Trump are acting as if the UN is telling them what to do, when in fact it is the US that has told the UN what to do ever since its inception, up to and including the recent Jerusalem donnybrook.

**Clearly the UN cannot dictate its wishes to the US, the US has a veto over anything the rest of the world might decide.** Unlike the US Constitution that provides a Constitutional remedy that empowers Congress to override a presidential veto, the General Assembly of Nations has no such legal power to override a US veto.

The US and Great Britain have used their economic influence and veto power to rule the UN for decades. They advocate liberal democracy world-wide, profess that democracy is and must be the wave of the future etc, and then hypocritically proceed to act like tyrants when it comes to getting their way at the UN. A veto is apparently not enough; President Trump and Ambassador Haley had to throw in threats of economic pain by threatening to "take names" of countries that dared to vote in favor of a UN General Assembly Resolution that rejected US recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

It is *not* necessary to threaten underdeveloped nations with economic sanctions; the US can simply veto any Resolution recommended by the UN General Assembly, as it did in opposition to the overwhelming Resolution against the US decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital. The economic threat is an unnecessary additional measure such as that used by a liberal bully when he kicks his clearly defeated victim to further make an already proven point: Support me against your will or I will do more to harm you.

Haley is not upset with a the status of Jerusalem (the US got its usual way in the UN by means of veto); she is upset

because the rest of the world dared to stand up in an unusual display of defiance; it refused to be bought out, would not bow or turn a blind eye to manifest and continued injustices in Israel and beyond. Economic threats are *not* only inducements; they are NOW punishments – US liberals and neo-liberals are acting like victims battered by the UN, when in fact, the they have almost ALWAYS gotten their way at the UN.

What is *new today* is that the real victims, third world Christian and other developing nations, such as Hungary in Central Europe, and many others are tired of being bullied, beaten so badly that they are now standing up, coming out of the closet of victimization and challenging the liberal agenda: *no mas*, to abortion and homosexulaity; *no mas* to population control; they are saying in Nigeria and other African and Middle Eastern nations: *no mas* to usury and financial exploitation; they are saying in Latin America and Asia: *no mas* to your carrot and stick diplomacy, to your neoliberal economic and moral policies intended to impose secular materialism in our countries contrary to our deepest values, beliefs and sentiments; *no mas, no mas*.

To conclude on a more humorous, yet profoundly serious, note regarding *no mas* to liberalism and its relationship to bullying, Brother Nathaniel provides a much unsupported and unscholarly video clip. Although flipiant, it speaks volumes that could be edited to become a highly plausible, well documented, and intelligent article regarding the imminent death of liberalism and the changing face of global relations in general and UN-Israeli relations in particular.

Although it is unclear what Brother Nathanael intends by this video, New Era forecasts an increasing inability of the US to support Zionism and the continued growth of anti-liberal forces within and beyond Israeli borders. The situation is changing, changing significantly, a change that, to the

chagrin of Neocon war hawks, bodes peace not war.

At Fatima, the Mother of God promised peace, an “Era of Peace”. Peace it will be as globalist liberal warmongers are being checked around the globe as they are being checked in Israel and the Middle East.

<https://youtu.be/KkFVAa2xSp4>

*“Israel’s Desperate Hour” could be More Accurately Titled “Do not Despair: Zionism-Liberalism Tottering as World Moves Toward Peace Promised by the Mother of God at Fatima”.*

---

# Is Jerusalem the Capital of Israel – Should it Be? Part One

[New Era World News and Global Intelligence Report](#) This article could easily be entitled: Is President Trump a Dispensational Zionist or just Theologically Illiterate?

**PRESIDENT TRUMP HAS UNLEASHED** an international and global tsunami with his recent declaration that Jerusalem is the capital city of Israel. Every nation on earth (including the Vatican) except the United States and Israel has been opposed to the idea ever since Zionist nationalists cooperated with the British government to repopulate Palestine with Jewish immigrants in the wake of World War I. Prior to post-war

British involvement, Jewish immigrants had already been returning to the Levant during the nineteenth century. Unlike later Zionist inspired and British supported immigrants, these earlier settlers came for religious motives; they were Orthodox Jews devoted to the Torah. They were *not* nationalist zealots willing to forcibly remove indigenous Muslim and Christian Arabs from their millennial homeland, nor were they part of the political-eschatological maneuver engineered by Zionist adepts, men and women who are experts at [pretending to be Jews but are not](#) ([Rev 3:9](#); [Rev 2:9](#)). Consequently, it should *not* be surprising that an increasing number of authentic Orthodox Jews are voicing their opposition to Zionist occupation of the Levant.

More Detailed Versions: (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nM09C6vni0w>) and (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=awCOSRg-gks>)

According to scholars writing for the [Middle East Research Project](#):

*“Most of them (pre-Zionist Jewish settlers) observed traditional, orthodox religious practices. Many spent their time studying religious texts and depended on the charity of world Jewry for survival. Their attachment to the land was religious rather than national, and they were not involved in—or supportive of—the Zionist movement that began in Europe and was brought to Palestine by immigrants”.*

In the first decades of the twentieth century Britain and France (assisted by the United States and what would later become Saudi Arabia) cooperated to defeat the Ottoman Empire and Germany in World War I. “By the end of 1916, the French had spent 1.25 million gold francs in subsidizing the (Arab) revolt. (against the Ottoman Empire)” Likewise, [“by September 1918, the British were spending £220,000/month to subsidize](#)

[the revolt.](#)” Britain promised their Hashemite (Arab) allies that following the war they would help the Arabs establish an independent state under indigenous rule in land carved from the defeated Ottoman Empire. Unfortunately for the Arabs, British authorities were simultaneously colluding with Zionist illusionists. Despite Arab hopes, by 1917, the same year the Mother of God appeared at Fatima, the British government inspired by its Foreign Minister, Lord Arthur Balfour, issued the “*Balfour Declaration*” thereby proclaiming its determined intent to establish a “Jewish national home in Palestine.”

Successful establishment of a nationalist Zionist project in the Levant required the cooperation of French adepts who complemented Balfour’s efforts by concluding the so-called “*Sykes-Picot Agreement*”. According to this agreement, former Ottoman controlled territories in the Levant were to be monitored by British and French forces who were to act as peace ministers in the newly manufactured Jewish and Arab enclaves. This agreement was immediately confirmed by the [League of Nations](#). Britain obtained what was referred to as a “mandate” (the legal instrument that contained the internationally agreed-upon terms for administering the territory on behalf of the League of Nations) over what is today

- Jordan
- Iraq and
- Israel including the Gaza Strip and the West Bank of the Jordan River.

France, on the other hand, received the mandate over

- Syria (an ancient Christian region) including the Golan Heights and
- Lebanon (having a Christian majority)





Britain decided that the land west of the Jordan would be referred to as Palestine, and the area east of the ancient river would be referred to as “Transjordan”, which constituted three-fourths of the territory included in the Mandate to be ruled as *per* agreement by a Hashemite prince (Hashemite and Saud families vied for power throughout the region). Thus, King Faysal’s brother, Abdallah (Arab leader who assisted British against Ottoman Turks in WWI), became ruler of Transjordan – Faysal became King of Iraq after being defeated in Syria. The Sauds would consolidate power south to the Arabian Sea.

Despite assurances to its Hashemite allies to establish an independent Arab State, British authorities appeared to be more interested in the Zionist project, even if it meant disrupting the indigenous Palestinian population that had resided there for nearly two thousand years.

Naturally, Arab Palestinians insisted upon self-rule in Palestine as they enjoyed in Transjordan, so too did the newly arriving Zionists in Palestine; nonetheless, although the Palestinians whose ancestors had lived upon and cultivated the land since the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, although

these same Palestinians had the stronger claim to self-rule, their claims were prejudicially ignored. Arabs living in Palestine therefore opposed the British Mandate because it thwarted their aspirations for self-rule. They understood that ["the last thing the Zionists really wanted was that all the inhabitants of Palestine should have an equal say in running the country."](#)

Chaim Weizmann (Zionist leader and first president of Israel) had convinced Winston Churchill that representative government in Palestine (equal voting among Arabs and Jews) would have meant the end of the Jewish hopes for a National Home in Palestine. Thus, Churchill could be heard saying,

*"The present form of (autocratic) government will continue (in Palestine) for many years. Step by step we shall develop representative institutions leading to full self-government, but our children's children will have passed away before that is accomplished."* ([David Hirst, "The Gun and the Olive Branch"](#)).

Jean Jacques Rousseau expressed a similar political astuteness over a century earlier. Although he seemed an advocate of representative government, no such government could exist in France until through annihilation, demographics favored a new secular elite and through education the people had been primed to vote the "correct" way.

Locating Jews on land previously belonging for centuries and millennia to Palestinians (Christians and Muslims) was probably *not* a good idea. Cognizant of this fact, British authorities were careful to name the area "Palestine" *not* "Israel". The more populous indigenous farmers of Palestine were poor and defenseless peasants. Nonetheless, Zionist settlers had the support of international Jewish organizations and of the British government. Consequently, the land was plagued with continual but lopsided conflict, conflict that

avored Zionist settlers to the detriment of native Palestinians.

The League of Nations Mandate created so much trouble for the British that following World War II they asked the region be transferred to the newly established United Nations. Thus, before the League of Nations mandate terminated in 1948 the United Nations had already adopted [Resolution 181](#) (November 29, 1947), which dealt with the future of Palestine. It envisaged the creation of separate Jewish and Arab states in Palestine, with Jerusalem being transferred to UN trusteeship.

British-Zionist forces operating within the UN did *not* wait long to implement their vision; on the last day of the League Mandate, they decided that Palestine (not including Transjordan) should be further divided to better represent the interest of both parties, *i.e*, Jews and Arabs. They therefore proclaimed their intent to create two States one Jewish, the other Arab. At this time the Jews, who owned roughly six percent of the land in Palestine, were bequeathed nearly 55% of the land, a massive increase from the British mandate.

This ideological imbalance in favor of the Jews was waged against the Palestinians from the beginning. Despite the fact that Palestinians outnumbered Jews nearly 2-1, the UN delegated the latter over half of the available land. However, in recognition of their spiritual patrimonies, **the UN was quick to re-affirm the League of Nations mandate that Jerusalem remain an International City** a holy site sacred to Muslims, Jews and Christians. Jerusalem was therefore declared as an "International City". It has been recognized by every nation on earth including the Vatican and the United States ever since, that is until [President Trump](#) made his recent announcement.

The recognition of Jerusalem as an international city was more than a gesture; it is an international spiritual, religious and political necessity. Nonetheless, it was not enough to keep temporal peace. Because their Christian and Muslim

ancestors had labored for centuries to cultivate their land and make it fruitful, because militant Zionists had no legal right to these lands and rested their case on some specious outdated and already fulfilled prophecies, and because Christians and Muslims Arabs outnumber Zionists nearly 2-1, the Palestinians were understandably distraught with the UN plan. UN backed British-Zionists had crafted a plan that permitted unwelcome Jewish foreigners to dispossess rightful owners of land that had been in Christian and Muslim hands for centuries, a plan that made Christians vagabonds in their own homeland, a plan that justified property confiscation by religious zealots backed by international dollars and British military power, by a plan lacking all moral support, justified by Social-Darwinism, by a supposedly outdated Law of the Jungle: "might makes right", because of these things, the Palestinians rightfully felt persecuted. But that was only the beginning – the newly arriving Zionists would not respect the boundaries designated by the United Nations.

ASIDE: The bond between Israel and England is deeply etched in English lore, in its music and cultural mores. If anyone doubts the British resolve to back the Zionists, the link between Zionism and British Masonry (the architects of King Solomon's earthly temple), let him consider the unofficial British National Anthem, esp 1:01 and 2:08-2:28 in the musical video below:

Thus, within days of the UN partition, fighting broke out. Jewish nationalists backed by International Zionist Organizations, British support, and modern weaponry supplied through Czechoslovakia, simply out gunned their poorly equipped and under-trained peasant opponents. Not only did the Zionists occupy territories assigned to them by the UN, they continued an offensive assault throughout the West Bank

claiming unprotected or poorly protected territories beyond established UN borders and thereafter claimed to legally incorporate them (despite their being in violation of International law) as part of Israel. It was not until then (1948-49) that Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and Jordan (all but Egypt under French and British influence) responded militarily in an unsuccessful attempt to rescue Arabs from Zionist seizure and control.

Palestine had been home to *both* Christians and Muslims for nearly two thousand years. Thus, the nomenclature "**Arab**" should *not* be misconstrued to mean Muslim; it **means both Muslim and Christian peoples of Arab descent. Palestine is the land where Christ preached the eternal Gospel**, where He suffered and died; it is the site where death was defeated: "*O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting*" ([1 Cor 15:55](#))? **It is the land in which Christ established His everlasting Kingdom, the New Israel.** Thus, when Zionist nationalists lashed out against Palestinians in the name of God, they were (and are) spilling Christian blood, while Dispensational Protestant Preachers, who forge unbreakable bonds between America and England, spin out an odd sort of eschatology calling for ever more money to be sent to support Israel against Christians.

<https://youtu.be/n9FVLFILVig>

Political-Zionist Cooperation: John Hagee Evangelical Pastor Crying for Military and Financial Support of Israel says Jewish people don't need Christ.

As a result of Zionist intransigence, the Palestinian state planned by the UN never materialized and no one stood up against this flagrant violation of International Law. Instead, in the aftermath of the 1947 onslaught, Palestine was again divided, this time into three parts, each governed by a different authority designated by a boundary referred to as

the "Green Line". Israel expanded, grabbing nearly 20% of the land designated for the Palestinians; they now occupied nearly 80% of the entire land of Palestine despite substantial numeric inferiority. According to the UN's 1947 partition plan, Jerusalem was to be an international city. However, the 1949 UN sponsored armistice cut the city in two; Jordan was assigned East Jerusalem (including the old walled city home of major Christian, Jewish, and Muslim religious sites), the West Bank or "Hill Country" abutting the Jordan River and extending westward into the craggy regions of Palestine. Egypt assumed control of Gaza Strip. The Golan Heights remained in Syrian hands.

Despite the fact that Israel was referred to as a "state" no such designation was afforded the increasingly marginalized Palestinian Christians and Muslims.

Although no one manifestly assented to the idea that "might makes right"; it was certainly the determining principle in this early act of Israeli aggression. Despite UN Resolutions to the contrary, lands seized from nearly 700,000 fleeing Palestinian civilians were *never returned* to their rightful occupants who were forced by Jewish immigrants to become fleeing refugees thereby affirming the accusation of hypocrisy hurled by Jesus at the Jews ([Matt 7: 1-6](#)).

*"The first UN General Assembly [Resolution-Number 194](#)—affirming the right of Palestinians to return to their homes and property, was passed on December 11, 1948. It has been repassed no less than twenty-eight times since that first date. Whereas the moral and political right of a person to return to his place of uninterrupted residence is acknowledged everywhere, Israel has negated the possibility of return... [and] systematically and juridically made it impossible, on any grounds whatever, for the Arab Palestinian to return, be compensated for his property, or live in Israel as a citizen equal before the law with a Jewish Israeli" [The Origin of the Palestine-Israel Conflict, pg 12](#)).*

Article 11 expressly “Resolves”:

*“... that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible*

Zionists did not like being made refugees but had (and continue to have) little problem making others suffer the same plight. Lord Balfour had little problem dealing with charges of hypocrisy. According to him,

*“In Palestine we do not propose even to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the present inhabitants of the country...The four powers are committed to Zionism and Zionism, be it right or wrong, good or bad, is rooted in age-long tradition, in present needs, in future hopes, of far profounder import than the desire and prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land.”* (Edward Said, [\*“The Question of Palestine” pg. 16\*](#)).





Furthermore,

*“No British officers, consulted by the Commissioners, believed that the Zionist program could be carried out except by force of arms” ([If America Knew](#)).*

Zionist leaders in Israel have been imbued with perverse ideas; they have relentlessly and illegally displaced Syrian and Palestinian people from the Golan Heights, West Bank and Gaza. As early as 1921, Dr. Eder, a Member of the British Zionist Commission, made known that from the beginning:

*“The Zionists made no secret of their intentions, for a member of the Zionist Commission, boldly told the Court of*



*Inquiry, 'there can be only one National Home in Palestine (not the promised two states), and that a Jewish one, and no equality in the partnership between Jews and Arabs, but a Jewish preponderance as soon as the numbers of the race are sufficiently increased.' He then asked that only Jews should be allowed to bear arms" ([The Origin of the Palestine-Israel Conflict, pg 7](#)).*

Even [David Ben-Gurion](#), founder of the State of Israel and its first Prime Minister, following an attempted Palestinian revolt recognized the hypocrisy of Zionism, what today we might call "Fake news":

*"...in our political argument abroad, we minimize Arab opposition to us,' but he urged, '**let us not ignore the truth among ourselves.**' The truth was that '**politically we are the aggressors and they defend themselves...** The country is theirs, because they inhabit it, whereas we want to come here and settle down, and in their view we want to take away from them their country, while we are still outside'."*

The British commitment to Zionism, even under false pretenses was clearly recognized by American intellect Noam Chomsky who reported that,

*"The revolt was crushed by the British, with considerable brutality" ([The Fateful Triangle, pg 98](#)).*

In the aftermath, Mahatma Gandhi declared that although the Zionists claimed that God had for-ordained their military conquest of Palestine,

*"A religious act cannot be performed with the aid of the bayonet or the bomb. They (the Zionists) can settle in Palestine only by the goodwill of the Arabs... As it is, **they are co-sharers with the British in despoiling a people who have done no wrong to them.** I am not defending the Arab*

*excesses. I wish they had chosen the way of non-violence in resisting what they rightly regard as an unacceptable encroachment upon their country. But according to the accepted canons of right and wrong, nothing can be said against the Arab resistance in the face of overwhelming odds"* ([Virtual Jewish Library](#)).

Echoing Ben-Gurion, Menahem Begin, founder of [Likud](#) and the [sixth Prime Minister of Israel](#) (before the creation of the state of Israel, the leader of the Zionist militant group [Irgun](#)), Begin echoing Gurion informs us

*"...how 'in Jerusalem, as elsewhere, we were the first to pass from the defensive to the offensive...Arabs began to flee in terror...The Israelis now allege that the Palestine war began with the entry of the Arab armies into Palestine after 15 May 1948. **But that was the second phase of the war;** they overlook the massacres, expulsions and dispossessions which took place prior to that date (committed by the Zionists) and which necessitated Arab states' intervention"* ([The Origin of the Palestine-Israel Conflict, pg 10](#)).

Fake News is not something new; it has been operative for quite a while. Jordan's King Abdullah let the cat out of the bag when he informed Western sources that the Palestinians never stood a chance; their forces he said were "ill equipped and lacked any central command to coordinate their efforts". Moreover, he promised the British and the Israelis that

*"His troops, the Arab Legion, the only real fighting force among the Arab armies, would avoid fighting with Jewish settlements. Yet Western historians record this as the moment when the young state of Israel fought off "the overwhelming hordes' of five Arab countries. In reality, the Israeli offensive against the Palestinians intensified"* ([If America Knew](#)).

Concluding Part One, it may be stated that following the self-admitted 1947-48 Israeli aggression, Israel *again* showed its hypocrisy by refusing to concede to the Palestinians what it declared as a right for itself:

*“Palestinians were trying to save by negotiations what they had lost in the war—a **Palestinian state** alongside Israel. Israel, however... Israel [preferred] tenuous armistice agreements to a definite peace that would involve territorial concessions and the repatriation of even a token number of refugees. The refusal to recognize the Palestinians’ right to self-determination and statehood proved over the years to be the main source of the turbulence, violence, and bloodshed that came to pass” ([Israeli author, Simha Flapan, “The Birth Of Israel](#)).*

Vatican response to President Trump’s decree on Jerusalem:

Short of Israel becoming a Christian State (something New Era is closer to forecasting), President Trump’s unilateral move is more than misguided; it is politically anti-peace and theologically anti-Christian.

Part Two Continued

---

# Russian President Vladimir

# Putin Announces He Will Run For Reelection In 2018

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

EARLIER TODAY RUSSIAN PRESIDENT VLADIMIR PUTIN (age 65), with the majority [United Russia Party](#) behind him, announced his intent to seek a second term in the upcoming March 18, 2018 presidential election:

*"I will be proposing my candidacy for the position of President of the Russian Federation...Russia will move only forward, and no one will ever stop it in its progress."*

Following a thunderous reception from an assembly of car factory workers in Nizhny Novgorod, Putin replied:

*"Thank you for this reaction, first of all, thank you for your work. Thank you for your attitude toward your work, the enterprise, the city, the country. I am sure that we will succeed."*

"I will put forth my candidacy for the post of president of the Russian Federation," Putin said in Nizhny Novgorod on December 6


Putin previously served two consecutive terms as president from 2000 to 2008 after which the then new President, Dmitry Medvedev, appointed him as Prime Minister. Putin was then elected president for a third time in 2012 and has kept his intention to seek a fourth term in 2018 close to his chest until earlier today.

A recent Romir-Gallup [poll](#) reveals that if the election were held within a week from now Putin would win an overwhelming victory garnering 75 percent of votes. Popular as he is, he will not run uncontested. Nonetheless, he is expected to win by a comfortable margin. *"No other candidate is expected to break through the 10 per cent barrier."*

Those who have already lined up to oppose him include: **Ksenia Sobchak**, a self-described underdog who plugs herself as "the against-all candidate." She will be joined by unlikely opposition journalist **Grigory Yavlinsky** representing the Democratic Yabloko Party. A more well known candidate **Vladimir Zhirinovsky**, long time Putin opponent and leader of the Liberal Democratic Party will oppose Putin for the sixth time. Other potential presidential candidates include: musician and political analysts **Ekaterina Gordon** running as an Independent, political scientist **Andrei Bogdanov**, and Russian Tycoon **Sergei Polonsky**.

In order to qualify as a candidate for president, each potential candidate must secure 100,000 signatures.

## Ksenia Sobchak



Ms. Sobchak is the socialite daughter of late St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoly Sobchak best known as a seasoned journalist with very little political experience. Nonetheless, She has already launched a [campaign website](#) on which she has announced her candidacy. According to Sobchak, she has already garnered

2,000 signatures toward the required 100,000 to be eligible to run for president.

## **Grigory Yavlinsky**



Mr. Yavlinski is a seasoned politician and economist best known for his leadership of the [social-liberal Yabloko Party](#) and as the author of Russia's [500 Days Programme](#), which he drafted to help the former Soviet Union transition to a market economy. Yavlinsky has previously run for president two times. In 1996 he finished fourth against Boris Yeltsin garnering 7% of the vote and then again in 2000 against Vladimir Putin, a race in which he finished third with 6% of the vote. Yavlinski does *not* support Russian annexation of Crimea and believes the nation should admit that it violated international norms in doing so. He [recently announced that he will beat Putin in 2018](#).

## **Vladimir Zhirinovski**



Mr. Zhirinovskiy is also a seasoned politician who as leader of the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia (LDPR), will represent the party for the sixth time. Zhirinovskiy is a colonel in the Russian army, a member of the Parliamentary Assembly Council of Europe, and Vice-Chairman of the State Duma (lower house Russian Legislature). He has been described as “fiercely nationalist” and “a [showman](#) of Russian politics, blending populist and nationalist rhetoric, [anti-Western invective](#) and a brash, confrontational style.”

The LDPR is opposed to both socialism/communism and [neoliberal capitalism](#). In the [2011](#) LDPR earned 11% or 50 of the 450 seats in parliament. The LDPR has a reputation for being authoritarian and fiscally leftist. Zhirinovskiy is infatuated with the idea of a “renewed Russian Empire” and the rebirth of a “Greater Russia”.

## **Ekaterina Gordon**



Katya Gordon is a song writer, human rights activist, and seasoned attorney and who heads her own law firm: Gordon & Sons, which specializes in family law. She received two “Golden Gramophone” awards and in 2016 she received the “Best Duo” version of the “[Muz-TV Award](#)”.

On October 30, 2017, she announced her intention to participate in the [presidential elections in 2018](#).

Taking a jab at a female opponent Ksenia Sobchak, Gordon sarcastically knocked Sobchak’s reputation as a glamorous socialite to her own advantage with the Russian people:

*“I am not a representative of glamour, I wasn’t born with a silver spoon in my mouth”*

Among Candidates Comments in this Video: “I am not a representative of glamour, I wasn’t born with a silver spoon in my mouth”

Running on a “pro-women” platform, she touts her emotionally packed experiences, experiences that have been etched into her legal psyche following a half decade of defending women’s and children’s rights as the motivation for her feminist platform.

*“I know how our judicial system works in practice,” Gordon stressed. “We are a country of single mothers whom no one cares about.”*

**Andrei Bogdanov**





Mr Bogdanov is a seasoned politician with strong political and historic ties to the West. Since 2014 he has served as Chairman of the [Communist Party of Social Justice](#); he is a Freemason and Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Russia (a post he will hold until 2020), and a 33° Scottish Rite Adept. In 2008 he ran for president and received nearly a million votes, which is roughly 1.3% of the Russian electorate.

As a Freemason, Bogdanov favors European integration, liberalism, and less state involvement in the economy.

## **Sergei Polonsky**



Mr. Polonsky is a successful Russian businessman who owns Mirax Group, one of Russia's largest real estate companies.

He was one of the richest men in Russia prior to the 2007 financial crisis. On 12, July 2017 he was found guilty of fraud, but the judge ruled that too much time had elapsed since commission of the crime for the court's decision to be implemented; consequently, Polansky simply "walked away".

*"A Moscow court convicted one of Russia's most flamboyant tycoons, Sergei Polonsky, of fraud on Wednesday, and yet the property developer who symbolized the excess of the oil-fueled boom times walked away a free man."*

Despite Bogdanovov's Masonry and Yavlinsky's show of bravado, none of these candidates has what it takes to defeat the incumbent come March 2018. Putin is an extremely popular political leader whose success in foreign policy, whose desire to increase domestic production and expansion of trade with Asia to offset Western Sanctions, as well as his willingness to take on the globalist financial elite and the purveyors of liberalism, have made him a champion among the vast majority of Russian people. His re-election seems an easy forecast – that is, if he continues to outwit would-be assassins.