

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

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

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

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

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

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

Parents are the first educators of their own children; however, she noted, current and proposed UN legislation

diminishes parents to the status of equal partners with informal state agencies such as health care providers and public school educators.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Liberal voices that have dominated the UN for decades were nonplussed:

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

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

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

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

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

Most notably,

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

Will the UN be able to enforce this new policy-program amendment as part of its comprehensive program for sexual education? With the US and the Holy See supporting the

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

---

## Beware False Apostles of “Americanism” – Part Two

[New Era World News](#)

**PART ONE OF FALSE APOSTLES** of Americanism ended with these these words of Pope Saint Pius X applied to so-called “Christian Ministers” who distort Sacred Scripture to defame the Catholic Church. It should come as no surprise that anyone who can pervert the Scriptures is fully capable of distorting historical documents to present the country’s “Founders” as Christian men intent on building a Christian nation, when in fact, their program was to destroy the Catholic Church and Protestant denominations that did not join the Framers in their subterfuge and efforts to establish a secular commonwealth built on the economic, political and moral principles of “Liberalism”. Pope St. Pius X saw through the charade:

*“We must repeat with the utmost energy in these times of social and intellectual anarchy when **everyone takes it upon himself to teach as a teacher and lawmaker – the City (any country) cannot be built otherwise than as God has built it; society cannot be setup unless the Church lays the foundations and supervises the work; no, civilization is not something yet to be found (Novos Ordo***

*Secolorum), nor is the New City to be built on hazy notions; it has been in existence and still is: it is Christian civilization...It has only to be set up and restored continually against the unremitting attacks of insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants.” (St. Pope Pius X, [Notre Charge Apostolique](#), April 15, 1910).*

Because many of [“Framer” were trying to establish a new Commonwealth without Christ](#) (He is not mentioned once in the Constitution, religion and God’s Laws are excluded and relegated to the private sphere – see note 1 below), because many were at war with His Church, because the American Revolution was a phase of the French Revolution and the broader Liberal Revolution sweeping the globe, the Catholic Church, according to Framers like John Adams, was a “monster that had to be annihilated:

*“Cabalistic Christianity, which is catholic (sic) Christianity, and which has prevailed for 1,500 years, has received a mortal wound, of which **the monster must finally die**” ([John Adams](#), (July 16, 1814) Letter to Thomas Jefferson).*

It was not just Catholics, many Protestants were opposed to the liberal program of the “Framers”:

One of America’s *unsung* founders was Elias Boudinot. Boudinot was a president of the Continental Congress, a United States Congressman and from 1795 to 1805 he was the Director of the U.S. Mint, an Evangelical and a Co-Founder of the American bible Society. [Boudinot was alarmed by the disregard for Christian principles](#) by many leaders of the new American government;

*“But has not America greatly departed from her original (17th century) principles, and left her first love? Has she not also many amongst her chief citizens, of every party, who have forsaken the God of their fathers, and to whom the spirit may justly be supposed to say, “ye hold doctrines which I hate, repent, or else I will come unto you quickly, and will fight against you with the sword of my mouth.”*

By the time that Protestant divines woke up to what was happening, it was already too late. [Pastor Timothy Wright, President of Yale Seminary](#) was one of the first to take note (1812):

*“The nation has offended Providence. We formed our Constitution without any acknowledgment of God; without any recognition of His mercies to us, as a people, of His government, or even of His existence. The [Constitutional] Convention, by which it was formed, never asked even once, His direction, or His blessings, upon their labours. Thus we commenced our national existence under the present system, without God.”*

Since Protestants such as these were opposed to the liberal charade of light being directed by the Framers, they too were belittled. John Adams referred to the Protestant ministers as “yahoos” the great enemies of “free inquiry” who should be endured no longer.

*“And ever since the Reformation, when or where has existed a Protestant or dissenting sect who would tolerate A FREE INQUIRY (Adams’ own emphasis)? The blackest billingsgate, the most ungentlemanly insolence, the most yahooish brutality, is patiently endured, countenanced, propagated, and applauded.”*

Jefferson concurred, the **Christian clergy** (Protestant and Catholic) are:

*“... the greatest obstacles to the advancement of the real doctrines of Jesus, and [do in fact constitute the real Anti-Christ.](#)”*

James Madison, the “Father of the Constitution”, also harbored hostility for the clergy (Catholic and Protestant), “spiritual tyrants” who “subvert the public liberty”; they had to go!

*“What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a **spiritual tyranny** on the ruins of the civil authority; on many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no*

*instance have they been the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wish to **subvert the public liberty** may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, **needs them not**" ([James Madison \(1785\) "A Memorial and Remonstrance"](#)).*

The Framers steeped in the Craft of esotericism might have fooled the people, but they did not fool Protestants such as Boudinot and Timothy Wright, not did they fool the sagacious Pius X:


***"Society cannot be setup unless the Church lays the foundations and supervises the work; no, civilization is not something yet to be found, nor is the New City to be built on hazy notions; it has been in existence and still is: it is Christian civilization...It has only to be set up and restored continually against the unremitting attacks of **insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants.**"** (St. Pope Pius X, [Notre Charge Apostolique](#), April 15, 1910).*

Since many of the Framers were in Pope Pius' words "*miscreants*", "*rebels*" and "*insane dreamers*", it should come as no surprise that many so-called ministers, contemporary men and women who are supposed to be lovers of the truth and "ambassadors" of Jesus Christ, the way and the truth and the life", seem to have no problem repeating the tale (about the Christian Founders) in order to improve their financial portfolios, or worse, in order to advance a nefarious hidden agenda that makes them guilty of that which they accuse others: being unchristian.

The truth is, many of the so-called conservative fundamentalists and dispensationalists ministers who claim that "liberals" are distorting the facts about the Christian roots of American government are the real ones that are doing the distorting. Perhaps you have seen their websites, or read their books and media tracts claiming that the Unites States Constitution was written by stalwart Christian men totally committed to Christ and the building of a Christian nation.

*What sundry readers are unaware of is that many of the quotes they use to defend their claims are fabricated, misunderstood, or misrepresented.*

## **David Barton “Christian” Spokesman for America’s Christian Founding: Guru of **Americanism****



Among the most popular spokesmen is a Pentecostal minister by the name of David Barton, a Christian fundamentalist and founding president of a popular website called “Wall Builders”, a site devoted to defending America’s Christian foundations. Barton has

been interviewed several times by Glenn Beck and is noted for tours of the capitol pointing out Christian heritage of the country to new congressmen and senators.

Barton wrote a book, *“The Myth of Separation”*, that was so full of errors and misquotes that it caused scholars across the country to leap into action; it was too outrageous to ignore, too opposed to expected standards of research and norms of scholarly writing, which are the hallmark of men and women who love truth, men and women who consider honest scholarship a mark of honor and dishonest a mark of reprobation. Consequently, numerous savants quickly engaged in research to verify the validity of Barton’s quotes. Unfortunately for Barton, many true scholars such as, Professor Robert S. Alley (University of Richmond) the man who authored *“James Madison on Religious Liberty”*, got involved. Prof. Alley received assistance from the editors of *“The Papers of James Madison”* at the University of Virginia who helped verify all of Barton’s quotes and misquotes.

Moreover,

*“Firms devoted to Madison and Jefferson became involved, universities got involved and ultimately the Library of Congress was*



*the final resting place for these quotes*[\[viii\]](#).

Barton's book does *not* contain an *occasional* error, the kind that are easily forgiven and which cause honest writer's to etch deeply in their memory so as to avoid repeating them. Barton is either a dishonest minister playing scholar or an uneducated one making so many mistakes that no one should consider him a learned man and therefore avoid him as a teacher and historical spokesman. True scholarship is time consuming and very difficult, every piece of evidence is verified, every source double checked and cross referenced. No one becomes learned or wise by simply reading; every time an in earnest student comes across information that he cannot verify or that he does not understand, he stops and does not continue again until he has mastered the content or idea. Every specious or questionable piece of information is cross-referenced and double-triple checked for accuracy and veracity. Apparently, Barton did not know that such men and women exist; there really is no such thing as a "lazy scholar", qua scholar. Like most charlatans, Barton, although himself not necessarily a charlatan, was eventually caught for poor scholarship. When presented with the evidence, he

*"...admitted to fabricating the quotes. He was (then) ordered to create a pamphlet that listed all his bogus quotes. Unfortunately that pamphlet has had almost zero impact on those who use the quotes daily in newspapers around the United States."*[\[ix\]](#)

Below are some of his more egregious misquotes. Fortunately, many people have become involved and this kind of scam scholarship is being exposed.

1. "Whosoever shall introduce into the public affairs the principles of primitive Christianity will change the face of the world." – Benjamin Franklin
2. "It cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that this great nation was founded, not by religionists, but by Christians; not on religions, but on the gospel of Jesus

Christ!" – Patrick Henry

3. "The only assurance of our nation's safety is to lay our foundation in morality and religion." – Abraham Lincoln
4. "Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based upon and embody the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind. It is impossible that it should be otherwise. In this sense and to this extent, our civilizations and our institutions are emphatically Christian." – Holy Trinity v. U. S. (Barton claimed this was a United States Supreme Court landmark case—in fact, the actual author is *not* the **United States Supreme Court**, but the **Illinois Supreme Court** (Richmond v. Moore, 1883). We are not concerned about state constitutions, which in many cases were influenced by Christianity, but with the secular federal Constitution. Not only is the quote misrepresented, Barton distorts the meaning of the Illinois court by omitting other text from the same decision, text such as, "*...a total severance of church and State is one of the great controlling foundation principles of our system of government.*")
5. "The philosophy of the school room in one generation will be the philosophy of government in the next." – Abraham Lincoln
6. "A general dissolution of principles and manners will more surely overthrow the liberties of America than the whole force of the common enemy. While the people are virtuous they cannot be subdued; but when once they lose their virtue they will be ready to surrender their liberties to the first external or eternal invader." – Samuel Adams
7. "I have always said and always will say that the studious perusal of the Sacred Volume will make us better citizens." – Thomas Jefferson
8. "There are two powers only which are sufficient to control men, and secure the rights of individuals and a peaceable

administration; these are the combined force of religion and law, and the force or fear of the bayonet.” – Noah Webster

9. “It is impossible to rightly govern the world without God and the Bible.” – George Washington

10. “The principles of all genuine liberty, and of wise laws and administrations are to be drawn from the Bible and sustained by its authority. The man therefore who weakens or destroys the divine authority of that book may be assessory [sic] to all the public disorders which society is doomed to suffer.” – Noah Webster

11. “We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future of all of our political institutions upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves ... according to the Ten Commandments of God.”– James Madison[\[x\]](#)

**The only problem with these quotes is that none of them have ever been found among any of Founder’s authentic writings.** Barton tried to excuse himself by blaming it on “secondary sources”. Perhaps this is a good excuse; however, any cross referencing or simple attempt to confirm the quotes should have raised a flag in Barton’s mind; *perhaps he was cherry picking quotes as Pentecostals cherry pick scriptures to fabricate tales about the Catholic Church.*

Barton, has earned rebuke from “*Church and State Magazine*”, which ran an article by Robert Boston who insisted that Barton’s fabrications were so egregious that they warranted a “Consumer Alert”.[\[xi\]](#) Barton has also received criticism from the “right” for “shoddy workmanship”. The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs (BJCPA) issued a critique of a Barton movie that highlighted most of the quotes. The BJCPA took Barton to task and hammered his video.[\[xii\]](#) They stated that his work is:

*“... laced with exaggerations, half-truths and misstatements of fact.”*[\[xiii\]](#) The Texas Freedom Network calls him “a pseudo-

*intellectual fraud whose twisted interpretations of history are little more than propaganda.”* [\[xiv\]](#)

According to “people for the American Way” [\[xv\]](#)

*“Such dim views of Barton’s work are based on repeated instances in which Barton cites quotes attributed to Founding Fathers that appear to support the right-wing view that the current model of separation of church and state was not at all what the Framers intended, only to have those quotes turn out to be unverifiable, if not utterly false.”*

*“Barton claimed that the phrase “wall of separation between church and state” originated in a speech made by Thomas Jefferson in 1801. Barton also claimed that Jefferson went on **to say** that “That wall is a one directional wall. It keeps the government from running the church but it makes sure that Christian principles will always stay in government.”* [\[xvi\]](#)

*“Such a claim would be powerful, provided it was true. The only problem was that Barton was [wrong](#) on all accounts: the phrase regarding church and state came out of an 1802 letter Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptist Association and the letter says absolutely nothing about keeping “Christian principles” in the government.”*

## **The Jefferson Lies**

*Barton’s book, “The Jefferson Lies” was as objectionable as his book, “The Myth of Separation”. The former was hammered so hard that it had to be withdrawn from publication. Hard as this might be to swallow, **apparently, it is Barton and not the “liberals” who has been telling the lies about Jefferson** (please do not say that this makes the author*

of this article a liberal):

*“In 2012, Barton’s New York Times bestseller, [The Jefferson Lies: Exposing the Myths You’ve Always Believed About Thomas Jefferson](#), was voted [“the least credible history book in print”](#) by the users of the History News Network website.[\[xvii\]](#) A group of [10 conservative Christian professors reviewed the work and reported negatively](#) on its claims, saying that Barton has misstated facts about Jefferson.”[\[xviii\]](#)*

*“In August 2012 [Christian publisher Thomas Nelson withdrew the book](#) from publication and stopped production, announcing that he had “lost confidence in the book’s details” and “learned that there were some historical details included in the book that were not adequately supported.”[\[xix\]](#)*

#### **According to Wikipedia**

*“In 1995, in response to criticism by **historian Robert Alley**, Barton conceded, in an online article titled [“Unconfirmed Quotations”](#),[\[xx\]](#) that he had not located primary sources for 11 alleged quotes from James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and U.S. Supreme Court decisions (hence, the title of Alley’s article), but maintained that the quotes were “completely consistent” with the views of the Founders. ([By 2007, the article listed 14 unconfirmed quotations.](#))[\[xxi\]](#)*

According to Texas Monthly,

*“[Honesty has been a problem for Barton](#) over the years and still is. After he issued his “unconfirmed quotes” retraction in 1995, for instance, a group of independent researchers went over *The “Myth of Separation”* with a fine-tooth comb and found more than one quote that Barton apparently fabricated through the **flagrant misuse of ellipses**.[\[xxii\]](#)*

In the past, you could find Barton’s bio online ([Endnote 2](#)) where it

says he's an "author and historian." The bio says he has a degree in Arts from Oral Roberts University and an honorary doctorate from the Pensacola Christian College. In his official bio at Ecclesia University, he refers to himself as [Dr. Barton](#). A bachelor's degree does not qualify a person as a "historian" (a bachelor is a certified apprentice of learning – certified to have the necessary qualifications to begin taking the next step leading to the title of "master"), nor does an honorary degree make one a doctor. There is a reason why there are peer-reviewed journals, and why some men and women are authorized to place Dr. in front of their names. The degree signifies the highest attainable level of scholarship and academic respectability, which Mr. Barton and those who support his ideological travesty – the Christian Founder Project – have not earned.

**David Barton cannot help himself – First he says that he does NOT have a Ph.D and then he says that he does???**

The fact is, Dispensationalists and Pentecostals, along with their allies in the not so secret "Secret Societies", are losing the battle to men and women who love the Truth, the truth who is a Divine Person, the truth who is also the Way and the Life. Men and women around the world are waking up and beginning to rally around His Church, the Church He established as the Light of the World and the City Set on a Hilltop; there is no other.

The Mother of God promised a victory, the "Triumph" of her "Immaculate Heart". Those who honor Her and follow Her Son (Catholic and Protestant) are getting in cadence because the "*Truth is marching on.*" Adept falsifiers so dread falling behind that they are forced to misquote and offer shoddy scholarship to hold on to their false dreams of freeing the world by global diffusion of anti-Christian principles in the guise of Enlightenment (because [the devil and his agents, come as "angels" and "ministers" of light](#) -DRB-), principles that in fact are intended to make them masters of the world, which is now in the process of turning against them (Review news articles at [newera.news](#) for details). These were the type of men Pope Francis was speaking about when he recently (November 30, 2015) stated:

*“Fundamentalism is a sickness that is in all religions (even Catholic fundamentalism). Such people “believe they possess the absolute truth and go ahead dirtying the other with calumny, with disinformation, and doing evil.” “We have to combat it,” he said. “Religious fundamentalism is not religious, because it lacks God. It is idolatry (in his case, the idolatry of nation or of Gnostic fraternity), like the idolatry of money.”[xxiii]*

The following links are provided for more information about this topic:

[David Barton Falsely Claims He’s Been Labeled A Hate Group By The FBI](#)

[Does David Barton Have A Ph.D.? Even He Doesn’t Seem To Know](#)

[David Barton Falsely Claims Justice Breyer Acknowledged That ‘The Bill Of Rights Came Out Of The Bible’](#)

[David Barton: The Declaration Of Independence And Bill Of Rights Came Directly Out Of The Bible](#)

[David Barton Falsely Claims He’s Been Labeled A Hate Group By The FBI](#)

[David Barton and Bogus Ph.D](#)

[Videos a Common Sense Rebuttal](#)

---

## **END NOTES**

1. The specious AD argument does not work. Some Christian ideologues who prefer ignorance to truth have scoured the document looking for just one reference to God. Finding none, they resort to the signature date which contains the words “In the year of Our Lord”. And then mockingly proclaim that the “secularists” are obviously wrong, as if this one miniscule thread redeems the entire document from being secular. This is a ridiculous argument, one worthy of only a footnote. By this logic, Hilary Clinton is a card carrying Christian because she

heads or closes her correspondence with the Christian date. Or, conversely, the Portuguese who live before 1700 are *not* Christians because they did not begin using the AD style until the 18th century. Using the in conventional date is *nothing but standard practice*; it is not evidence from which to draw conclusions about such deep seated beliefs as faith in Jesus Christ, and all that He taught. **New Agers even claim that Jesus is Lord** along with a host of other gods and lords. Thomas Jefferson called himself a “Christian” because he believed in the morals taught by Jesus. But he denied His divinity, incarnation, and resurrection; most especially, he denied the Trinity, which disqualifies him from being a Christian no matter how much he might protest: “Who is a liar, but he who denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is Antichrist, who denieth the Father, and the Son.” (1 John 2:22). AD, moreover, is one of several dating mechanisms used throughout Masonry and Masons are not Christians because they deny the divinity of Christ as Jefferson did. ([http://grandlodgeofiowa.org/docs/Masonic\\_History/AnnoLucis.pdf](http://grandlodgeofiowa.org/docs/Masonic_History/AnnoLucis.pdf))

[\[iii\]](#) All legitimate nations do derive authority and power from God through the natural law. The Church, is the only society conferred power and authority be means of the divine law and also by means of the natural law.

[\[iv\]](#) John Adams, Letter to John Taylor

[\[v\]](#) Thomas Jefferson (1810) *Letter to Samuel Kercheval*

[\[vi\]](#) Letter to Dr. Benjamin Rush, September 23, 1800

[\[vii\]](#) The Evangelical Founding Father:  
[http://www.patheos.com/blogs/anxiousbench/2015/11/the-most-evangelical-founding-father/?ref\\_widget=related&ref\\_blog=anxiousbench&ref\\_post=what-can-we-learn-from-the-david-barton-controversy](http://www.patheos.com/blogs/anxiousbench/2015/11/the-most-evangelical-founding-father/?ref_widget=related&ref_blog=anxiousbench&ref_post=what-can-we-learn-from-the-david-barton-controversy)

[\[viii\]](#) The Barton Chronicles  
<http://candst.tripod.com/bartchron.htm>

[\[ix\]](#) Blair Scott Michigan Atheist  
<http://michiganatheists.org/2015/04/27/david-barton-and-fake-q>



uotes/

[x] *ibid*

[xi] <http://www.positiveatheism.org/writ/founding.htm>

[xii] Scott

[xiii] J. Brent Walker, "A Critique of David Barton's Views on Church and State," Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty, April 2005

[xiv] Texas Freedom Network Education Foundation, "The Anatomy of Power: Texas and the Religious Right in 2006," p.19

[xv]

[http://www.pfaw.org/media-center/publications/david-barton-propaganda-masquerading-history#\\_edn21](http://www.pfaw.org/media-center/publications/david-barton-propaganda-masquerading-history#_edn21)

[xvi] Rob Boston, "Sects, Lies and Videotape," *Church & State*, Volume 46, No. 4, April 1993, pp 8-1

[xvii] Wikipedia, Schuessler, Jennifer (2012-07-16). "[And the Worst Book of History Is](#)". New York Times. 2012-07-19.

[xviii] Wikipedia, Kidd, Thomas (August 7, 2012). "[The David Barton controversy](#)". *World* (God's World Publications, World News Group). Retrieved April 9, 2013.

[xix] Wikipedia, Kidd, Thomas (August 7, 2012). "[The David Barton controversy](#)". *World* (God's World Publications, World News Group). Retrieved April 9, 2013.

[xx] Blakeslee, Nate (September 2006). "[King Of the Christocrats](#)". *Texas Monthly* **34** (9): 1. [ISSN 0148-7736](#). Retrieved 2008-11-10.

[xxi] Barton, David. "[Unconfirmed Quotations](#)". *WallBuilders website*. Archived from [the original](#) on September 28, 2007.

[xxii] (On page 248, for example, Barton pulled this quote from a Supreme Court of New York case called *People v. Ruggles*: "This [First Amendment] declaration ... never meant to withdraw religion ... and with it the best sanctions of moral and social obligation from all consideration and notice of the law." In the unedited version, however, it is abundantly clear that the "declaration" referred to is not the First Amendment, as Barton indicated in brackets, but an article of the New York state constitution.) In the vault, I finally got to take a closer look at a piece of plastic-sheathed parchment Barton

had been waving around on the pastors' tour in D.C., which he claimed was an example of Jefferson signing a document "In the Year of Our Lord Christ." It was already pretty flimsy evidence that Jefferson was a Christian, but on closer inspection it appeared that Jefferson himself had not even written the words; the document was the nineteenth-century equivalent of a form letter. (Texas Monthly: <http://www.texasmonthly.com/articles/king-of-the-christocrats/>). [\[xxiii\]](#)

<http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2015/11/30/pope-francis-says-he-is-not-losing-any-sleep-over-vatican-leaks-trial/>

---

## Beware The False Apostles of "Americanism" Part One

[New Era World News](#)

*"I join you, therefore, in sincere congratulations that this den of the priesthood is at length broken up, and that a Protestant Popedom is no longer to disgrace the American history and character."*

[Thomas Jefferson to John Adams upon the disestablishment of religion in Massachusetts \(Works, Vol. iv., p. 301\).](#)

**BEWARE OF THE SPECIOUS CLAIM** that America was founded by Christian men on Christian principles. The claim has long been touted by ideologues men (and women) who are in the business of falsifying information to suit their "noble" agenda. Their agenda includes other similar unsubstantiated and false claims made about the Catholic church.

These men and women (primarily Christian ideologues who correlate

Christianity with the United States, capitalism, and the constitution) seem to have no problem distorting, changing, and twisting the Church's sacred documents just as they mangle and pervert American historic documents so that they can present an untrue picture, a picture that matches their distorted script about God, history, current events and even the end of the world and a supposed pre-tribulation rapture.

False prophets such as these have difficulty distinguishing their religion from their politics. Somewhere along the line they conceived the idea that America is the "light of the world", a nation with a God-given destiny to establish a "New Order of the Ages" or as it says on the nation's currency, "*Novus ordo seclorum*". Men such as these place their political philosophy in front of their moral and spiritual theology. Then disguised as disciples of Christ, they attempt to foist their false political and messianic agenda on the world in the name of Christ. They are so convinced by the righteousness of their cause that they are willing to distort the truth in order to advance their highly cherished but fallacious world views.

Somehow, they seem to think that it is the will of God, the *Supreme Law Maker* and *Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe*, that Americans should draft laws without Him, that He endorses the separation of church and state whereby He is shut out of the political, economic and social arenas, effectively denied a voice in the public affairs of the nation leaving it to elected officials to promulgate their own secular-statutory laws in disregard of the divine law given by God to mankind in both the Old and New Testaments.

Almost every American man, woman, and child has accepted this idea (the secularization of the state and promulgation of man-made laws rooted in the supposed **sovereignty of the people** rather than in the **sovereignty of God**). Popular sovereignty and the separation of church and state are liberal political slogans that have become sacred American dogma. Neoconservative politicians, who give requisite lip service to Christ, act like it is their sacrosanct duty to spread political, economic and social "Liberalism" aboard as if it were derived from God, when in fact, on many points, "Americanism" is

antithetical to the laws given by God to govern His people – antithetical and deadly.

*The ultimate consequence of this American dogma practically speaking (that is not theoretically, but practically, what in fact has, and is taking place) is the denial that the Gospel and the Church's social teaching, (drawn from it) have any applicability in the broader political, social, and economic realm. These broad public realms were declared off-limits to the Church. As a result of the Framers privatization of religion, these realms have slowly become secularized and ultimately dehumanized ["structures of sin"](#) that manifest a ["culture of death"](#) (Pope John Paul II " [Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, 36-37-38-39-40](#)).*

It is the exclusion of God from the public forum and the corollary rejection of Divine Law, inherent in the system established by the Framers, that are the root causes of the problems that the church has condemned as "Americanism".

By portraying the Founding Fathers as Christian men who bequeathed the nation a Christian Constitution, and then further insisting that it be treated as a **sacred** document, Americans have mistakenly replaced Divine Authority with human authority and elevated a secular man-made law over and above God-given Divine Law. Knowingly or not, we have exiled the omniscient and omnipresent God from the America political playing field and in the process institutionalized secular rule. This mistake is perpetuated by insisting that Founding Fathers, the "wise" and "virtuous" men who gave us a sacred Constitution, be continually placed on sacerdotal pedestals – including, wherever possible, church pedestals – when in fact, all they left us with is a secular Constitution subject to the whim of the "people" and to be freely interpreted by any political ideology that might suit the Justices.

As long as the Founding Fathers are revered above the saints and the prophets or somehow judged to be equal in stature to them, we will continue to perpetuate the polysemous and ambiguous secular and philosophical ideas on which they founded this nation.

Love of country and patriotism are splendid assets; however, when people raise the Constitution with one hand and tout the bible in the other claiming they are both sacred documents from God, beware "Americanism". Such people, in the guise of patriotism are often misguided and wayward "nationalists."

Pope Leo XIII addressed these concerns in his encyclical [\*Testem Benevolentiae Nostrae\*](#) in which he condemned several false ideas that Catholic prelates were introducing to the church in America; thereby slowly transforming her into an institution governed by, and therefore subject to, the same secular and democratic ideas that the United States government was founded upon, ideas such as majority rule, the cherishing of practical action and social work over prayer and contemplation, popular sovereignty, and the separation of church and state and a deficient idea of the "natural law". Pope Leo was, in effect, attempting to protect the church from the false prophets of Americanism; these were the men (and women) who had blindly subordinated their faith to their politics, and were bringing the latter into the church *rather than the former into the latter*.

They quickly became advocates of "American Exceptionalism", of liberal ideas such as the separation of church and state, and popular sovereignty. In the nation's new public schools, curricula were established by **anti-Christian atheists**, such as **John Dewey** (the **grand patriarch of the American Public School System** and Teacher Training Colleges), to overcome the effects of too much Christianity. Due to the increased secularization of American education, virtue was increasingly understood as a civic character trait (something very different than that taught by Aristotle, Aquinas, and Doctors of the Church) manifest in utilitarian excellence and the ability to achieve practical results strengthened by a democratic character whereby tolerance is turned into false-liberty increasing characterized by nihilism, skepticism, and an ever increasing acceptance of moral relativity as logical outgrowths of Dewey's utilitarian philosophy and disdain for Christian ideas.

*"There is (he said) no God and there is no soul. Hence, there is no need for the props of traditional (Christian) religion. With dogma*

*and creed excluded, then immutable truth is dead and buried. There is no room for fixed law or permanent moral absolutes” ([John Dewey – The Legacy](#)).*

John Dewey was made the President of the National Education Association, which facilitated the ideals and liberal values of the new secular government, which were slowly but inevitably incorporated into the curricula of newly created public schools until the privatized religious and moral sphere morphed with and became increasingly congruent with the secular version of morality introduced in the public sphere.

According to Dewey and his disciples who gained control of the public school system:

*“The behavioral sciences are providing **new natural explanations** of phenomena so extraordinary that once their supernatural origin was, so to say, the natural explanation.”*

*“Geological discoveries ...have **displaced Creation myths** which once bulked large.” And*

*“The social sciences have provided a **“radically different version of the historic events** and personages upon which Christian religions have built” (John Dewey, A Common Faith, Yale University Press, 1934, pg 84).*

Making progress on all these fronts *vis a vis* Christianity Dewey, as early as 1908, was able to superciliously proclaim that the new civic religion of America was replacing the Christian religion:

*“Our schools ... are performing an **infinitely significant religious work**. They are promoting the social unity out of which in the end genuine religious unity must grow. ...dogmatic beliefs (articles of*

*Christian faith)...we see disappearing... It is the part of men to... work for the transformation of all practical instrumentalities of education till they are in harmony with these (above) ideas" (John Dewey (1908) The Hibbert Journal, Dennis L. Cuddy, Ph.D. Chronology of Education, pg. 11.).*

The secular "experiment" undertaken by the Framers in 1787 bore its penultimate fruit in 1933, when John Dewey and a group of leading American intellectuals signed the "*Humanist Manifesto*", which brought the slowly developing secular program into plain view; listed below are its more salient points:

- *Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.*
- *Man is a part of nature and that has emerged as the result of a continuous process.*
- *The traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.*
- *The nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values.*
- *Man is at last becoming aware that he alone is responsible for the realization of the world of his dreams, that he has within himself the power of its achievement.*

Educational leaders such as John Dewey set the nation's schools on a secular path on which liberal ideas (and more developed dogmas) in the guise of civic virtue were to replace long held sacred beliefs. After successful implementation throughout the nation, it was America's God-given task to carry these dogmas throughout the world.

Students therefore imbibed large draughts of “Manifest Destiny”, a toxic brew served up in civics classes throughout the nation, a brew so intoxicating that it was preached from church pulpits thereby successfully giving birth to a new civic-religion containing doctrines that in many ways stood in opposition to the doctrines given them by Jesus Christ. Inebriated and pumped with missionary zeal and love of country, they welcomed ideas about exceptionalism and zealously manned the ramparts when their teachers told them that it was their sacred duty to spread Americanism abroad. They were so pumped with love of country, with its “Manifest destiny” that they failed to see the blasphemy in their newly acquired views, views that presented America as the “Light of the World” and the “City set on a Hilltop” ordained by God to lead the nation of the world to freedom.

This is nothing but political hype repeated by zealous nationalists, men and women who place the Constitution on a pedestal along with the Holy Bible and then proceed to enthusiastically foist their erroneous political ideas on the rest of mankind; thereby zealously enslaving the world in the name of liberalism while claiming to set it free.

It was Jesus Christ, *not* the American government, that died to make men free; but the Framers had left Him out of the Constitution, had left any mention of God whatsoever out of the Constitution, and Dewey scornfully saw to it that He was excluded from the public schools, which became the vehicles for promoting new and false secular ideas about liberty. Nice as the pursuit of liberty might sound, *no government can advance the cause of liberty without Him* and especially without the Church that He commissioned for this purpose, *viz.*, to set all men free ([John 8:36](#)). Jesus is the way and the truth and the life, there is no other name under heaven by which men are saved; yet the Constitution demands that He remain out of the state’s business.

**A secular government can achieve nothing (truly) good for man without God ([John 15:5](#)); yet they demand the constitutional right to do everything without Him.** When Christians put the Framers on a Sacred Pedestal, equate the Constitution with the Bible, and then support foreign policy more than they do Christian missionaries, we have a problem.



*“Unless the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it. Unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain that keepeth it”*  
[\(Psalm 127:1\)](#).

When Benjamin Franklin proposed that the delegates assembled to draft the Constitution pray before they continued to work, **51 of the 55 delegates voted against the proposal**. On June 28, 1787, Franklin registered a plea to begin each day with prayer to the “Father of Lights”. A simple and sane request made to a group of supposedly Christian men ended up in an overwhelming rejection. According to Franklin himself, 51 of the supposed Christian delegates did not think prayer necessary. In his own words:

*“With the exception of 3 or 4, most thought prayers unnecessary.”*  
*(Ferrand, Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, rev. ed., Vol. 1, p. 452.)*

The Lord either builds the house or He doesn't; we either cooperate with Him or we build a city without Him, the “city of man” rather than the “City of God.” Are the words of [Psalm 127](#) just empty words or are they words of wisdom; if they are wisdom than we have acted like fools—it is clear that the Lord did not build the American house, nor was he, according to John Adams, even consulted.

*“It will never be pretended that any persons employed in that service (the writing of the constitution) had interviews with the gods, or were in any degree under the inspiration of heaven...it will forever be acknowledged that these governments were contrived by the use of reason and the senses (not faith and the bible)...Thirteen governments founded on the natural (versus supernatural) authority of the people alone”* (John Adams, “A Defense of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America” (1788).

The fact is that the “God of Nature”, the god known by “reason” was the god of the leading Founders (Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin et al). They preferred the god of nature to Jesus Christ and

His Bride, the Church, whom He divinely established to “feed His sheep and to shepherd His lambs” and to “teach all nations” in the name of the Holy Trinity. No, they preferred reason and reason’s god, the “*God of Nature*.” Adams and Jefferson both boasted of this lamentable fact:

*“The question before the human race is, Whether the **God of nature** (the Deist, Masonic, Epicurean and Gnostic god) Shall govern the World by his own laws, or Whether Priests and Kings Shall rule it by fictitious Miracles? Or, in other Words, whether **Authority is originally in the People?** or whether it has descended for 1800 Years in a Succession of Popes and Bishops, or **brought down from Heaven by the holy Ghost in the form of a Dove, in a Phyal of holy Oil**” (John Adams)?[\[i\]](#)*

No, the Lord who gave the world His Divine Law (old and new) was *not* consulted when the “Founders” established their own laws without Him; He was purposefully and admittedly ignored. Despite the fact that America was a nation of Christians, Jesus Christ is *not* mentioned one time in our nation’s supreme document[\[iii\]](#). Consistent with this American commitment to the “*God of Nature*” is the equally irreverent privatization of the Church under the guise of doing Her and all Americans a big favor. In other words, Christ was “kicked out” and the deed was conducted with cunning arrogance.

Pope Pius XI recognized the absurdity of this kind of social and political arrogance in his encyclical, [Quas Primas](#) (1925) in which he quoted the Prophet Daniel who foretold the universal kingdom founded by Christ. If His kingdom is universal and respected by Christian men, it is to be expected that such men would enshrine it as a beacon for the nation rather than relegate it to the private sphere unsupported by laws, tax dollars, public education, statue or ordinance. **Christ established a kingdom to stand forever, and the Framers were intent on building their own** without Him.

*“The kingdom that the God of heaven shall found, ‘shall never be destroyed, and shall stand forever” [\(Daniel 2:44\)](#).*

Pope Pius reminds us that after the resurrection, Jesus solemnly affirmed his omnipotence and conveyed His power and authority to His Church[[iii](#)]. **He did not confer divine power on any secular nation, nor did He direct any nation to be a “City on a Hilltop” or a “Light to the World”.** Those are things He delegated exclusively to His Church ([Matthew 5:14](#)) to whom He also delegated His own authority and power, something the Founding Fathers had a real difficult time understanding and respecting.

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

If, as Daniel foresaw, Christ established a kingdom that will never be destroyed and that will stand forever, why did we exclude Him, why did Jefferson and Adams believe that the Church established by Christ was suffering from a “mortal wound” and would soon die?

*“Cabalistic Christianity, which is catholic (sic) Christianity, and which has prevailed for 1,500 years, has received a mortal wound, of which the monster must finally die. Yet so strong is his constitution, that he may endure for centuries before he expires”* ([John Adams](#), (July 16, 1814) Letter to Thomas Jefferson).

Obviously, many of these men were out of the spiritual loop. They excluded Christ because they envisioned America as His new church, his new kingdom and empire and themselves as a new priesthood. The new nation was to be governed exclusively by them and not by Catholic priests and Protestant clergy, against whom they had vowed “eternal hostility”.

*“The clergy...believe that any portion of power confided to me [as President] will be exerted in opposition to their schemes. And they believe rightly: **I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility** against every form of tyranny over the mind of man”* (Letter of [Thomas Jefferson](#) to Dr. Benjamin Rush, September 23,

1800)

John Adams referred to the Protestant ministers as “yahoos” the great enemies of “free inquiry” who should be endured no longer.

*“And ever since the Reformation, when or where has existed a Protestant or dissenting sect who would tolerate A FREE INQUIRY (Adams’ own emphasis)? The blackest billingsgate, the most ungentlemanly insolence, the most yahooish brutality, is patiently endured, countenanced, propagated, and applauded.”*[\[iv\]](#)

Jefferson concurred, the **Christian clergy** are:

*“... the greatest obstacles to the advancement of the real doctrines of Jesus, and do in fact constitute the real Anti-Christ.”*[\[v\]](#)

Catholic priests and Protestant clergy were the great deceivers, the tyrants over the minds of men whom Jefferson had sworn upon the altar of God to eradicate:

The Framers must have thought very highly of themselves. Likewise, Americans who believe the “Christian” myths about them probably believe themselves to be very special people, although more and more people around the world are having difficulty seeing it.

Christ’s kingdom is *not* of this world – that is, it is not founded on anyone’s political power; it is conveyed fully to His Church; the Church that our “Founders” excluded from public life and left to fend for itself without a dime for His cause and without any public show of support either from the schools from which He we also *excluded* or from the public *dais* from which He was *forbidden*. This was, and is, certainly a funny way for a “Christian nation” to treat its King, an odd way to reverence the one whom you claim to serve.

If the Framers in the name of reason and reason’s god (the “*God of Nature*”, on whom they built the new nation) removed Christ from the public arena and were at war with the Christian clergy (the so-called

“Antichrist”)”, we can be quite sure who the “*God of Nature*” is and who the men that profess loyalty to him are. How can any authentic Christian clergyman claim that America is a holy nation founded by men who loved Jesus and therefore established a Christian foundation? The fact is (beside clergy who are just ignorant “blind guides”), men who stridently profess such things in the name of Christ are themselves enemies of Christ, dispensational bigots who have no problem forging documents and distorting facts to push their agenda and catch people unawares in the idolatrous trap of “Americanism”.

One of America’s *unsung* founders was Elias Boudinot. Boudinot was a president of the Continental Congress, a United States Congressman and from 1795 to 1805 he was the director of the U.S. Mint.

Boudinot was alarmed by the disregard for Christian principles by many leaders of the new American government;

*“But has not America greatly departed from her original (17th century) principles, and left her first love? Has she not also many amongst her chief citizens, of every party, who have forsaken the God of their fathers, and to whom the spirit may justly be supposed to say, “ye hold doctrines which I hate, repent, or else I will come unto you quickly, and will fight against you with the sword of my mouth.”* [\[vii\]](#)

The fact is, the foremost founders were *not* Christians. The leading lights among them hated both the Trinity and the Church established by Jesus Christ. The current successors of these men who claim to be Christian ministers, ministers who tell us that the Founders were Christian, and that the Constitution is a Christian document, are wolves in sheep’s clothing ([Matt 7:15](#)). Many are deceiving ministers who dress in sheep’s clothing; that is, in lay garb rather than clerical garb (because they have like Jefferson and Adams rejected the clergy and set themselves up as guides). Priests do not wear sheep’s clothing, *i.e.*, the clothing of the flock they shepherd. They wear clerical garb. Wolves dressed in sheep’s clothing are lay ministers who wear business attire rather than ecclesial or liturgical attire.

The truth is that these so-called Christian-American zealots do not have Jesus Christ for their God or the Church for their Mother; they have no king but Caesar; that is, their allegiance is to the Republic *before* it is to the Church, even though they claim to be ministers of Christ.

Not all who claim allegiance to Christ have allegiance to Christ, but only those who do the will of his Father.

*“Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven. Many will say to me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name? Did we not drive out demons in your name? Did we not do mighty deeds in your name?’ Then I will declare to them solemnly, ‘I never knew you.’ Depart from me, you evildoers [\(Matt 7: 21-23\)](#).*

Pope Saint Pius X saw through the charade,

*“We must repeat with the utmost energy in these times of social and intellectual anarchy when **everyone takes it upon himself to teach as a teacher and lawmaker – the City cannot be built otherwise than as God has built it; society cannot be setup unless the Church lays the foundations** and supervises the work; no, civilization is **not** something yet to be found, nor is the New City to be built on hazy notions; **it has been in existence and still is: it is Christian civilization...It has only to be set up and restored continually against the unremitting attacks of insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants.**” (St. Pope Pius X, [Notre Charge Apostolique](#), April 15, 1910).*

Because many of these self-styled “pastors” are “miscreants”, “rebels” and “dreamers”, it should come as no surprise that many so-called ministers, men who are supposed to be lovers of the truth and “ambassadors” of Jesus Christ, the way and the truth and the life”, seem to have no problem telling a lie to gain fame or to make a buck, or worse, in order to advance an agenda that makes them guilty of that

which they accuse others, viz., being unchristian.

The truth is, many of the so-called conservative fundamentalists and dispensationalists ministers who claim that “liberals” are distorting the facts about the Christian roots of American government are the real ones that are doing the distorting; their scholarship is often so offensive that it makes an honest man blush and then (as will be shown in the follow-up article) so incensed that they move into action to expose its falsity). The output of Christian nationalists has become legion. Perhaps you have seen their websites, or read their books and media tracts claiming that the United States Constitution was written by stalwart Christian men totally committed to Christ and the building of a Christian nation.

*What many of their readers are unaware of is that many of the quotes they use to defend their claims are fabricated, misunderstood, or misrepresented.*

**End Part One:**

[Go to Part Two](#)

---

## **Purveyors of “Fake News” about to be Confounded by Their Own New Laws**

[New Era World News](#)

**LAST WEEK FOUR OF THE NATION’S LEADING INTELLIGENCE** chiefs (James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence; John Brennan, CIA Director; James Comey, FBI Director and Admiral Mike Rogers, NSA Director) presented classified documents to President Obama and President-elect Trump. The documents

contain a two page synopsis of specific allegations appended to a 35 page report alleging Russian interference in the presidential election. The FBI is still investigating the authenticity of the information, much of which remains unconfirmed.

This synopsis, although not an official part of the report, supposedly contains evidence that the Kremlin nefariously exchanged information with the Trump team to damage Clinton's campaign. Since the uncorroborated report was cited by CNN Mr. Trump refused to field a question from Jim Acosta a reporter representing CNN whom he accused of being a purveyor of "Fake News".

Technically speaking it was an outlet known as BuzzFeed, *not* CNN, that leaked the news including false allegations that Russian operatives possess compromising financial and personal information about the President-Elect. The Russians are supposed to have gathered damaging information that could be used to control or compromise the president in the future, such as an alleged agreement between Donald Trump and a group of prostitutes whom he supposedly propositioned to urinate on a bed slept ("Golden Showers") in by President and Michelle Obama the night before at the Ritz Carlton Hotel in Moscow. Trump has continually denied the allegations referring to them as "fake news" and a "total political witchhunt." It was [CNN](#) that first published the news, but it did not include the specific allegations since they could not be verified for accuracy. [BuzzFeed](#), whom Trump referred to as a "failing pile of garbage", however, had no problem published the specious allegations, with the caveat that they were *not* yet substantiated."

While this might seem to be a major story, a story that many are getting confused trying to unravel, a closely related story, **a story having to do with empowering the United States government to handle fake news allegedly originating from new social media outlets, a story with far greater ramifications, slipped by virtually unnoticed over the**



**Christmas Holiday** when people had their minds set on the holiday season.

Interestingly, [Senator John McCain](#) (who admits to having been the person behind real fake news, fake news about Trump and Russia, which he passed to the FBI) recently sponsored a bill entitled the **National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA)** designed to protect the main-stream media by outlawing so-called fake news presumed to be coming from “alternative social media”. McCain admitted passing documents to James Comey (FBI Director), documents that allegedly show that Russian intelligence agents possess compromising data about the President-elect.

The fact that Vladimir Putin’s spokesperson, Dmitry Peskov, denied that [Russia](#) has collected any compromising intel on Mr. Trump and referred to the allegation as a “complete fabrication and utter nonsense”, did not stop John McCain from escalating the matter in an attempt to ruin fellow Republican presidential candidate Trump. In McCain’s own words:

*“Late last year, I received sensitive information that has since been made public. Upon examination of the contents, and unable to make a judgement about their accuracy, I delivered the information to the Director of the FBI.”*

[According to the Guardian:](#)

*“McCain was reluctant to get involved, according to a colleague, for fear the issue would be dismissed as a personal grudge against Trump. He pushed instead for the creation of a special Senate committee to look into connections between campaign staff and Moscow, but the proposal was blocked by the Republican leadership.”*

*“[McCain told the NBC programme Meet the Press on Sunday:](#) “I would like to see a select committee. Apparently that is not in agreement by our leadership. So we will move forward with*

*the armed services committee and I'm sure foreign relations and intelligence committee will as well."*

So Senator **John McCain passes fake news on a candidate running for President** of the United States and then turns around and **sponsors a bill intended to stop the spread of fake news** of which he himself is a purveyor. In a show of non-partisanship, President Obama signed the bill into law on Friday December 23 during the rush of the holiday season, the day before Christmas Eve

[Obama stated that:](#)

*Today, I have signed into law S. 2943, the "**National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.**" This Act authorizes fiscal year 2017 appropriations principally for the Department of Defense and for Department of Energy **national security programs**, provides vital benefits for military personnel and their families, and includes authorities to facilitate ongoing operations around the globe. It continues many critical authorizations necessary to ensure that we are able to sustain our momentum in countering the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and to reassure our European allies, as well as **many new authorizations that, among other things, provide the Departments of Defense and Energy more flexibility in countering cyber-attacks and our adversaries' use of unmanned aerial vehicles.**"*

By far, the most significant news has to do with alarming provisions buried deeply within the NDAA. Buried deeply inside the new bill are provisions from the "*Countering Disinformation and Propaganda Act*" of 2016 (CDPA), which provides **remedies for the government to censor the press in the name of veracity vis a vis fake news.** The 2016 CDPA was introduced by Congressmen Ted Lieu and Adam Kinzinger as [House Bill H.R. 5181](#), which is intended to limit "foreign disinformation and manipulation" and

*“To collect and store examples in print, online, and social media, disinformation, misinformation, and propaganda directed at the United States and its allies and partners.*

From the House the bill passed to the Senate where it was supported by **Senators Robert Portman** (Rep – OH) and **Chris Murphy** (Dem – CT) who argued that Washington *vis a vis* the Kremlin spends a relatively small amount on its foreign news agency, the *Voice of America* while the Kremlin provides prodigious funding for its news agency, Russia Today (RT). Portmain advocates a single government agency to integrate and synchronize “whole strategies to counter foreign propaganda and disinformation.”

Thus, prior to the passage of the NDAA in December of 2017, before the discrediting of CNN by Trump mentioned above, **the Secretary of State was being asked by to coordinate national efforts to “establish a Center for Information Analysis and Response” and to “develop” and “disseminate” “fact-based narratives” to counter propaganda otherwise now known as “fake news.”**

According to the bill’s sponsor in the Senate, Chris Murphy, the:

*“Countering Disinformation and Propaganda Act – legislation designed to help American allies counter foreign government propaganda... has been signed into law as part of the FY 2017 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA).”*

The CDPA was inserted inside the December 2017 NDAA and has become law, a law that erodes freedom of the press in America presaging what Trump refers to as “witch hunts” followed by censorship, fines and possibly imprisonment for writing news stories that do *not* correspond with the liberal script. **The NDAA provides funds for a grant program for think tanks, NGOs and other personnel engaged in counter-propaganda operations.**

While supporters of the bill consider it an outrage that Russia would dare publish its version of world news, they see no problem with their doing the same. Not to be out done by RT, the bill provides for a more robust foreign propaganda machine enhanced by on-going assistance to foreign allies to help them defend themselves against harmful false news coming out of places like Poland, Hungary, Russia and Slovakia *et al*.

Strangely, the NDAA is a law intended to help counter false news while its sponsor John McCain is a purveyor of false news. Apparently news is true if it supports the liberal economic, military or moral agenda and false if opposed. False news such as the type sponsored by Senator McCain supports the agenda. News containing false allegations about “golden showers” and Russian war-mongering is considered worthy of belief, when in fact it is McCain who is acting like a war monger beating the NATO and US war drums to mount a crusade against Russia.

While berating Russia as a military behemoth waiting to strangle the world, the fact is that **US military spending is higher than that of all the countries of the world combined – including Russia**. NATO alone spends ten times more on military than the entire Russian Federation – so who is the war-monger?

Putin recently challenged the West to publish a map of all of its bases around the world and compare them to Russian bases – such a map would more clearly show who the war-monger really is:

[“I invite you to publish the world map in your newspaper and to mark all the US military bases on it. You will see the difference” \(Vladimir Putin\)](#)

Putin continued:

*“American submarines are on permanent alert off the Norwegian*


*coast; they are equipped with missiles that can reach Moscow in 17 minutes. But we dismantled all of our bases in Cuba a long time ago, even the non-strategic ones. And you would call us aggressive?"*

*"You yourself have mentioned NATO's expansion to the east. As for us, we are not expanding anywhere; it is NATO infrastructure, including military infrastructure, that is moving towards our borders. Is this a manifestation of our aggression?"*

*"Everything we do is just a response to the threats emerging against us. Besides, what we do is limited in scope and scale, which are, however, sufficient to ensure Russia's security. Or did someone expect Russia to disarm unilaterally?"*

## **MAPS OF US BASES AROUND THE WORLD**

Looking at the maps below, it seems that Mr. Putin has a valid point, a point that neo-liberal and neo-con war mongers want to ignore:




*Graphic by 5W Infographics*

Please excuse the following jocularly (sarcasm), but this is how ridiculous it has become: If we need further proof of Russia's aggression we need only consider how bold the Russians are: How dare they move their country so close to our military bases. It is not the Russians who are demonizing the West, we do a good job of that all by ourselves; it is the West that is demonizing Russia. It seems that [Russia and the West have switched roles](#). Hopefully, under President Elect Trump, the United States and Russia will be reconciled and cooperate to bring an end to terrorism and advance world peace.



## Global Expansion of U.S. Military Involvement



Anyone with eyes can see who is threatening whom. Russia is virtually surrounded except for the frigid North Pole and even there the US has nuclear submarines that can target and hit Moscow in 17 minutes.



## WHY THE HATRED OF RUSSIA

Why the hatred of Russia? In the 20th century it was because of the American opposition to Communism. Today it is the opposition of Russian Christianity to Western Liberalism. In the mind of a liberal ideologue, Russia is engaged in such terrible things as adopting legislation to outlaw abortion, spending money to support the spread of Christian political parties throughout Europe, introducing Christianity into its public schools, using state money to build thousands of churches throughout the country, promoting the spread of traditional family values, and God forbid, working to unite Europe around a Christian moral agenda rather than the liberal agenda that has been regent for more than a century. The liberal press in America, a press that is promoting abortion, materialism, hedonism, homosexuality and other anti-Christian and anti-family values will have none of this. To assure its place of leadership as cunning promoter of liberal cultural values, it is looking to the government for protection of its freedom and privileges, freedom it intends for itself but not for the rising alternative media that has had enough of its twisted agenda and therefore must be silenced. Apparently freedom is not meant for reporters who question the enlightened game plan supported by the Clintons, Obamas and other globalists. Thus, when the state sponsors of December's NDAA bill say such things as

*"Our enemies are using foreign propaganda and disinformation against us and our allies, and so far the U.S. government has been asleep at the wheel."*

*"But today, the United States has taken a critical step towards confronting the extensive, and destabilizing, foreign propaganda and disinformation operations being waged against*



*us by our enemies overseas. With this bill now law, we are finally signaling that enough is enough; the United States will no longer sit on the sidelines. We are going to confront this threat head-on. I am confident that, with the help of this bipartisan bill, the disinformation and propaganda used against us, our allies, and our interests will fail."*

When the bill's proponents say such things, they are either blinded by ideology and thus ignorant to what is really happening around the globe (and in America itself), or they are fully aware of it all and opposed to the rise of traditional moral values at home, in Europe, Africa and elsewhere.

Given the fact that nations such as Poland are struggling to throw off Western control of media in their own back yards and to exercise dominion over their own news agencies, it sounds strange to hear Senator Murphy say such things as:

*"The use of propaganda to undermine democracy has hit a new low. But now we are finally in a position to confront this threat head on and get out the truth. By building up independent, objective journalism in places like eastern Europe, we can start to fight back by exposing these fake narratives and empowering local communities to protect themselves."*

Murphy seems ignorant of the fact that Poland just elected a new president and government from the Law and Justice Party (PiS), a Party committed to Poland's Christian patrimony. Among other things, the new government almost immediately moved to gain control over the nation's media, which was being funded and overtly influenced and controlled by foreign sources from Germany, UK, and the USA.

Because it was clear that Polish culture had been systematically invaded by Western media outlets, by

libertarian think tanks, and by foreign agents of the EU and US influencing the development of “liberal democracy” and “liberty” including the structuring of Poland’s new government and court system (they could not be trusted to do it themselves), PiS simply decided the time had come to do something about reasserting Poland’s national sovereignty and the promotion of its own indigenous cultural values – something anathema to liberal ideologues operating in Warsaw and throughout Poland and around the globe.

Consequently, PiS began the process of minimizing outside meddling in their political and domestic affairs by adopting a new law designed to remove foreign influences from their media and reassert Polish control of its own cultural affairs. The new law permits the government to terminate employment of media executives (placed by previous politicians or executives under the influence of and beholden to exogenous foreign forces) and to appoint new heads, men and women devoted to Polish values. Of course, this is something that did not sit well with those accustomed to controlling foreign governments, thus it did not go by without significant opposition.

Immediately the new government was hit with accusations of tyranny and autocracy simply because they wanted the Polish media to be run by Poles and to reflect indigenous Polish values rather than liberal Western ones. Various **EU leaders** including Volker Kauder of the ruling German CDU party **called for retaliation and began demanding that EU nations impose sanctions on Poland for the violation of “European values.”**

**Speaking to *Der Spiegel*, Kauder emphasized that Poland should swallow Western liberal values or be forced to pay a price for failing to do so. Brussels, he said, must:**

*“...find the courage to apply sanctions” against a disobedient Poland if [“European values are violated.”](#)*

It is information like this, that causes *New Era* to question the competency and/or veracity of Senators like John McCain and Chris Murphy.

Strong as the liberal forces arrayed against traditional Christian values in Poland might be, they did not expect anything like this in 2015:

<https://youtu.be/Hakb6S0IpgY>

Nor did they ever see anything like this in 2016

[https://youtu.be/dpC2\\_BUCTS0](https://youtu.be/dpC2_BUCTS0)

Because of events like these occurring in Poland, *New Era* believes that many intelligence analysts who are interpreting the events discussed in this article as indicators of an onward continuation of liberal public indoctrination buoyed by the use of oppressive laws and political force to curtail the growing influence of alt-news sources proliferating around the globe, are misguided in their projections. These agencies are forecasting a government crack down on the alternative media:

*“While the US media has indoctrinated the public to assume that any information which is not in compliance with the official government narrative, or dares to criticize the establishment, is also “fake news” and thus falls under the “Russian propaganda” umbrella, the scene is now set for the US government to legally crack down on every media outlet that the government deems to be “foreign propaganda.”*

To many it looks like an inevitable government backed secret-society plot to obliterate any opposition to the spread of liberalism leading them to conclude:

*“Just like that, the US Ministry of Truth is officially born.”*

It might look as if there is a nefarious attempt to stifle the truth. Although this might appear to be the intent of the NDAA and related legislation, from New Era’s perspective, these type of projections are faulty. If it is the intent of the legislation to curtail social media, the NDAA will fail. It will fail as miserably as the EU is failing and as the liberal forces in America continue to erode.

The world is on the verge of an *Era of Peace* promised by the Mother of God at Fatima; there is no way that all the powers of the nether world can stop the ordaining will of the Holy Trinity. New Era forecasts that the NDAA will confound its drafters; it will come back to bite the hand that crafted it.

In other words, **there will be a crack down on fake news, but much to the chagrin of the bills supporters the crack down will come on the hands of those whom they support in the liberal media – they will fall by their own sword.**

---

## **Trump Circumvents Fake News – Tips Hand Before Inauguration**

[New Era World News](#)

**FOLLOWING LAST WEEK’S PRESS CONFERENCE** during which President-Elect Trump referred to CNN as a purveyor of “fake news”, he was asked if he would continue using social media after he becomes president. Of course he will! Since social media allows him to turn the table on networks such as CNN accused of “fake news”, his answer, although a shock to mainstream

media, is a “no-brainer.’

*“I think, I’ll keep it. I’ve got 46 million people right now – including Facebook, Twitter and Instagram, so I’d rather just let that build up.”*

*“I thought I’d do less of it, but **I’m covered so dishonestly by the press that I can put out Twitter** – and it’s not 140, it’s now 280 – and as soon as I tweet it out – this morning on television, Fox – ‘Donald Trump, we have breaking news.’”*

The changes expected from a Trump presidency are already occurring: It looks like **CNN has inadvertently catapulted a counter-main-stream-media-revolution** that has been gaining momentum for several years. Now- world leaders, such as Trump, need only Tweet news they want the world to hear. Look for Twitter to become an increasingly important avenue for current events; if it is not on Twitter it might just be “fake news.”

Following his nod to Twitter, the real estate mogul proceed to turn the heat up on both Germany and German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Like others, Trump is watching a populist Anti-European Union movement sweep across Europe. Adding fuel to the populist fire, Trump implied that the Euro-skeptic movement is understandable not only because family and Christian values are being jeopardized by mass immigration, but also because the other European nations are being exploited by Germany, which, being a highly advanced export economy, is the main beneficiary of the relationship:

*“You look at **the European Union** and it’s Germany. **Basically a vehicle for Germany**...That’s why I thought the UK was so smart in getting out.*

*“I believe others will leave. I do think keeping it together is not going to be as easy as a lot of people think. And I think that if refugees keep pouring into different parts of Europe, it’s going to be very hard to keep it together because people are angry about it.”*

Speaking of Merkel’s highly unpopular immigration policy (a policy that permitted over a million Middle Eastern refugees to enter Germany), a policy being combated throughout Europe in France, Poland, Hungary and elsewhere, Trump stated it is:

*“...a catastrophic mistake” Germany should not have accepted “all these illegals.”*

*“Nobody even knows where they are coming from.”*

## **NATO**

The EU immigration policy has led to an emergence of Christian political parties throughout the continent. But it is not just immigration and a resurgent Christian identity that the European globalists must deal with; they are also facing a defense problem. The Europeans, long accustomed to being defended by NATO for which the United States has footed the bill, have grown complacent. Trump has indicated that he will not be the type of leader whom one can accept a gift from and then defame when ever possible. The European Union should take notice: Trump does *not* like to be crossed – CNN is on the sideline, Merkel is in the hot seat. She must run for office in a few months against the populist pro-Christian [Alternative for Deutschland Party \(AfD\)](#) but will presumably receive no help from Trump whom she passively threatened several months ago:

*“Germany and America are connected by values of democracy,*

*freedom and respect for the law and the dignity of man, independent of origin, skin color, religion, gender, sexual orientation or political views,” she said in a statement, adding: “I offer the next President of the United States close cooperation **on the basis of these values**” ([New York Times](#)).*

In other words, if Trump cozies up to Putin or any number of new European leaders who questions some of these liberal values espoused by the German Chancellor, if Trump does not stand behind these values, all of them, Merkel has indicated that she will not cooperate with him. In other words, she has set the basis for relations with the United States. The US will not dictate future relations to the EU and Germany. Chancellor Merkel has marked the EU as her territory. From New Era’s perspective, the Chancellor has made a significant political blunder. Germany will not be able to act as the fulcrum of the EU much longer – that role is shifting to France in union with the rising tide of Euro-skeptic nations rising across Europe. Germany will either change its position or get lost in the rising tide.

Merkel has exacerbated German-American relations. Apparently, under Trump, there will be no more free gifts. Europe must pay for its own security and the only one with enough assets is Germany. The Germans long accustomed to living the “good life” have loudly complained about footing the bill to rescue the EU from economic catastrophe, now she must foot the additional mega-burden of footing the military bill as well:

*NATO is not only “obsolete” it has according to Trump “outlived its usefulness”, The countries, according to Trump are also “not paying their fair share.”*

Nevertheless, they expect to be protected -something that will not continue under Trump unless they ante-up. At such a time Germany should be facilitating cordial relations with the new

administration not exacerbating them by attempting to bully a man long accustomed to exercising considerable power with liberal ultimatums.

Related to NATO, Trump has also indicated that he wants to disengage from the costly military engagements and complex nation-building protocols that have plagued the US in the Middle East (Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan, Somalia, Yemen and Syria) where Saudi Arabia has been the beneficiary of American largess. He accuses the Saudis of the same failure to cover their military cost as most of the nations of Europe. Under Trump, there will be no more free riders in the Middle East or Europe.

## **RUSSIA**

Since Vladimir Putin has been a supporter of the Euro-skeptic movement sweeping Europe, and the beneficiary of any NATO reduction, it is more than significant that the President-Elect is also considering the ramifications of rescinding President Obama's sanction regime imposed on Russia (over Crimean referendum that made Crimea a part of Russia) in exchange for a nuclear reduction deal. Trump told the [Times of London](#):

*"They (the Obama Administration) have sanctions on Russia – let's see if we can make some good deals with Russia... For one thing, I think nuclear weapons should be way down and reduced very substantially, that's part of it (the deal)."*

Trump was referring to previous sanctions and the round of [new sanctions](#) placed on Russia by the Obama administration, which expelled 35 Russian diplomats from the US in response to Russia's alleged interference in the 2016 presidential election.



Trump spoke in favor of finding common ground to facilitate cordial rather than adversarial relations with Moscow. He views Putin as an ally against terrorism, which is an issue that provides a solid basis for cooperation between the two countries. As a result of Russia's creative response to the sanctions, a response that includes investment in the new silk road project sweeping Asia as well as oil and natural gas deals with China and investment in agriculture that has resulted in Russia surpassing the United States as the leading exporter of wheat around the globe, as a result of responses such as these, Russia is *not* feeling the bite of the sanctions as Western analysts thought she would. Consequently, Trump being a logical realist, understands that cooperation with Russia can have positive results:

*"Something (good) can happen that a lot of people are going to benefit."*

Related to Russia, Trump has stated that the nuclear agreement made with her ally, Iran, is:

*"...one of the dumbest deals" he has ever ever seen*

Now that Iran, contrary to all Western Intelligence projections, has entered into a strategic military and political alliance with Iraq, there seems to be some truth in Trump's claim that the invasion of Iraq was

*"...possibly the worst decision ever made in the history of our country. It's like throwing rocks into a beehive."*

## **BREXIT**

As indicated above, Germany's dominance over the European economy works to the detriment of other European countries who

must accept German exports duty-free. In response to this economic verity, Trump stated:

*“You look at **the European Union** and it’s Germany. **Basically a vehicle for Germany**...That’s why I thought the UK was so smart in getting out.”*

Trump is a fan of Brexit, which he views as an opportunity for the UK and the US to closely cooperate.

*“I’m a big fan of the UK, we’re going to work very hard to get it done properly.”*

If the two countries can seal a deal it should facilitate the UK exit from the EU by demonstrating the ongoing economic viability of the UK outside of the EU.

Being an avid observer of exchange rates, Trump, views the devaluation of the British Pound as an opportunity to spark business between the US and UK prompting him to state that

*“Business is unbelievable in a lot of parts of the UK, as you know. I think Brexit is going to end up being a great thing.”*

Consequently he indicated his willingness to consummate a new trade deal with the UK, *“very quickly.”*

Putting it all together:

1. A new platform for truthful news
2. The populist Euro-skeptic movement sweeping Europe
3. Its negative effects on Germany
4. Support of Brexit, which further unhinges the EU
5. The reduction of NATO

It looks like President-Elect Trump will be facing a hard time from entrenched war-hawks in congress and from military leaders committed to America’s global presence as a beacon of

liberal democracy. Nonetheless, as the EU continues to unravel and Germany is left to handle the ever-increasing financial and military burden, Germany will find itself moving out of the fulcrum of power as a new center emerges and coalesces around France. We expect that Germany will find its way and ally with France in a new union that will help usher in an Era of Peace. It behooves the United States to withdraw from its many global engagements and participate in the peace process as an ally of both the newly emerging EU and Russia. The possibility of such an event happening is greater under Trump than under any other modern United States president.

---

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

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

**Result:** Expecting a stuffed butterflied filet, the collective palate was fed an unsatisfying cuisine of saltine crackers.

The Report, based on unsubstantiated common sense hunches, suffers from a dearth of substantial evidence. It is so unconvincing that it constitutes another egregious embarrassment to the United States and the US Intelligence Community.

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

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

1. “The CIA and American Intelligence Communities report that America’s cyber security was hacked is devastating... **It means that the Russians beat us and are beating us at cyber security; it means that the nation is not safe under President Obama.**”
2. “It further manifests to honest Americans **the extent to which Democrats prefer lies to truth. They prefer that Clinton gets elected to Americans being told the truth.** They are upset because the truth about Hilary could not remain hidden, that Americans actually learned the truth about her... It is a lamentable day when Americans have to learn the truth from the Russians because their own politicians lie to them.
3. “Finally, **the third reason** that trying to implicate the Russians will fail is the **hypocrisy** of it all. By this point, most people are aware that it is common US foreign policy to interfere in the elections of other countries. For the Democrats to raise a tremor about presumed Russian interference indicates the height of arrogance and their blind hypocrisy. “

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

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

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

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

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

With the release of the highly advertised intelligence report, the **Neocons and Neoliberals have moved from hypocrisy to embarrassment**; their situation just keeps getting worse, one distorted and finely concocted report after another. Expectations were high for a quality report; what has come forth is an embarrassment.

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

The “Intelligence Report”, released by the ODNI, was ordered by President Obama. Prior to its release it was billed as a

“declassified” version of its “top secret” counterpart, a counterpart that is supposed to prove that the Russians conspired to support Trump in the recent presidential election. *New Era* doubts that the “top secret” version (the one being conveniently withheld from public scrutiny) is robust; its robustness is doubted because the declassified version is little more than flim-flam dressed up in professional garb to impress specious observers.

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

## **MOTIVE**

According to the Report:

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

*“We also assess Putin and the Russian Government aspired to*

*help President-elect Trump's election chances when possible by discrediting Secretary Clinton and publicly contrasting her unfavorably to him. All three agencies agree with this judgment. CIA and FBI have **high confidence** in this judgment; NSA has moderate confidence."*

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

*"Putin publicly pointed to the Panama Papers disclosure and the Olympic doping scandal as US-directed efforts to defame Russia, **suggesting** he sought to use disclosures to discredit the image of the United States and cast it as hypocritical."*

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

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

even more so; they operate under their own laws.

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

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

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

## **EVIDENCE**

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

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

It takes more than a presumption to know this. How does anyone know, without evidence, that Russia hacked the data and



filtered it through WikiLeaks? The reader is expected to accept this verbiage because the ONDI verbally assures them that such a statement is made, with “high confidence”. Then, with the same bravado, they announce that Moscow “**most likely**” chose Wiki Leaks. **Most likely is only a probability scenario** – no evidence has been presented to support the claim that Russia hacked the DNC and passed the data to Wiki Leaks. If there was evidence, the report would not have to preface the assessment with a “most likely” statement. No one with an objective mind is in the business of accepting allegations because someone else carries a title and presents a professionally looking report based on “most likely” and **probability suggestions** inferred from unrelated actions. Objective observers require evidence, not mere probability statements. If Russia is behind the hacking, what is the proof to support the allegation. *New Era* was under the impression that such proof would be abundantly supplied in the Report, instead we were fed with probability statements about the Russian government, statements that were and are exacerbated by contrary statements that are verified by solid evidence, made by Wiki Leaks Director Julian Assange, who asserts that: “**Our (Wiki Leak’s) source is not the Russian government.**”

<https://youtu.be/bP3wPbbFQ6k>

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

According to [Vox Press](#)

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

Russian military intelligence might be a hypothetical “**most likely scenario**”, but there is no demonstrated evidence to

back the assertion. Moreover, the director of WikiLeaks denies any connection with the Russians. Thus, Vox's conclusion that, "now we've got the ODNI report to back it up", is fallacious and bogus – as weak as the Report itself.

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

*"The various ways in which usually anonymous spokespeople for U.S. intelligence agencies are equivocating – saying things like "our best guess" or "our opinion" or "our estimate" etc. – shows that the emails alleged to have been "hacked" cannot be traced across the network. Given NSA's extensive trace capability, we conclude that DNC and HRC servers alleged to have been hacked were, in fact, not hacked. The evidence that should be there is absent; otherwise, it would surely be brought forward, since this could be done without any danger to sources and methods. Thus, we conclude that the emails were leaked by an insider – as was the case with Edward Snowden and Chelsea Manning. Such an insider could be anyone in a government department or agency with access to NSA databases, or perhaps someone within the DNC.*

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


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

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

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

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

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



[SOURCE: Vox News](#)

If this is true, it means that the Russians are winning the media war with the Americans under Obama and Clinton. It is also a tacit admission that other governments besides Russia are engaged in alternative media operations, governments such as the UK and Qatar as indicated in the above graphic. The BBC, Al Jazeera (Qatar-US ally) and CNN may engage in propaganda, and along with [Radio Free Europe](#) and [Radio Liberty](#) seek to subvert foreign governments, but no one else

can. The Russians can engage in alternative news all they want – it is up to the viewer to decide. **It is the fault of the American government and the American mainstream press corp (not of the Russians) that people are loosing, and in many cases, have lost, confidence in their veracity.** Apparently, many American viewers are beginning to think that it is the liberal American Press that is engaged in subversion and “fake news”. As a direct result, many Americans are looking for an alternative news source. RT just happens to fill the bill; they are challenging what they refer to as the American “surveillance state'”, “civil liberty abuse”s, “drone use”, as well as the US economic system, American Greed, and the overwhelming debt accumulated by all levels of government. It is apparently a sin for a foreign government or media outlet to question the *faux pas* of the American Government. Thus, according to the Report:

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

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

*“RT has also focused on criticism of the US economic system, US currency policy, alleged Wall Street greed, and the US national debt. Some of RT’s hosts have compared the United*

*States to Imperial Rome and have predicted that government corruption and "corporate greed" will lead to US financial collapse" (RT, 31 October, 4 November).*

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

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

According to the [Daily Wire](#)

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

*interference (that Hillary interfered in the election process herself!) and try and bring in foreign policy (The Russians did it)."*

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

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

Assange [told ITV](#) that the information his group had obtained on Clinton could "proceed to an indictment." Because Wiki Leaks has become such a problem for the mainstream media and American Foreign Policy, **it appears that the liberal propaganda machine is now learning from the Russians and reeving up its propaganda campaign under the guise of its own version of "alternative news."** Operating under the name of "**Political Insider**", the globalists posing as right wing conservatives are attempting to undo Assange and the

authentic alt-right news services that are benefiting from Wiki Leaks. For example, the people at *Political Insider* refer to the people at *Democracy Now* quoted above as “[far left morons](#).” and to ISIS as “[terrorist scumbags](#)”

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

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

Ironically, the mainstream media is not questioning the veracity of the Wiki Leaks. According to Sean Hannity:

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

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

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

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