

Italy's New Government Strongly Christian – Soros Accuses Putin of Collusion

[Newera Global Intelligence Report:](#)

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

Italian debt is the second highest in Europe

Debt as percentage of national GDP



Source: Eurostat, AMECO European Commission



BBC

Italy is suffering an economic crisis, a crisis exacerbated by pressures from foreign powers who have successfully persuaded Italian leaders to curtail trade with Russia, a move supported by the government of Prime Minister Matteo Renzi. To compound its trade and debt problems,

unemployment has skyrocketed in some areas (primarily in the south) to nearly 30%.

Italian unemployment rate in 2017

Unemployment rate by provinces



Source: ISTAT

BBC

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

Despite their success, neither Lega Nord nor M5S were large

enough to form a majority and thus had to look for coalition partners. The Five Star Movement refused to form a coalition with any of its rivals, but acknowledged that if forced to, it would partner up with the Northern League. Eventually forced, the two combined having well over the 40% threshold needed to govern.

Election Results:

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

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

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

Together they have

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Who is the Northern League or Lega Nord

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

“When Matteo Salvini took over the leadership of the Northern League at the end of 2013, Italian politicians and the media said his job would be to officiate at the party’s funeral. Two years later, it is back from the near dead – and stronger than ever.”

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

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

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

In this regard, Salvini recently hosted a *Milan Conference* for a new group in the European Parliament known as [Europe of Nations and Freedom Group](#) (ENF), which includes Marine Le Pen and other Euroskeptic party leaders from throughout the continent. ENF is working to establish a [“Europe of free nations in which power is fully returned from the European Union to the voters of sovereign states.”](#) The group’s

commitments are to **sovereignty, democracy, freedom** and ending mass **immigration** so that members may advance their own interests at the domestic level. Along these lines, the League, promotes Italy's **cultural values**, supports the **traditional family**, is **opposed to same sex union, globalism**, and the spread of **liberalism**.

In the words of Marine le Pen VP of ENF:

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

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

“An opposing force that embodies the patriotic alternative to the globalist Europe, Brussels...”

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

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

“We will not surrender to the clandestine invasion.”

Whether it was the refugee crisis, the [Marine Le Pen](#) bandwagon or what party insiders prefer to call the “*Salvini Effect*”,

the party that sank to an historic low of 4 percent in the 2013 election is now part of the ruling coalition leading Italy into the future.

Following the 2018 elections Salvini exclaimed:

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

Who is Five Star

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

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

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

It opposes

1. Extreme concentrations of wealth

2. *Neoliberalism*

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

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

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

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

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

“It was a reflection, analysts said, of the changing

political landscape in Italy. The country's [conservative and right-wing parties are largely in disarray](#) and Grillo likely sees an opportunity to pick up conservative voters in upcoming local elections if he can scupper or weaken the civil unions bill."

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

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

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

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

Will this Coalition Work?

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

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

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

If the League is going to get along with its new coalition partner, it is going to have to learn some new economic thinking. M5S is definitely liberal by conservative eyes. It promotes homosexuality, stands for social justice, fair distribution, serving the common good *etc.* Although **social** and

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

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

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

The problem is not the euro, it is systemic. Five Star has the stronger moral hand *economically*. The old model of usurious finance, unrestricted concentration of wealth, mass consumer society, speculation that benefits a few to the detriment of

the common good are all associated with economic liberalism, which Five Star wants to modify, regulate or abandon.

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

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

NOTE:

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

“Were never to be admitted to citizenship; while the Amalekites, who were yet more hostile to them, and had no fellowship of kindred with them, were to be held as foes in perpetuity: for it is written ([Ex. 17:16](#)): “The war of the Lord shall be against Amalec from generation to generation.”

New Age Globalists in Guise of Geopolitical Analysts Trying to Hijack Era of Peace

[New Era World News](#)

ANY IMPARTIAL OBSERVER OF GLOBAL EVENT can discern the Hand of God at work in the world as [Russia is being converted](#) and the nations of the world are one by one in the process of rejecting global liberalism while many are reasserting their Christian patrimonies ([Western Europe](#), [Eastern Europe](#), [Africa](#), [Poland](#), [France](#), [Asia](#), [Argentina](#), [Middle East](#)).

While New Era has been reporting on these changes since its

inception, secular and liberal pundits have also begun to observe the many changes occurring world-wide. They are, however, **misinterpreting, and thus misrepresenting, them as a *political movements***, movements referred to as [“Populist”](#), when in fact these are primarily moral, cultural, spiritual and religious movements. However, there is at least one commentator, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, a much more sophisticated player, who realizes that the fast-paced global movement underway is *not* a typical populist cry for economic justice, but a deeper more rotund-paradigmatic movement having cultural, moral and spiritual dimensions as well. One of the few think-tank/institutes that recognizes the unique and broad scope of the current global movement is the [Schiller Institute](#). The Schiller Institute bills itself as the “Forum for a New Paradigm” and a “New Era of Civilization.” LaRouche recently stated at Schiller Institute Seminar (Jan. 11, 2017):

“What we see right now is a completely new paradigm emerging...Obviously the idea for what was the axiomatic basis of the globalization system since 1991 to insist on a unipolar world, is failing, or has failed already.”

Summarizing her presentation in which she called for a new international economic order and the revival of a classical Renaissance in culture, the [LaRouche PAC](#) stated:

*“**Sublime**, is the only fitting word to describe Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s deep and beautiful presentation and the atmosphere she created... at the Schiller Institute/EIR seminar held in Stockholm on January 11th, under the title “Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm.” Her speech moved the audience to address the fundamental epistemological, deeper meaning...of mankind in the universe. This deeper meaning even touched the diplomats present...In all, there were seventeen diplomats among them seven ambassadors. Four European countries were represented, nine from Asia, and four from Africa...Among the other participants there were contacts from*

different Swedish associations working for friendship with Russia, Ukraine, Syria, Yemen, Somalia, the Baltic Sea area, and another group working to leave the EU, as well as three businessmen contacts and longtime activists of the Swedish LaRouche Movement.

A few days later, after the Trump inauguration, Helga percipiently stated:

“The next days will witness many revolutionary developments, qualitatively new, resembling nothing ever seen previously in all of human history. But there is one thing which is known now, and already is inevitable and unavoidable. Their system (neocon-liberalism) is finished. It is over, and it can never come back. Yes, they can raise a ruckus, as they are doing. They can make a bloody mess if they are allowed to—but they will never be able to bring that system back from the grave. Thank God, now we are done with it forever.

Almost immediately following the results of the Presidential election, Lyndon LaRouche announced that [“it was not \(only\) the United States that had rejected Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, and everything they stood for—it was the world that had rejected them. It was a global phenomenon.”](#)

LaRouche is correct about a “completely new paradigm emerging”. However, **she misrepresents it as a Schiller Institute initiative** aimed at rectifying the many errors of a rapidly eroding neo-liberal world that has characterized modernity.

In discussing LaRouche’s ideas in an online intelligence report, members of the Schiller Institute reveal the ideological potency of the founder’s ideas and initiatives:

“He (LaRouche) went on to point to the success of the (his) Manhattan Project—of organizing the American people around

*the necessity, and possibility, of choral beauty—despite all of its difficulties (see [EIR, Jan. 8, 2016](#)). **That Manhattan Project is now the key to history**; if LaRouche had not launched it as he did in October 2014, now all would be lost.*

Who are the LaRouche's, what is the Schiller Institute, and exactly how does an institute whose analysis of the situation is so astute offer solutions that run contrary to the vision for an *Era of Peace* expressed by the Mother of God at Fatima?

What Does LaRouche Say that Sounds So Sublime and Convincing?

LaRouche hopes to gain her listener's confidence by being an astute observer of the the global liberal demise and by presenting herself as an opponent of effete liberalism and of decadent liberal culture. According to the [Schiller Institute](#)

“The clock of mankind has advanced to a point where the old lackluster ways will no longer work. According to all established criteria, mankind has gambled away all its chances for survival. Too many catastrophes are crowding in upon us, the entropic process has proceeded too far and the rift between the U.S.A. and Western Europe is all but accomplished.”

Demonstrating her astute observation skills, the collapse of liberalism, and subsequent opportunities for an *Era of Peace* she states:

*“We are indeed in very, very fascinating times. And I think there is much reason to be hopeful...There are accumulations of strategic realignments which have shaped up over the last three years, but especially in the last year, where one can actually see that the potential for a completely new kind of relation among nations is on the horizon, and that **we may actually have the chance to bring a peaceful world.**”*

Adding to the sublimity of her message, Ms. LaRouche states:

“What we see right now is a completely new paradigm emerging, a system which is based on the development of all, a “win-win” potential to cooperate among nations, and obviously the idea for what was the axiomatic basis of the globalization system since 1991 to insist on a unipolar world, is failing, or has failed already. And with that, a system which tried to maintain this unipolar world with the policy of regime change, of color revolution, or humanitarian intervention, or so-called humanitarian intervention to defend democracy and human rights, obviously has led the world to a terrible condition, but this is now coming to an end.”

Then, in language reminiscent of recent New Age Reports, she traces the movement’s etiology:

“It started in a visible form with the vote of the British population in June last year for the Brexit, which was the first real upset; everybody was taken totally unawares, except a few insiders. This anti-globalization revolt was obviously continued with the election of President Donald Trump in the United States; it was continued with the “no” to the Italian referendum organized by Prime Minister Matteo Renzi, to change the Constitution.

LaRouche is avante-garde, progressive and intellectually confident, enough to be an advocate of cooperation between the United States and Russia because such cooperation can usher in an *Era of Peace*. In her own words:

“So the fact that Hillary did not win the election was extremely important for the maintenance of world peace. And I think that of all the promises that Trump made so far, the fact that he said that he will normalize the relationship between the United States and Russia, is, in my view the most important step. Because if the relationship between the

United States and Russia is decent, and is based on trust and cooperation, I think there is a basis to solve all other problems in the world.”

LaRouche even gets the roles of the United States and Russia in Syria and the Middle East correct – a very astute observer indeed:

*“Ash Carter, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, just gave a press conference where he said that **it was only the United States which has fought ISIS in Syria**. Now, it takes some nerve to say that, because **everybody in the whole world knows** that without President Putin’s decision to militarily intervene in Syria starting in September 2015, and the tremendous support of the Russian Aerospace Forces for the fighting of the Syrian troops, the present military situation in Syria would have never developed. And it was to the contrary, the very dubious behavior of the United States supporting various kinds of terrorist groups which prolonged this process and slowed it down.”*

Evaluating the Trump effect, LaRouche correctly ties it to a global phenomenon (because the *Era of Peace* is a global phenomenon):

*“**Donald Trump is actually part of a global process which is underway**; and which is not going to stop until the reasons for this process – which **you can actually call a global revolution** – until the causes are removed.”*

*“**This period of history**, which I would say started with the collapse of the Soviet Union, and which led to what we call “globalization,” **is coming to an end**. Or, has come to an end already. Now obviously, that process, which really started immediately with the broken promises of the United States and*

others not to expand NATO to the Russian border; which subsequently was broken many times. The recent deployment of U.S. and NATO troops and military equipment to the Russian borders is just the latest example of that."

Yes, the United States has broken promises related to NATO expansion along the Russian border and yes the period of liberal global hegemony is coming to a close.

As attestation to this fact, LaRouche points out the "depraved" and "degenerate" culture spawned by liberalism that must be modified if the world is to advance into a new and prosperous era:

"We have to reject the popular culture associated with modern globalization, because it is depraved and degenerate. And that we had to go back to the revival, a Renaissance, of the best traditions of every culture, and have a dialogue among them."

LaRouche is clearly a coruscating observer and social-cultural critic; however she misses, and therefore fails to represent, the Mariological dimensions of the global movement underway. Moreover, the solutions she offers run contrary to authentic Christian renewal of the type associated with Fatima and the *Era of Peace* promised by the Mother of God.

Who is LaRouche and What is the Schiller Institute?

When they founded the Schiller Institute [Mr and Mrs Schiller insisted](#):

"We are founding the Schiller Institute. We do so not only because there is a vacuum we need to fill with institutions willing to revive the spirit of the American Revolution and the German classical period. We are founding the Schiller

*Institute because Schiller's special method of approaching world-historical problems is the **only one** which can still bring about a solution today. The kernel of this method can be defined in Schiller's own words: Man is greater than his fate. Even if the objective situation looks almost hopeless and desperate, we, like Schiller, are sure that a courageous spirit and human reason will always be able to find the higher level where the problems are solvable..*

In its own words:

"The Schiller Institute is working around the world to defend the rights of all humanity to progress –material, moral and intellectual. It is named after [Friedrich Schiller](#), the great 18th-century German poet and playwright, whose works have inspired republican opposition to oligarchic tyranny worldwide."

"In America, the Institute, a non-profit corporation headquartered in Washington, D.C., was founded in May 1984. The Schiller Institute is also established in Australia, Canada, Russia, Denmark, Germany, France, Italy, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and has a growing influence in Asia, Africa and the Middle East."

LaRouche – Schiller Initiatives

Education:

"[The whole education system must be changed](#). You have to throw out algorithms, you have to throw out mathematics, you have to go back to basic scientific discovery. You have to go to a Classical culture. And I think that that is so

absolutely important why the Schiller Institute must really be a guiding force in this process, because you know, the popular culture in the United States is so detrimental to the idea of creativity, that I think we have to really intervene in this situation in a very, very powerful way."

Culture:

Because modern culture is so bereft of artistic, philosophic and humanistic ideas it is easy to criticize. In the context of post-modern culture anything "classic" sounds good. Thus, LaRouche is able to slip in a significant negative cultural element in the name of a good *vis a vis* modernity:

"The future of civilization will be a dialogue between Plato, Schiller, Confucius, Tagore, and many other great poets and scientists of the past."

The nations of the Western World have their roots in Christendom, but LaRouche envisions a return to paganism.

According to the [First Things](#),

*"Schiller prefigures the Whig interpretation of history, in which enlightened Protestantism gradually triumphs over the medieval obscurantism of the Catholic Church. Schiller's interest, to be sure, is not religious but political; **his neo-Hellenic "Classicism" was explicitly non-Christian.***

Schiller was avowedly anti-Christian (at least as far as institutional Christianity is concerned-against the institution but not the religion *per-se*), even accused of being a Free Mason:

"His two book-length histories are unabashed Protestant polemics. The first is a sympathetic portrayal of the Netherlands' revolt against Catholic Spain... The second is a

history of the Thirty Years War, which makes the astonishing claim that “Europe came out of this frightful war unoppressed and free” because it destroyed forever the principle of Catholic universal empire.”

As far as being a Mason, it has not been conclusively demonstrated, but many have made the allegation linking LaRouche, the Schiller Institute, and Masonr:

*“Lyndon LaRouche, the one-time U.S. Trotskyist who embraced conspiracy theories as he lurched to the extreme right through the 1970s. LaRouche includes Masons and Gnostics in his overcrowded pantheon of evildoers, which is slightly odd given that **he was once happy to see himself and his followers as part of a “neo-Platonic humanist” conspiracy against oligarchical enemies.** He also venerates the eighteenth-century German Romantic Friedrich von Schiller, who was not only a Mason but also, according to J.M. Roberts, a member of the Illuminati.(One of the many LaRouche front groups is called the Schiller Institute.)*

Others, like author [Carol White](#), are not so credulous:

“Larouche is a Grand Orient Freemason and so not to be trusted completely. This Larouche is an agent of the Hegelian Dialectic, setting up two false opposing movements which are both controlled by the same sect usually freemasonry to have an appearance of a “natural” synthesis (old age of liberalism versus new paradigm). However if you have two glasses of hot water BUT you NAME one cold water even if you mix them you will still only have hot water regardless of names.”

Masonic or not, the LaRouche model looks and sounds suspicious and even more so since his mentor, Friedrich Schiller, was a Christian in name only:

“Schiller’s support of the Protestant cause was nominal

rather than heartfelt; he was no Christian, but man of the enlightenment, a self-styled “citizen of the world.”

This is precisely the problem with Schiller and with LaRouche: self-proclaimed citizens of the world *not* proclaimed citizens of the Kingdom of God, men of the Enlightenment, a period in which a New World Order, *Novos Ordo Seclorum*, was introduced by like minded men, many of them Freemasons, which helps give credence to the supposition the Schiller was himself a member of the lodge.

The Mother of God or LaRouche – How Do LaRouche-Schiller Initiatives Run Contrary to Fatima?

According to LaRouche human beings are an evolving species. Speaking like an agnostic socio-biologist she states:

“If you look at the evolution over a longer period of time, life developed from the oceans with the help of photosynthesis; then you had the development of ever higher species, species with a higher metabolism, higher energy-flux density in their metabolism.”

In a document entitled “The Next Stage of Human Evolution”, the LaRouche PAC states:

“That next stage of evolution is a whole interlinked complex—moral, material, psychological, and scientific—all of these aspects closely intertwined, as they always have been in Lyndon LaRouche’s thinking. One word for this next stage of our species’ evolution is the “New Paradigm.” The New Paradigm, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche has memorably said, “where we become truly human.”

Thus, according to LaRouche, human beings progressively solve

their problems by advances in technology and intellectual attainment etc. Although there is much truth to ponder in these assertions, there is no mention of God, prayer, charity imitation of Christ, the Church or the sacraments et al.

LaRouche is *not* seeking a new vision of economics rooted in the precept of charity, “Solidarnosc”. LaRouche proposes turning the pages back to earlier chapters in liberal history, to the times of Roosevelt, Hamilton, and Glass Stegall, (a 1930 act that limited securities, activities, and affiliations within commercial banks and securities firms) as if permitting commercial banks to engage in security activities caused the current economic crisis, a crisis that has been brewing for decades and even centuries as attested to by the acceptance of business cycles as a natural phenomenon associated with capitalism. The global system needs much more than a return to financial regulation of the Glass Stegall brand. Obviously financial regulation is needed – the whole question must be revisited . However, the type of change needed is far more extensive than that proffered by LaRouche. According to the Schiller Institute:

“The only solution, at this point of deep breakdown, is to implement [LaRouche’s four laws recovery program](#) on an emergency basis”:

- [1.Reinstate FDR’s Glass-Steagall banking separation](#)
- [2.Return to a Hamiltonian System of national banking](#)
- [3.Invest federal credit for productive employment](#)
- [4.Launch a crash program for fusion power](#)

According to the [LaRouche PAC](#):

“LaRouche’s Four Laws provides the only basis for the United States to save itself from collapse and join in collaboration with China, Russia, India, and other nations participating in

the global economic renaissance centered around China's New Silk Road program."

There is muster in this latter point as well, partial and specious truth (to be discussed in the future).

The main reason LaRouche is able to make such a brilliant analysis of the current global situation and then provide such a weak reform platform is due to a commitment to the Enlightenment and a refusal to let go of the deist dream for a better world without the Holy Trinity – god yes, perhaps the deist God of Nature, but not the Holy Trinity.

LaRouche is a strong advocate of Classical culture, which she associates with the Enlightenment. One of Schiller's mission as stated above is **"to revive the spirit of the American Revolution and the German classical period."** In other words, the Schiller Institute, like the Schiller's themselves, is anti-Catholic, perhaps anti-Christian all around.

Quixotically, The Enlightenment was itself the bedrock and purveyor and source of modern liberalism. The Schiller Institute thus proposes going forward by first going backward, backward to the founding principles of the Enlightenment and then forward again. Perhaps they think they can do it better if they get a second try.

In true Enlightenment and New Age style, LaRouche seeks a universal syncretism:

'From the beginning, we said that such a new world economic order can only function if it's combined with a Classical Renaissance...That we had to go back to the revival, a Renaissance, of the best traditions of every culture, and have a dialogue among them. For example, in Germany, obviously you would emphasize the German Classical culture of Schiller, Beethoven, and all of Classical music; in China, you would emphasize Confucius; in India you would emphasize the Vedic writings, Tagore (a Pirali Brahmin), and so forth.

Of course there is no mention of Christianity. No it is part of a “xenophobia” that must be healed:

“People get completely excited, because they discover that there are beautiful things to discover in other cultures! And once you study and know these other cultures, xenophobia and racism disappear!”

New Era is perplexed: What does a Chinese citizen and devotee of Confucianism or a Hindu Brahmin do when he or she comes into contact with a French or Polish devotee of Jesus Christ and His blessed Mother? Does the Oriental person get healed of their cultural xenophobia or only the Christian? Does the Hindu Ashram give way to the Greek Academy or are they all acceptable because they share common principles found in all religions and cultures as LaRouche seems to think:

“Because you realize that it’s beautiful that there are many cultures, because there are universal principles to be discovered in music. One musician will immediately understand another musician because it’s a universal language.”

It is beautiful that there are many cultures, and beautiful that there is a Christian culture too, a culture that LaRouche fails to mention, but one she implicitly demeans as a purveyor of “xenophobia”. If she believes there is such a disease as xenophobia, but that purveyors of Classical culture along with Confucius in China and the Hind Vedic culture as well as that of Plato and Tagore are exempt, if she believes all of these are grand and precious cultural attainments, which culture then is xenophobic except her own, the one she fails to mention, i.e., Christian culture?

It seems that LaRouche desires Americans and Europeans to be healed of their cultural ailments but those from a Hindu or Oriental background are OK. Presumably Christianity is also OK, if it gives up its evangelical component and accepts all

religions as equal AS LONG AS THEY CONTAIN AND REFLECT THE “UNIVERSAL” DIMENSIONS, dimensions that LaRouche, along with Theosophists, Gnostics and Masons believe and teach are present in all religions – a grand religious synthesis in which Jesus Christ who suffered and died for all humanity is no longer the savior of all humanity, but is equivalent to a Pirali Brahim, a being who himself honors higher more evolved gods and “ascended masters”, gods and masters who say wonderful things but none who took the form of a slave and died for anyone. The story of the Incarnation, death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ is unparalleled in the annals of comparative religion.

At one point LaRouche endeavored to cooperate with the Catholic Church,

“At one point, LaRouche decided he wanted to work with the Roman Catholic Church – he was hoping to get in with the Church. So, suddenly, he was pro-Catholic. At that point, many members converted to Catholicism. But when he discovered that the Catholic Church wanted no part of him, in 2000, LaRouche launched a vicious attack on the Catholic members of the organization, including commissioning items for the daily internal briefing memos attacking members for going to church. In a savage campaign, he drove most of the Catholics out of the organization.

After driving out Catholics from his organization, LaRouche, like Masons and Theosophists, further manifested his anti-Catholicism.

“Take the Papacy in a certain earlier period. You had a great leader who built all the water systems in Europe [Charlemagne]. He did it; and as soon as he died, Hell broke loose. And the Catholic Church became a piece of sodomy, immediately at that point. You have to know what happened when Charlemagne died; after his death, the Satanic movement

took over the Catholic Church.”

In short, LaRouche and the Schiller Institute are just another front for liberalism, a very sophisticated front – one that offers one of the most progressive Christian geopolitical analyses imaginable. For example, LaRouche’s “Producerism” and anti-imperialism makes him appear to be an opponent of capitalism, when in actuality he is an advocate:

“Producerism, with its problematic distinction between productive industrial capital and parasitic finance capital, was central to LaRouchite economics, as [it enabled LaRouche to be procapitalist and “anti-imperialist” at the same time](#)

LaRouche’s ideas might be complex and sophisticated, but in the end – because such ideas neglect the Incarnation and subsequent Christian prophetic content – no matter how resounding, they work against authentic human and social development.

Nothing really new here except a brilliant expose of the changing times that can be interpreted as a **Masonic** bailout in the guise of helping humanity progress to its next stage of evolutionary development. LaRouche’s analysis and solutions are similar to the “Reform Liberalism” unfurled by FDR, a reform that rescued capitalism from the throes of socialism by engaging in Keynesian economics and deficit spending.

Neither LaRouche nor Schiller represent a forward march toward human dignity and Christian social renewal. They represent an adroit and very clever manipulation of events in the guise of progressive change, an attempt to hold onto a financial and cultural empire by appeal for change that simply returns the world to a previous chapter in a how-to-book that brought the world to the place where it stands now. In other words, the only thing sublime about LaRouche and Schiller are the slippery words and concepts they employ. Correctly seeing the world

groping for change, they hope to continue profiting by representing themselves as enlightened avante-garde agents of an merging paradigmatic shift while refusing to let go of the liberal agenda that brought about the collapse we are now experiencing. [Perhaps this is why Lyndon LaRouche was sentenced to a fifteen year prison term](#) for conspiracy to commit mail fraud involving more than \$30 million in defaulted loans, and 11 counts of actual mail fraud involving \$294,000 in defaulted loans.

Mr. LaRouche maintained that he was

“...the victim of a Government campaign to keep him from alerting the nation to a wide variety of threats and from otherwise expressing his unorthodox political views”.

It seems as though the LaRouche phenomenon is still operative – trying to alert the nation, and the world, this time to a wide variety of new possibilities that are nothing but a Masonic sham attempt to keep people from seeing the possibility for *authentic* integral social, cultural spiritual, economic and political renewal-renewal rooted in the Holy Trinity. Real change, real peace, prosperity and progress will be achieved when the world returns to its God, to the Holy Trinity, Someone LaRouche fails to mention.

**Liberalism Coming to an End
in Germany – Alternative for**

Deutschland?

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

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

French voters head to the ballot boxes in the spring of 2017 during which time they are likely to elect a pro-traditional European cultural candidate (either Marine Le Pen from the National Front or the conservative Francois Fillon from the Republican Party), a candidate opposed to open

borders and favoring a rapprochement with Russia. Though Le Pen is the more anti-liberal and “traditional” of the two, regardless who prevails, France will move to amend or abrogate the [Schengen Agreement](#), which created open borders among EU member states.

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

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

WHO IS ALTERNATIVE FOR GERMANY?

Originally, the AfD was founded to oppose the euro and Chancellor Merkel’s handling of the euro economic crisis.

Since then AfD has adopted a pro-family, traditional values, anti-immigrant platform, a platform that has made them, according to [Der Spiegel](#), a “dangerous party”,

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

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

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

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

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

“Anxiety about immigration dominated the Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania election on 4 September, enabling the AfD to take second place (almost 21%), behind the centre-left Social

Democrats (SPD – 30.6%) but ahead of Mrs Merkel’s Christian Democrats (CDU – 19%).”

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

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

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

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

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

[According to Politico:](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

LIBERALISM COMING TO AN END IN GERMANY

The developing trend (most advanced in Berlin) but in motion throughout most of Germany is clear: The age of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and the Christian Democratic Union

(CDU) leadership based on liberal European values is being seriously challenged, perhaps coming to an end.

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

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

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

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

With just four years under its belt, the AfD is now the third

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

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

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

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

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

Italy Next in Line to Oppose Liberalism and Exit the EU?

UNTIL YESTERDAY ITALIAN PRIME MINISTER MATTEO RENZI had been advocating a referendum to “slim down” and “defang” the Upper Chamber of the Italian Parliament (from 315 to 100). A move that would in effect eradicate a check on the lower house and empower the central government thereby enabling Renzi to more efficiently implement his pro-European program. A widely advertised and highly emotional campaign resulted in a near 70 percent turnout of Italy’s electorate. Of this large group a significant 60 percent voted no for the referendum.

A “No-Vote” to the Renzi sponsored referendum could be interpreted as a vote of no-confidence in Renzi and his attempts to strengthen ties with Paris and Berlin in favor of the EU and Eurozone. However, it should be pointed out upfront that this referendum did *not* involve an exit from the European Union *per se*. Unlike the Brexit referendum, the Renzi referendum sought to tie Italy closer to the EU. Thus, its failure may be indirectly interpreted as a vote to widen the gap between Italy and the EU.

Renzi promised his countrymen that if he failed to get his referendum approved, he would tender his resignation and step down from office. In wake of yesterday’s referendum’s failure, Renzi is faced with a dilemma, keeping his word and actually stepping down or ignoring his statement as political rhetoric. Renzi, has chosen the former.

Being a man of principle, he has kept his word. Sunday morning the Prime Minister announced:

“When you lose you cannot pretend that nothing has happened and go to bed and sleep. My government ends here today” ([Fox News](#)).

“I take full responsibility for the defeat. I will greet my successor with a smile and a hug, whoever it might be” ([CNN Money](#)).

The main beneficiary of the Renzi defeat seems to be the Italian “**Five Star**” movement, which is in favor of imitating Brexit in Italy by spearheading plans for another referendum asking the Italian people to withdraw from the European Union and the Euro Zone thereby discontinuing use of the Euro and reinstating the Italian Lira in its place.

In the wake of Brexit and aspiring Euroskeptical movements in France, Greece and Spain exacerbated by successful Euroskeptical movements in Hungary, Poland, Moldova, and Slovakia, liberal globalists are awakening to the likelihood that another populist party, such as Five Star, will rise to national prominence in Italy thereby creating ever-deepening crisis leading to questions about the on going viability of the EU itself.

Matteo Renzi Accepts Defeat Giving Rise to Hopes among Euroskeptical Parties such as Five Star for an Italian Exit

WHO IS FIVE STAR

As stated in the above video, Five Star is a “populist, anti-establishment, anti-European, increasingly popular” movement in Italy. Five Star was established by an Italian comedian, Beppe Grillo and web strategist [Gianroberto Casaleggio](#) in 2009. As stated, the party is populist, Euroskeptical, and anti-globalist. It is named Five Stars because it coalesces around five primary issues: (1) transportation (2) water (3)

development (4) internet access (5) non-violence. Five Stars is in favor of direct digital democracy (direct participation of all citizens in public affairs by use of computer technology) and rejects foreign military intervention in the Middle East and specifically American intervention in Syria.

Five Star favors green technology, is anti-pollution and social justice oriented, ecological-minded, anti-capitalist and anti-consumerist. As such, it favors limited but sustainable growth, reduced production and consumption, and the growth of arts and more humane use of leisure time. Currently, Five Star has 109 deputies in the lower house known in Italy as the Chamber of Deputies, which consists of 630 members.

The BBC and other media agencies are focusing on Five Star and presenting it as the apparent front runner leading the way to change among Euroskeptic elements throughout Italy. New Era does *not* agree with the BBC, which seemingly forecasts and implicitly promotes the rise of Five Star. Five Star is a left wing movement committed to an aberrant moral agenda. The BBC is apparently pinning its hopes on a Five Star rise to power thereby presenting the movement as another populist party like those coming to the fore throughout Europe. Unfortunately, Five Star is not one of these.

A MORE LIKELY SCENARIO

There are other populist parties developing in Italy, parties more in tune with what is happening in Eastern Europe, France, Asia and Africa than Five Star. Five Star has many valid and potentially good ideas, but without a moral foundation, it risks running the gamut of just another "hippie movement" backed by technological savvy.



Beppe Grillo, and Gianroberto Casaleggio Co-Founders of Five Star

Technological savvy and direct democracy, however, are not the answer to future problems. Future problems require deep roots in philosophy, theology, spirituality, social science and then technology and professional expertise.

Five Star is being presented favorably by outlets such as the BBC because the BBC and others are fully aware that the Euroskeptic anti-liberal movement is in full swing. Unfortunately, although Five Star has an innovative *political* and *economic* reform package, *morally* Five Star is just another liberal program masquerading in progressive populist guise. [In 2014 the party voted for gay rights and same sex unions.](#)

That was 2014, given the current political landscape, Five Star is back peddling on the issue. According to the [Guardian](#):

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

“It was a reflection, analysts said, of the changing political landscape in Italy. The country’s [conservative and right-wing parties are largely in disarray](#) and Grillo likely sees an opportunity to pick up conservative voters in upcoming local elections if he can scupper or weaken the civil unions bill.”

“There is an element in this of M5S (Five Star) generally not being reliable partners. They are also opportunistic. There is an opportunity to grab votes from centre-right parties, which at this point cannot even put forward candidates in key cities,” said Wolfango Piccoli, an analyst at Teneo Intelligence in London.”

This is an opportunistic vote and party that is not to be trusted. **Beppe Grillo is asking his followers to “trust their gut not their brain”**

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=37aUvz-v0FE> at 2:57 in video) as if they were a pack of animals unable to think for themselves. Thus, BBC and others are hoping that people are still dim-witted enough to be unable to see through the propaganda, but that is exactly what the Euroskeptic anti-liberal movement is about: People are tired of the propaganda and will see through this campaign with just a little insight:

A win for Five Star is a win for liberalism.

To hide this fact, leaders of Five Star are beginning to strategize. According to the Economist, [“Five Star is Smartening Up”](#) :

“EVEN fans of the Five Star Movement, an Italian political group often described as populist, maverick and anti-establishment, would never have credited it with slickness.”

Slickness, however is not wisdom. Given the current Christian family values renewal under way in Europe, and Five Star's reluctance to form political alliances with other parties, Five Star's chances of making it to power on a pro-gay agenda are slim. The Party has not definitively disowned or modified its agenda; it has merely refused to make a statement at this time and in an attempt to be "slick" it has merely left the vote to individual conscience. This ploy will have its effect, but it will not result in victory. A more likely political party candidate for the future of Italy is **Lega Nord**.

As reported by the Guardian:

"When Matteo Salvini took over the leadership of the Northern League (Lega Nord) at the end of 2013, Italian politicians and the media said his job would be to officiate at the party's funeral. Two years later, it is back from the near dead – and stronger than ever."

"Whether you credit the refugee crisis, the [Marine Le Pen](#) bandwagon or what party insiders prefer to call the [#effettoSalvini](#) (the Salvini effect), the party that sank to an historic low of 4 percent in the 2013 election – below the threshold for seats in the Senate – now has [16-17 percent support](#) in nationwide polls."

A likely scenario for Italy is a coalition movement consisting of Silvio Berlusconi's **Forza Italia**, right-wing **Fratelli d'Italia** and **Lega Nord**.

Lega Nord, promotes Italy's cultural values, supports the traditional family, is opposed to same sex union, globalism, and the spread of liberalism.

Recently, Salvini, leader of Lega Nord, hosted a Milan Conference for a new group in the European Parliament known as

Europe of Nations and Freedom Group (ENF), which includes Marine Le Pen and other Euroskeptic party leaders from throughout the continent. ENF is working to establish a “Europe of free nations in which power is fully returned from the European Union to the voters of sovereign states. The group’s commitments are to sovereignty, democracy, freedom and ending mass immigration so that members may advance their own interests at the domestic level.”

In the words of Marine le Pen VP of ENF:

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

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

“An opposing force that embodies the patriotic alternative to the globalist Europe, Brussels...”

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

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

““We will not surrender to the clandestine invasion.”

In a recent Facebook Post carried by the Guardian, Salvini stated:

["We are the real alternative to Renzi."](#)

Then he thanked supporters on Twitter and beckoned Renzi

"We're coming", #Salvini.

If *Lega Nord* or *Five Star* happen to pull a surprise victory (a surprise victory like the Trump surprise and the many similar surprises occurring throughout Europe) in the next election, Italian voters should expect a referendum to withdraw from the European Union or Euro Zone.

Anti EU Pro-Christian Party Emerges in UK Leader Already Meets with Trump

THE UNITED KINGDOM Independent Party (UKIP), an anti European Union or Euro-skeptic party, has recently emerged in the United Kingdom as similar parties are emerging all over Europe, most prominently in Poland, Hungary, Slovakia Greece and France.

The UK story has extra merit since Nigel Farage, a founding member of UKIP is the first foreign leader to arrive on US soil to meet with president-elect Donald Trump.

Farage's visit comes on the heels of a warning and potential snub delivered by German Chancellor Angela Merkel who immediately set liberal conditions on her relationship to the

new president and by extension to America itself. In her congratulatory communication to Trump, Merkel stated:

“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... [I offer the next President of the United States close cooperation on the basis of these values.](#)”

Although, the British Prime Minister Theresa May simply congratulated Trump, without the inclusion of any implicit or veiled threat, she is in an awkward position. As Prime Minister she, not Farage, a mere Member of the European Parliament (MEP), should be the one making the visit – in short, protocol has been violated and the prime minister upstaged. To make matters worse, [Trump “spoke to nine other world leaders in the 24 hours after his election win before speaking with May.”](#)

According to Time:

“Many in Westminster are coming to terms with the fact a politician long seen as a fringe figure in British politics can command the attention of the leader of the free world. On his return, Farage reported that Trump and his aides are unhappy at the attacks leveled at the President-elect during the campaign by some government figures. [Speaking to the Daily Telegraph](#), he offered to “provide introductions and to start the necessary process of mending fences” between the two governments.

Unfortunately, [PM May indicated that neither she nor the government will be taking Farage up on his offer.](#)

So Who is This Upstart Nigel Farage and What do We Know about

His Party, UKIP

In 2013 Nigel Farage was ranked second among the 100 [most influential conservatives](#) in the UK, behind then Prime Minister David Cameron. Farage was also a founding member of UKIP. In September of 2016 (2 months before his recent November visit) Farage was in the US to speak at a Trump rally before 15,000 in Jackson, Mississippi. Introducing him, [Trump stated](#):

*“On 23 June, the people of Britain voted to declare their **independence** – which is what we’re looking to do also, folks! – from **international government.**”*

Mirroring the Trump introduction, Farage told the Americans gathered in Mississippi to ignore the polls and to **“stand up and fight the establishment.”**

“You can beat the pollsters. You can beat the commentators... Remember, anything is possible if enough decent people are prepared to stand up against the establishment.” He added: “We can overcome the big banks, we can overcome the multinationals.” Later he stated “I wouldn’t vote for Hilary Clinton if you paid me...So many political representatives are politically correct parts of the liberal media elite”

Farage spent years advocating for a UK referendum to exit the EU (Brexit). His hard work paid off. By June 2016 the people of the UK voted to exit the EU. Thereafter, Farage became something of a global celebrity among right-wing conservatives including Donald Trump and Marine Le Pen of France. Clinton was correct when, after Farage’s speech in Mississippi, she linked him, as well as Donald Trump, to a conservative global movement, which she hates enough to inconsistently vilify by calling it on one hand “global” and on the other “national”.

“Clinton seized on Trump’s embrace of Farage in a speech a few days later, characterizing both men as “alt-right” figures who were part of a “rising tide of hardline, right-wing nationalism around the world” ([PBS News](#)).

A movement cannot be both globalist and nationalist at the same time. Men like Trump and Farage share a set of universal values, of respect for human dignity, economic justice, fairness, family values etc. that transcend national boundaries and are truly global and universal. Hilary is caught in an imbroglio that name calling cannot fix. Nonetheless Clinton

“... went on to name Russian President Vladimir Putin as “the grand godfather of this global brand of extreme nationalism” ([PBS News](#)).

Clearly Ms. Clinton loathes UKIP, which was founded only a few years ago in 1991. In a short time UKIP comfortably won the 2014 European elections, received the third largest vote share in last year’s UK general election, and achieved its long-held goal of an EU exit by June’s Brexit referendum. With 22 members in The European Parliament, UKIP is the largest UK party in the European Parliament; it also has 488 councilors active in UK local government and has placed six of its members on the Welsh National Assembly.

Like other Christian based political parties emerging around Europe (and the world), UKIP has been slandered as racist and xenophobic, allegations which are as untrue as Clinton’s allegation of nationalism. UKIP represents healthy love for country and national patrimony. Since the national patrimony shared among European nations is a Christian Patrimony with regional and local cultural variations; it is therefore Catholic or universal. If universal, none of these parties can be nationalist, but they are patriotic and they do stand for love of God, for homeland and family – universal values that

all men can agree upon without stooping to xenophobia, universal family values that are already part of their national patrimony unlike the global lgbt values being foisted by the liberal globalists that are not part of anyone's patrimony but their own. The truth is, it is the liberal global crowd that are xenophobic – they aim at a one world culture and the overcoming of local regional and national cultures by one set of values for all (anywhere the liberals finally gain power), and disrespect for the rest – that is xenophobic. Since the veneer of toleration used by the left for themselves when they were a minority has worn off as they have gained considerable power, the global xenophobic values and the way they they are forcing these values on the world are no longer tolerable. It is their hypocrisy, their blatant violation of the “Golden Rule” to treat others as they want to be treated themselves; their disrespect for any values other than their own, that has led to the global movement, of which UKIP is the British example, so feared by people like Clinton.

It is probably true to say that UKIP and other emerging parties are populist, movements being fueled by the people, people everywhere who have experienced the hypocrisy and dehumanizing results of global liberalism and are rising against it. These parties represent a true democratic revolution, if by democracy we mean respect for human dignity and the common good. World wide people have simply grown tired of being told to tolerate others who refuse to tolerate them, of hosting minorities who can burn bibles and flags and get away with under protection of the law, then turn around and respond ferociously to anyone that would dare do such a thing to objects they hold sacred or dear, and this even in the host country. Frankly, the populist message is simple; “enough is enough.”

Like other emerging parties, UKIP has a Christian face. [In a formal message to UKIP members, Farage identifies the part](#)

Christianity must play in the future:

“Christianity plays a significant part in my vision for the future of Britain. I have been saying for a long time that we need a much more muscular defence of our Christian heritage and our Christian Constitution. This does not of course mean we should be disrespectful of other faiths, only that ours is fundamentally a Christian nation and so we believe Christianity should be recognised by Government at all levels (that is what New Era means by patrimony – the indigenous national ethos not a foreign imposition).”

“Sadly, I think UKIP is the only major political party left in Britain that still cherishes our Judaeo-Christian heritage. I believe other parties have deliberately marginalised our nation’s faith, whereas we take Christian values and traditions into consideration when making policy. Take the family, for instance. Traditional Christian views of marriage and family life have come under attack of late, whereas we have no problem in supporting and even promoting conventional marriage as a firm foundation for a secure and happy family.”

“We share with Christians a concern for the poorest and most vulnerable in our society, and our policies provide a financial safety net for those who are unable to work, while encouraging self-reliance and endeavor for those who can. Our attitude to overseas development works in the same way: by re-focusing the foreign aid budget towards critical and essential aid for those in need and widening investment in free trade relationships, developing countries benefit more in the longer term from having a hand up, as well as a hand out. I believe UKIP has a lot to offer Christians, and we certainly value the participation of Christians in politics

and in UKIP.”

Although UKIP does not represent the full spectrum of Christian values advocated by some, UKIP, is the British variant of a global phenomenon; it is moving in the right direction toward cultural rebirth, economic justice, service to the common good, and promotion of authentic human dignity, that are part of the Christian patrimony.

Rise of Macron and En Marche Strengthens National Front of Le Pen

EMMANUEL MACRON, former French Minister of Economy has announced his candidacy for president. Because Macron plans to compete as an Independent supported by En Marche, a movement he founded in 2016, he will likely receive votes from both opposition parties, the Republicans (center right) and the Socialist (center left). If this occurs, the National Front of Marie le Pen, which is competing with both these parties will be the beneficiary as the centrist voter will be split between center right and center left parties thereby reducing the votes going to each and increasing the chance of a victory for the Le Pen in next years presidential election.