

South Korea Having a Bout with Liberalism that Will Affect America

[New Era World News](#)

LIBERALISM HAS ENTERED A PERIOD OF GLOBAL decline. Since its inception, Newera has reported on the eclipse of liberalism occurring in places diverse as [Poland](#), [Hungary](#), [Slovakia](#), [France](#), [Philippines](#), [Taiwan](#), [Russia](#), [Nigeria](#), [Bulgaria](#), [Moldova](#) *et al*; now it appears that South Korea is following the global trend, but in a less obvious way. For decades Korean students (students steeped in the Confucian tradition of elevating scholars as defenders of morality) have risen against authoritarian rule and self-serving elites, elites who, in the name of private property and individualism, have contributed to the dehumanization of the human person and to economic injustice. Together, these phenomena have contributed to the rise of liberal parties committed to freedom and equality resulting in the eventual acceptance and toleration of immoral behaviors that were once thought criminal. As a result of excessive toleration, liberal education and a broad media campaign supported by One World Globalists, just about every moral aberration is now being claimed as a human right. Recent events, however, indicate that change is taking place in the Korean atmosphere as it is elsewhere around the globe as an increasing number of people are turning toward the right and voting conservative.



Over a million People Gather in Seoul to Protest President Park Geun-hye

Over a million people gathered in Gwanghwamun Square and in cities throughout South Korea in late November, 2016 calling for **President Park Geun-hye** (the daughter of former president [Park Chung-hee](#)) to retire from office. Park's approval rating plummeted from around 90% to a new low of 14% following reports that Park's long-time confidant and cult leader, non-appointed and non-elected, **Choi Soon-sil** has been charged with fraud and coercion for using spiritual manipulation that enabled her to use the relationship she cultivated with President Park to garner over \$60 million in donations for her foundations. Some have referred to Choi as "Rasputin", as a covert "puppet master" who is the real power behind "the throne."

Choi Soon-sil's father, **Choi Tae-min** was a Christian cult leader who was married six times before his death in 1994. Choi established the "**Church of Eternal Life**" and referred to himself as the "Maitreya", a Future Buddha, a claim that he used to ingratiate himself to Park Geun-hye following her mother's death in 1974 after which she became the First Lady of South Korea. In that year, Tae-min presented himself to Park and said that her mother had appeared to him in a dream and asked him to assist her daughter.

Like his daughter, Choi Soon-sil (who succeeded her father as leader of the Eternal Life Church), Choi Tae-min used his relationship with Park to bribe both businessmen and government officials. [According to WikiLeaks](#), the American Embassy in Seoul reported that

Choi “had complete control over Park’s body and soul during her formative years and that his children accumulated enormous wealth as a result.”

Choi Soon-sil, picked up where her father left off. [CNN](#) describes Soon-sil as “a deviously persuasive figure outside government”, a persuasive figure who used her influence to tell the president how to run the country, “in exchange for favors”.

Consequently, up to 1.7 million people gathered in Seoul in sight of the presidential residence to demand the president’s expulsion. According to the [Washington Post](#),

“Park is accused of letting a longtime friend with no official government role, Choi Soon-sil, see classified documents and improperly influence government actions. In turn, Choi has been charged with using her relationship with the president to shake down the nation’s biggest companies for donations to her companies, personally enriching herself.”

According to [Forbes](#), Koreans are not only upset with Park’s connections with the Church of Eternal Life but also because of the perception she cultivated of being above corruption. Park, elected in 2012 as South Korea’s first female leader, was purported to be from a new mold, expected to put her country before personal gain, a true public servant.

“Part of her appeal is the perception that she is not corrupt,” says Trinh Nguyen, senior economist with French investment bank Natixis. “Koreans thought that given that she had no family and was estranged from her siblings that her

dedication to Korea's future would be total."

After assuming office on Feb 25, 2013, her first mission as Head of State was a trip to the US to meet President Barack Obama and his Secretary of State John Kerry. President Park predictably urged cooperative S. Korean-American efforts to contain North Korea and accepted the presence of 20,000+ US troops on South Korean soil. Park expressed her wish that beyond containment of North Korea, that the US-South Korean partisanship be "upgraded from a comprehensive strategic alliance to a global partnership." The parties agreed to a joint-statement pledging to establish a committee charged with communications and information technology and to pursue a comprehensive energy plan to assure continued coadjuvancy and on-going symbiotic growth of the two economies.

Nonetheless, on December 9, 2016, the South Korean Parliament voted to impeach their president on charges of corruption, thereby *de facto* terminating her executive powers. Since then, Prime Minister Hwang Kyo-ahn has been invested with those powers as Acting President. This leaves the door wide-open to re-evaluate South Korea's commitment to liberal trade, to its pro-US foreign policy and South Korea's 2013 commitment to pursue a global partnership with the USA. Thus, according to [USA Today](#):

"The pro-U.S. foreign policy of South Korean President Park Geun Hye is at risk now that she appears to be on her way out over a growing corruption scandal."

Several of the at-risk trade and foreign policies validated by the Obama Administration include:

North Korea

Following [North Korea's nuclear test on September 9, 2016](#),

South Korea formulated a hard-line policy with its northern neighbor as well as rethought its relations with China and Japan. Park's new approach was congruent with President Obama's plan to treat North Korea as a pariah state and thereby slap it with additional economic sanctions. [President Obama said](#) that the imposition of new sanctions, on top of already existing sanctions, demonstrate to North Korea that there are "consequences to its unlawful and dangerous actions." Now, however, according to John Delury, professor of International Affairs at Yonsei University:

"With the equally sudden demise of the president (Park), it puts into question the new hard-line policy."

For example, following the North Korean missile launch, President Park ordered South Korean military units to withdraw from the *Kaesong Industrial Complex*, a cooperative venture reliant on South Korean expertise and yet provides significant funds to the North. When Park leaves office, Delury believes that "doves" in the administration would reopen the joint-project. His prognosis is seconded by past US Ambassador to S. Korea, Kathleen Stephens, who recently indicated that parties in opposition to the President's party are likely to drop Park's hard-line stance and seek a rapprochement with Pyongyang.

It would be "a major project" to reopen relations with the North, but options would include a resumption of food and humanitarian aid, plus family reunions that took place in past years.

As [USA Today](#) points out:

"Such voices have already spoken out. Chung-in Moon, a foreign affairs adviser to South Korea's opposition, in September [called for](#) suspending joint military exercises with the United States and for encouraging dialogue with the

North. Such a move by South Korea would be seen as a step toward rejecting the U.S. security umbrella in the region that has existed since the 1950s, said Yun Sun, an analyst at the Stimson Center, a Washington think tank.

Missile Defense

As a further consequence of N. Korea's nuclear test, Park permitted the United States to deploy THAAD (a \$900 million Terminal High Altitude Area Defense) missile system, and to accept a further deployment of US troops in South Korea. China, South Korea's major trading partner, interpreted the deployment as a threat to its own missiles and aircraft. The \$900 bill has been picked up by the United States, but President Trump has indicated that he wants US allies to pay their fair share. On top of that, **there are political forces in S. Korea who would like to improve relations with China;** Parks removal provides them with an opportunity.

Conclusion

President Trump referred to the [Obama brokered US-Korea Trade Agreement](#) as a "job-killing trade deal." By "job-killing", Trump was referring to US jobs; Korea, like Japan and China, is the primary beneficiary, something Trump has vowed to rectify. If S. Korea really wants to keep the agreement intact, it will have to make concessions to the United States or find alternative trade with China and Europe, something made increasingly possible with the ongoing construction of the "Silk Road Project" linking Asia to Europe. **As it stands right now, S. Korea's trade with China exceeds its trade with the USA.** In fact, [trade between S. Korea and China is greater than its combined trade with both the US and Japan!](#)

South Korea continues to improve its economic relations with

China; the two nations have joined the newly created Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank ([AIIB](#)). The AIIB along with [BRICS](#) is viewed by many as an alternative funding for infrastructure projects traditionally handled by the **IMF and World Bank** which have strapped debtor nations with **neo-liberal fiscal and monetary requirements detrimental to both their indigenous culture and their economic growth**, requirements *not* imposed by the AIIB.

The Real issue here is how Park's removal affects relations between the United States and China and how it contributes to ongoing American-Korean relations and the exportation of neo-liberal economic and social policies with US satellites throughout Asia, satellites who, like the [Philippines](#) and [Malaysia](#), have indicated a desire to increase trade relations (and military drills) with China and Russia. S. Korea desires a continued US alliance; however, S. Korea also has a significant and growing relationship with China. The question is which one will predominate as Southeast Asian nations appear to be moving toward more local and regional patterns of association.

Is President Trump pushing America's allies in SE Asia into the Chinese camp and into closer regional cooperation among each other? Is the ouster of Parks a signal of an ongoing Asian shift toward increased regional autonomy, toward new trade opportunities with China, Russia and Europe? Newera believes that these events are occurring but not as a result of President Trump's policies or executive agenda for America. **No, these events were in motion before Trump ever assumed office** and they will continue in motion as they are regularly propelled forward by unforeseen and unexpected events such as the ouster of South Korean President Park Geun Hye. **These are not events or knee-jerk reactions to anything Mr. Trump is doing or has done.** Rather, they are events indicative of something happening to Mr. Trump and to America, something unforeseen by any geopolitical forecaster as more

and more nations (either consciously or inadvertently) move to shake off the divisive economic, political, and social aspects of global liberalism and move toward an “Era of Peace”.

The United States must wake up to the fact or find itself on the back-side of history as the nations move on without it. The US can maintain a global leadership position if it slowly, yet consistently, relinquishes its liberal economic-political-cultural agenda and sincerely reaches out to developing nations with disinterested helping hands as well as extending cooperative hands toward Russia and Europe in the mutual battle against terrorism. If the US gives up its liberal policy of forced regime change, learns to respect the sovereign political rights of other nations, puts a halt to its liberal sexual agenda, and cooperates for the economic global common-good of all nations, if it can do these things, the United States will be admired as a peace-maker and perhaps regain its status as a “great nation under God.”

Following Phone Conversation Trump Apparently Pivots on Russian Rapprochement

[New Era World News](#)

OVER THE WEEKEND NEWERA provided an [abstract](#) containing a conclusion and forecast relative to the Intelligence leak, the release of Secretary of [National Security Flynn](#) and the Trump request that Putin [return Crimea to the Ukraine](#).

CONCLUSION: President Trump’s actions can be understood as a *practical* rational response to internal pressures arising from

the so-called “deep government” The real issue here is whether or not Mr. Trump is up to a life and death struggle with the so-called “deep government” to reclaim America for all Americans thereby making “America Great Again.”

FORECAST: Despite the monumental bulwark known as the “deep government’, the United States and Russia will continue down a path of rapprochement but *not* without significant interference, which can be expected from all ends of the political and social-cultural spectrum. Constant, well orchestrated, and confusing series of events can be expected as agents from both the left and right proceed to push confrontation with Russia to a boiling point. Nonetheless, in the long run, the shadow government will fail as it has consistently failed and been out maneuvered in its foreign policy initiatives for the past decade – we have no discernible reason to believe that this chain of events will cease unfolding. The shadow-government is being opposed by more than Mr. Trump. The real question is what will Mr. Trump do? Will he continue down the road of his immediate predecessors, or be bold enough to set America on a new course?

What is Going ON?

The leak of information to the press, the resignation of Secretary Flynn, and the strange request for the return of Crimean to the Ukraine represent a peculiar set of inter-related phenomena germane to American-Russian foreign relations. The return of Crimea is clearly a Russian issue, an issue that appears to engender conflict and create distance between the United States and Russia. Likewise, the intelligence leak and removal of Flynn are also “Russian issues.” Of all of Mr. Trump’ recent appointees, Flynn was the most adamant about a reset with Russia involving cooperation in the battle against ISIS, the lifting or amendment of

sanctions, and an emphasis on the sovereignty of nations.

These three objectives *stand in stark contrast* to the globalist agenda that is being challenged by various nations esp. nation's throughout Europe. This emerging challenge to globalism involves advocacy, protection, and promotion of the sovereign rights of individual nation states, the conservation of diverse cultural patrimonies and the safeguarding of Christians and traditional Christian values *all* of which are supported by Russia and a widening array of "populist parties" spread throughout Europe. They are however, anathema to the EU and American New World Order Globalists who are involved in a decades long process of using foreign aid, the power of multi-media, education, and when necessary, military force, to advance and [export Western culture and liberal values to third world nations](#) thereby promoting a one world culture antithetical to indigenous cultures and traditional family-oriented and Christian values.

Given this clash between the global agenda and the Kremlin, anything or any person favorable to American-Russian cooperation and a cooperative war against terrorism (what [Trump referred to as "bombing the shit out of ISIS"](#), whom the war-hawks and globalists have supported in their thwarted attempts to overthrow the democratically elected government of Syria) must be opposed and, if possible, neutralized or terminated. Thus, **the ouster of Flynn appears to be a macro-dynamic related to hindering American and Russian relations** as hinted at by Mr.Trump.

In this regard, following Flynn's expulsion, Leonid Slutsky, head of the Russian Duma's (Parliament) foreign-affairs committee, issued a statement, picked-up by [The Washington Post](#).

According to Slutsky, the removal of Flynn represents a "negative signal for normalizing the Russian-American dialogue."

Likewise, Russian Senator Alexi Pushkov echoed Slutsky's evaluation by indicating that the issue is more about Russian relations than it is about Flynn:

"The mission isn't Flynn, it's relations with Russia."

The Trump Team is therefore facing stiff opposition not only from an entrenched bureaucracy but also from die hard members of the intelligence community who still view Russia through the lens of Soviet Communism or of those committed to globalism and who realize that Russia is increasingly becoming a Christian nation-state and purveyor of traditional family values and an avowedly anti-liberal foreign policy. If Trump plans to improve relations with Russia, thereby enhancing Russian economic development, according to the globalists, he must be opposed. The Deep State supporters of global hegemony, those who promote the ideological export of American values to all nations abroad view themselves as patriots who must stop the nefarious Russian Bear whose commitment to national sovereignty and Christianity is a threat to global hegemony and the advancement of the liberal New World agenda. Thus, the "Deep State" and its operatives in the bureaucracy must stop Russia even if it mean opposing their own president, and even though such opposition is a crime that could be prosecuted as "treason."

Given such an international political battlefield, it is little wonder that President Trump is being opposed and Russia vilified. As the contestants stepped into the arena for the first round, Trump lunged forward with a flurry of punches beginning with a quick jab to Obamacare, an undercut to immigration, and a hay-maker that halted taxpayer dollars from being used to fund "counseling or referrals for abortion or

advocating for access to abortion services” in foreign countries. It was the Deep State however, those operating in the shadows of secrecy, that threw the most devastating punch. It appears that Mr. Trump endured a body blow to the gut that doubled him over causing him to regurgitate his National Defense Secretary whom he discharged from office leading many analysts giving the first round to the Deep State and leaving them wondering if Trump could recover from the body thrashing.

Is it possible that Trump was playing “rope a dope” from round one in order to score a bigger victory, perhaps a KO in later rounds? That we do not know, but if the president continues on like this, few doubt that his mouth piece will be out by round two and by the third round he will acquiesce (as others before him) by agreeing to throw the fight and giving way to the demands of the Deep State who will carry him for appearance sake to the fifteenth round of the fourth year, that is, if he plays along as he is supposed to.

By failing to fight back, by failing to protect Flynn, President Trump appears to be dazed, a look that can only increase the ferocity of his opponent, a look that rapidly unleashes the instinct to close in for the finish.



Nonetheless, some analysts such as Israeli publicist [Avigdor Eskin](#) emphasize that the president can still win IF he sticks to the simple program of delivering on his campaign promises; this

however will entail a ferocious battle, perhaps the most lethal in the annals of American Executive history. If Mr. Trump’s hanging the picture of Andrew Jackson across from his desk in the Oval Office is any indicator of his resolve, if it is more than decor, expect the president to launch a coy but

surreptitious comeback.

“His only chance to prevail is by forcing his way through in order to win as soon as possible massive support at home and active assistance from his real allies around the world. He must stick to his promises and show uncompetitive faithfulness to his team,” Eskin stressed.

Eskin understands that Trump is up against the Deep State, that he must deal with lethal opponents and their agents deeply entrenched in the Washington bureaucracy.

It is unlikely that the president will find enough intellectual and cultural support at home (support beyond the adulation of the masses), a land inundated with liberal values, a place where liberal political, economic, and moral ideas have morphed into ordinary life to be accepted without thought as easily as oxygen in the air is inhaled without any thinking involved. This culture has spread far beyond the Atlantic and Pacific coasts to encompass the globe thereby making the American Deep State and its allies major players and beneficiaries in the global spread of liberalism. This culture of liberalism has become so pervasive that it has been concretized in every major institution, the very structures of society that [John Paul II](#) was speaking about when he stated:

*“It is important to note therefore that a world which is divided unto blocs, sustained by rigid ideologies, and in which instead of interdependence and solidarity different forms of imperialism hold sway, can only be a world subject to **structures of sin**. The **sum total of the negative factors working against a true awareness of the universal common good**, and the need to further it, gives the impression of creating, in persons and institutions, **an obstacle which is difficult to overcome.**”*

Eventually, Mr. Trump will have to make some moves against

terrorists in the Middle East who have been supported overtly or covertly by transfer of aid from one group to another in Syria and Iraq. Eventually the truth will have to be told about American ally Saudi Arabia. It is the Saudis *not* Iranians who are the major sponsor of international terrorism. It is true that Iran supports lonesome Hezbollah; the roots of 9-11, however are traced to Riyadh not Tehran, ISIS-ISIL and Al Qaeda all have their roots on Saudi Arabia, the home of the most radical forms of Islam – Wahhabi and Salafist – a tyrannical monarchy opposed to democracy and upholders of Shariah law.

Eventually these realities will have to be admitted, and the Trump administration will have to deal with the cascading fallout such a revelation and its resounding repercussions will cause among neoliberal and neocon supporters of Saudi Arabia and Israel. It is due to Israel's opposition to Hezbollah and to its cooperation with US ally Saudi Arabia (*albeit* for political expediency) that Iran is vilified in the Western press while Iran's opponent, Saudi Arabia (the home of jihad, Al Qaeda, and Sunni radicalism in its many forms) is supporting terrorists throughout the Middle East in order to destabilize governments antithetical to its (and Israel's) interests, which currently also seem to be American interests. The US declared a war on terrorism and then turned around and gave significant tranches of aid to terrorists while simultaneously maintain its alliance with the country that produces them. If President Trump dares to team up with Russia to eradicate terrorism, he will have to face the ire of Israel, Saudi Arabia and the Deep State.

However, if the new president continues the foreign policy of the Bush and Obama administrations (who though very different

in ideology waged essentially the same failing strategy of the Middle East), if he continues to pursue the same path as his predecessors (a path favored by the globalists), American Foreign Policy will continue its downward slide and America will continue suffering one international embarrassment after another (as it has for the past decade) while earning the ire of other nations around the globe. President Obama, the Nobel Peace winner, was never able to disengage from war or to defeat ISIS; Trump however, has vowed to obliterate them, *implicitly*, with Russian cooperation. It is this cooperation, above almost all else, that makes him the enemy of the deep establishment.

If Mr. Trump moves too quickly, he will not be able to withstand the tumultuous tsunami that is being gathered for a melancholy day of release; he must first cultivate relationships among international leaders who have a very different view on America and American Foreign Policy than that being fed to Mr. Trump by neocon war-hawks such as Sen. John McCain who recently discredited himself again by what he evaluated as an adroit move to pit Trump against Putin.

If Sen. McCain believes that Mr. Trump will buy into his most recent ploy, he must think the new president is a novice at chicanery – highly unlikely, it does not take philosophical or theological brilliance to be a master of practical politics – any successful business man can play quite well on his field.

What Happened?

During his campaign Mr. Trump alarmed Kiev by indicating that he would seek improved relations with Russia. Conflict is still underway in Eastern Ukraine where it erupted the day following an early term phone conversation between President Trump and President Putin. The violence was so great that it resulted in the highest casualty rate since the end of 2016

According to Sen McCain, Russia is experimenting with the new president to test his gullibility and his resolve to oppose a lying murderer like Vladimir Putin. Putin cannot be trusted and therefore the Ukraine should be supplied with lethal aid in order to route the pro-Russian rebels in Eastern Ukraine.

In a [letter released by Sen. McCain](#) to the United States President, McCain offered his specious version of events. From McCain's perspective,

"This surge of attacks began the day after he (Putin) talked with you by phone is a clear indication that Vladimir Putin is moving quickly to test you as commander in chief. America's response will have lasting consequences."

Obama provided Ukraine with non-lethal aid such as drones, radar, first aid equipment, communication apparatus etc. But McCain wants the new president to provide lethal assistance. According to the neocon war-hawk,

"Vladimir Putin's violent campaign to destabilize and dismember the sovereign nation of Ukraine will not stop unless and until he meets a strong and determined response."

It appears that Sen McCain lacks respect for the new president. Does he really expect Mr. Trump to believe that one day following a phone conversation with the President of Russia, that Russia would foment a violent military surge in the Ukraine thereby winning the ire of America's Commander and Chief, a man whom Putin has longed to talk with in order to facilitate cooperation in the Middle East against ISIS?

Vladimir Putin has a reputation of being a very rational person; the act that the senator is accusing him of is very irrational. What does Putin gain from bluntly, boldly, and condescendingly lying to Trump? Sen. McCain's letter appears to be non-nonsensical and therefore to be treated as highly specious. It appears more likely that if anyone is testing the

new president, it is Sen. McCain himself.

The two leaders (Putin and Trump) engaged in conversation for nearly an hour, a conversation that VP Mike Pence was invited to sit in on. Afterward, the [Kremlin issued a statement in which they said](#):

"...both sides showed their readiness for active, joint work to stabilize and develop Russian-American cooperation."

[The White House referred to the talk as](#) a “

"... significant start to improving a relationship 'in need of repair."

Who in their right mind would talk about repairing relationships, joint-work and cooperation by phone one day and the next blow the entire peace and cooperation process by ordering a major strike in an area of major contention? Apparently, Sen McCain and the American Intelligence Community along with the so-called “fake news” outlets used to leak their stories have become so accustomed to public manipulation that they think people will believe anything they say. Unfortunately, for them, people are waking up to the game – Newera is quite confident that the President of the United States is wide awake to it.

In the interim, President Trump will have to go along with many ruses, or apparently so, occasionally garnering support from his followers by delivering on select aspects of his campaign promises – enough to keep the sheep satisfied and the wolves at bay while he builds goodwill around the globe. At first, he might have to continue support for Qatar and Saudi Arabia and buttress the pillars of Zionism (political forces that all support terrorism and an equal disdain for Russia and her allies); nonetheless, if the new president plays his cards right, he will be able to Trump any hand. He will deliver on

his campaign promises but not in a way that is readily apparent. It is not time for fisticuffs, so yes, Newera does tend to believe that Mr. Trump has come out with a rope a dope in Round One, at least partially so. If he is able to eventually pound ISIS into oblivion (the sooner the better) with Russian cooperation, he will build up a tidal wall of good-will and support composed of many international components that spell peace, a peace woven into a wall that will be able to withstand any Tsunami the Deep State can bellow in his direction.

If President Trump collapses before the winds and succumbs to the mounting global pressures of liberalism and to those in his own administration, if he fails to deliver on his campaign promises and follows the lead of Neocon war-hawks like Sen. John McCain, New Era foresees an abject failure on the horizon and the ultimate collapse of American Foreign Policy and the waning of American influence.

Continued Tomorrow as Newera delves more deeply into this crucial issue at the forefront of the Trump presidency.

Intelligence Report: Trump Apparently Pivots on Russia –

Abstract – Full Report Feb 20

[New Era World News](#)

Intelligence

ABSTRACT

THIS PAST WEEK NEWERA provided two articles detailing President Trump's unexpected release of his National Security Adviser and seemingly ludicrous request that Russia return Crimea to the Ukraine. This controversial and highly unexpected request was immediately rejected by Russian statesmen; as one Russian reporter noted: this will happen as soon as the United States gives California back to Mexico. Together, these controversial actions appear to signal a **weakening of what looked like support for a rapprochement with Russia**. After gathering relevant data from various and conflicting sources, breaking the data into component parts, comparing and contrasting the parts and determining veracity of the information (**is there evidence that reported events really happened**), considering the ideological motivations of news outlets and the web of relationships among the data points, comparison and contrast ended with propositional judgement (**is there evidence that events really happened as reported**). This was followed by a synthesis of the data involving not only historical, cultural, political and economic variables, but philosophical and theological variables as well as unexpected turn of events and discernible global patterns that indicate emerging trends and serve as catalysts to unexpected change. These methodological components are all necessary parts behind a robust Intelligence Report, which is further checked for its own logical validity followed by a forecast relevant to the events under scrutiny.

CONCLUSION: President Trump's actions can be understood as a *practical* rational response to internal pressures arising from the so-called "*deep government*" (people who exercise a powerful influence on political affairs, but not necessarily elected officials (financiers, bureaucrats, corporate interests, and those who prefer to manipulate and, if possible, control events from behind the scenes). Newera prefers the term "*shadow-government*" to "*deep government*" because this "government" is **operated by veiled doyens skilled at circumventing exposure**, doyens and intelligence agents who avoid "transparency" by operating under a veil of darkness that casts a shadow over occurring events. **Clearly, someone is leaking data detrimental to the Trump Team, not even the President of the United States, whom these intelligence officers supposedly work for, knows who they are** – he is in a dim shadow because they are operating under cover of darkness. The only evidence of their operation, all that can be observed is a shadow, a shadow formed by the fact that light has been blocked out. No exposure of light is permitted, no cracked windows through which it might flow because there are no windows in this wall. This is how a strong shadow is formed, hence the term, "shadow government", one unnamed massive wall of operatives, which President Trump is up against. **The real question is whether or not Mr. Trump is up to a life and death struggle to reclaim America for All Americans thereby making "America Great Again."**

FORECAST: Despite the monumental bulwark known as the "shadow government", **the United States and Russia will continue down a path of rapprochement but not without significant interference from a ubiquitous *shadow-government*.** Because it is, or appears to be, "ubiquitous", **interference can be expected from all ends of the political and social-cultural spectrum.** Constant, well orchestrated and confusing (shadows can be used to cast confusing and mixed messages) series of events can be

expected as agents from both the left and right proceed to push confrontation to a boiling point. Nonetheless, in the long run, the shadow government will fail as it has consistently failed and been out maneuvered in its foreign policy initiatives for the past decade – we have no discernible reason to believe that this chain of events will cease unfolding. The shadow-government is being opposed by more than Mr. Trump – they are losing their grip on power, and they know it. Again the real question is what will Mr. Trump do? Will he continue down the road of his immediate predecessors, or be bold enough to set America on a new course?

Full Intel Report Tomorrow, Monday, Feb. 20

President Trump Going Back on Russian Platform Part Two: Bromance to Standoff?

New Era News limits itself to reporting and in-depth analysis/synthesis of breaking events.

Interpretation, Extrapolation and Forecasting are provided in Weekly Intelligence Reports released each Saturday

AS STATED IN ARTICLE ONE, in recent days the Trump administration has engaged in some surprising behavior that has reporters and intelligence agents scratching their heads. Not only has his National Security Adviser resigned, President Trump has also indicated that he expects Russia to return Crimea to the Ukraine. This controversial and highly

unexpected request came out of no where, as one Russian reporter noted: this will happen as soon as the United States gives California back to Mexico. Together, these executive actions **might signal a weakening of what looked like support for a rapprochement with Russia.**

The Crimean Question

Russian history begins in the Ukraine with the first East Slavic state, the Kievan Rus (Kiev is the modern capital of the Ukraine). In 988 Prince Vladimir of the Kievan Rus accepted the Christian faith and had his people baptized in the Dnieper. Due to Mongol invasions in the 13th century power shifted northward to what was then a small Rus outpost named Moscow and Ukraine fell prey to foreign invaders. Nonetheless, in the mind of Russian leaders, Ukraine retained its Russian identity; as late as the 19th century czars still referred to the Ukraine as "Little Russia."

Ukraine did not become an independent nation until 1917 at the end of World War I and the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires; it was, however, **incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1922.** It remained under Soviet dominance until 1991 when the nation voted for independence with the dissolution of the USSR. Clearly, Russia has an historic affinity to Ukraine, **the Ukrainian capital of Kiev is the birthplace of Russia and czars of Russia trace their lineage back to Prince Vladimir.**


Likewise, Russia has historic ties to Crimea which has become a significant point of contention between Moscow and Kiev.

After being occupied by the Kievan Rus in the Medieval period, Crimea fell to the Monguls and became part of the Golden Horde, which was followed by the Crimean Khanate and then the Ottoman Empire, which held it until **1783 when Catherine the Great defeated the Ottomans and Russia re-**

assumed control of Crimea. Historically, Crimea does seem to be part of Russia. However, geographically speaking Kiev is connected to Ukraine by several strings of land, it appears to be part of Ukraine. Nonetheless, Russia lies only several miles off shore and Russia has ruled Crimea for centuries. This problem was resolved in 1954 when **Nikita Khrushchev, for whatever reason, gifted Crimea to the Ukraine.**

Since that time, Crimea has been under the control of the Ukraine *albeit* with ongoing conflict and calls for reunion with Russia, calls that broke out into a cacophony in 2014 during the Color Revolution that split the Ukraine. During that year a referendum to decide if Crimeans wanted to remain a part of the Ukraine or rejoin Russia was held. When [97% of Crimeans voted for union with Russia](#), Crimea once again became a Republic of Russia. The Russian argument becomes stronger when considering the ethnic-language map below. Clearly, Eastern Ukraine and *esp.* Crimea are linguistically Russian

The majority language by city, town, and village councils
Results from the Ukrainian 2001 Census



Nonetheless, many countries, including the United States and Canada, considered the Crimean referendum to be illegitimate. Thirteen members of the UN Security Council (comprised of 5 permanent – with veto power – and ten non-permanent members) also declared that the referendum was illegitimate; however, the vote was vetoed by Russia and China abstained. The measure was then taken up by the UN General Assembly which passed a resolution by a vote of 100-11 (58 abstentions) that the referendum was invalid.

The Security Council action was legitimately and legally vetoed and the General Assembly could only muster a “resolution”, a resolution with no bite behind it because the Security Council had already vetoed the resolve. Russia, moreover, has made the somewhat compelling argument that people everywhere have a right to secede from one nation and enter into a union with another or to remain independent if

that is their common desire. For example, Scotland recently held a referendum to secede from Great Britain and Kosovo held a referendum to secede from Serbia despite the fact that the [Preamble of the Serbian Constitution](#) declares that **Kosovo 'is an integral part of the territory of Serbia'**.

Nonetheless, Kosovo, backed by US military might, unilaterally declared its independence leading to protracted and violent warfare. Although Kosovo was recognized by many members of the European Union, five nations refused to recognize her secession: Spain, Slovakia, Cyprus, Greece and Romania. There does seem to be some validity to the desire of the Crimean people to decide for themselves what nation they want to belong to – besides, the Crimean referendum backed by Russia was carried out peacefully; whereas, the Kosovo referendum resulted in an ocean of violence, war brutality, and ethnic cleansing over a protracted period of 16 months. It included a [NATO bombing campaign that never gained approval of the UN Security Council and caused at least 488 Yugoslav civilian deaths](#) – Russia did not drop any bombs on either the Ukraine or Crimea.

Nonetheless, The [Obama administration almost immediately imposed sanctions](#) on Russia:

“We’re making it clear that there are consequences for their actions,” the president said. And, he warned, “If Russia continues to interfere in Ukraine we stand ready to impose further sanctions.”

“A senior administration official later called the action, “far the most comprehensive sanctions applied to Russia since the end of the Cold War.”

[The European Union also imposed sanction](#) saying it would “freeze assets of, and ban travel for, 21 officials in Russia

and Ukraine” adding: “We urge our counterparts and financial institutions around the world to shun these individuals.”

Conflict between the United States and Russia was apparently heating up and began to reach fever pitch toward the end of the Obama administration. For example, Obama’s good-bye gift to Putin was a further deployment of US troops to the Russian border. [According to the BBC](#), just four days before the Trump inauguration:

“More than 80 main battle tanks and hundreds of armoured vehicles have already arrived in Germany and are now being moved into eastern Europe by road and rail. The US Armoured Brigade will also carry out military exercises in the Baltics, all part of President Obama’s response to Russia’s intervention in Ukraine and to reassure nervous NATO allies.”

“Russia says it views the arrival of more than 3,000 US soldiers in Poland as a threat to its own security...It is the largest US military reinforcement of Europe in decades.”

“President Vladimir Putin’s spokesman Dmitry Peskov told the BBC that the move “threatens our interests and our security...It’s a third country that is building up its military presence on our borders in Europe,” he said. “It isn’t even a European country.”

All this despite the fact that President-elect Trump indicated that he prefers non-intervention, unless American interests are directly at stake; he respects the sovereignty of nation states; a reduction of global involvement and of international institutions; and accordingly prefers bi-lateral agreements brokered by the United States itself. He even indicated that [he might support Russia’s acceptance of Crimea](#), and that the

issue is a [European not an America problem](#). But as of this week, his National Security Adviser has resigned and Trump is alleging that Putin “TOOK” Crimea from Ukraine and that [Obama was “too soft” on Russia](#). Now, he wants Crimea given back to the Ukraine. In this regard, White House spokesman Sean Spicer said earlier this week that the Trump administration [expects Russia to “return Crimea” to Ukraine](#).

“President Trump has made it very clear that he expects the Russian government to deescalate violence in Ukraine and return Crimea,” Spicer nuanced his remark by adding that “at the same time, he (President Trump) fully expects to and wants to get along with Russia”

This might be hard feat to accomplish, since Russia has no intention of giving up Crimea.

In response to Spicer’s statements, Maria Zakharova, Russian Spokeswoman for Foreign Affairs immediately rose to correct President Trump’s allegation that Russia “TOOK” Crimea and should give it back.

“We don’t return our territories. Crimea is a territory of the Russian Federation.”

Echoing Zakharova, [Viktor Ozerov, Chairman of the Defense Committee in the Russian Upper House](#) stated:

“The issue of Crimea return is absolutely clear – it is part of Russia and it cannot be subject of bargaining between Russia and the United States, no matter what is at stake.”

From a campaign strategy that featured a rapprochement with Russia, working together to defeat ISIS, and seeking global peace, the Trump administration has apparently changed course drastically; they are now saying the United States needs to be tougher on Russia. Trump has apparently confirmed the buildup of troops on the Russian border sent there by President Obama days before he left office and now is making ludicrous request for Russia to return Crimea – All this from a president who indicated during his campaign that [Crimean's were happier being a part of Russia](#).

“But you know, the people of Crimea, from what I’ve heard, would rather be with Russia than where they were.”

Since there have been no uprisings and anti-Russian demonstrations in Crimea and indicators are that the people are pleased with Russian rule, at least more than they were with Ukrainian rule, it can be presumed that the referendum was a valid expression of the majority and that President Trump was correct about their rather being with Russia. Does he want the people of Crimea to suffer a set-back by negating their referendum and being forced back into a union with the Ukraine that 97% of them indicated they do not desire? This does not seem to be a prudent diplomatic, democratic or humanistic move to make.

Why the Turn Apparent Around? What is going on?

The whole situation might be explained as a power move by Trump to enhance his bargaining position *vis a vis* Putin. In this regard. [After signing in “Mad Dog Mattis” as Secretary of Defense, Trump stated:](#)

“I’m signing an executive action to begin a great rebuilding of the armed services of the United States, developing a plan for new planes, new ships, new resources and new tools for

our men and women in uniform,” Trump said after the swearing-in of the retired Marine general. “I’m very proud to be doing that.”

“Our military strength will be questioned by no one, but neither will our dedication to peace,” he added. “We do want peace.”

To which the new Secretary of Defense responded:

“Thank you very much for your confidence in me and welcome to the headquarters of your military – your always loyal military – where America’s awesome determination to defend herself is on full display,” said the new secretary of defense at his swearing in ceremony.

“You’ve made clear Mr. President your commitment to a strong national defense,” he added.

Trump has instructed Secretary Mattis to get the United States in a position to bargain with Russia, to bargain from strength. The problem is that Putin is also stacking his deck; in response to American aggressiveness, President Putin has ordered the Russian Air Force to prepare for a “*time of war*”.

[According to Russian Defense Minister Sergey Shoigu:](#)

“In accordance with the decision by the Armed Forces Supreme Commander (President Putin), a snap check of the Aerospace Forces began to evaluate readiness of the control agencies and troops to carry out combat training tasks.”

“Special attention should be paid to combat alert, deployment

of air defense systems for a time of war and air groupings' readiness to repel the aggression."

Before anyone gets war crazy, it was and is highly expected, as we indicated at the close of [Part One](#), that relations with Russia will be brought to a boiling point, but this does not necessarily mean war. Given the highly unusual tenor of this should be no story (The resignation of Flynn and Crimean situation), Newera has shuffled the issue to its Intelligence Department for further analysis. The Flynn-Crimean debacle appears to be part of a related story necessitating a broader investigation into the Neocon-Neoliberal deep government, Russia and American Foreign Policy, Fatima and an Era of Peace.

An Intelligence Report on this topic is planned for Sunday Reading

[Access Part One](#)

President Trump Appears to be Reversing His Russian Platform

New Era News limits itself to reporting and in-depth analysis/synthesis of breaking events.

Interpretation, Extrapolation and Forecasting are provided in Weekly Intelligence Reports released each Saturday

IN RECENT DAYS PRESIDENT TRUMP has engaged in some surprising behavior that has reporters and intelligence agents scratching their heads. Not only has his National Security Adviser resigned, President Trump has also indicated that he expects Russia to return Crimea to the Ukraine. This controversial and highly unexpected request came out of no where, as one Russian reporter noted: this will happen as soon as the United States gives California back to Mexico. Together, these executive actions **might signal a weakening of what looked like support for a rapprochement with Russia.**

Flynn was one of a few that was open to reset with Russia and a proponent of Trump's retreat from Neocon Global Intervention (the highly vaunted American Moment), an intervention that involves the US military spread thin across the globe and involves the United States in broad international agreements brokered by international agencies involving many countries that the US must abide by. Trump prefers non-intervention, unless American interests are directly a stake, and bi-lateral agreements brokered by the United States itself. He has even indicated that [he might support Russia's acceptance of Crimea](#), and that the issue is a [European not an America problem](#), but now his National Security Adviser has resigned and Trump is alleging that Putin "TOOK" Crimea from Ukraine and that [Obama was "too soft" on Russia](#) and he wants it given back to the Ukraine. What is going on?

President Trump indicated opening to Russia Nonintervention and possible acceptance of Crimean Referendum – What has happened?

National Security Adviser First

Earlier this week **Michael Flynn** resigned as President Trump's National Security Adviser. Previously, he was head of military

intelligence in Afghanistan and Iraq. He also served as Director of intelligence for the U.S. Central Command and was Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, a position from which he was removed by President Obama following Flynn's Congressional testimony in which he stated, contrary to President Obama's wishes, that ISIS did *not* constitute a "major threat" and therefore could not be used as a justification for prolonged engagement in the Middle East.

Mr. Flynn resigned from the Trump team due to pressure for withholding information from Vice President Pence, information regarding a phone conversation that took place before inauguration (December, 29, 2016) with the Russian Ambassador, Sergei Kislyak. During that conversation Flynn responded to questions from the foreign ambassador about US sanctions imposed on Russia (on the same day that thirty-five Russian diplomats were expelled from the US), which he later left out of his report to the Vice President

Others report that sanctions were not part of the conversation. Recalling his conversation with the Russian Ambassador, Flynn himself stated:

"It wasn't about sanctions. It was about the 35 guys who were thrown out... So that's what it turned out to be. It (the conversation) was basically, 'Look, I know this happened. We'll review everything.' I never said anything such as, 'We're going to review sanctions,' or anything like that."

Either way, the Vice President was not fully informed (either about the sanction conversation [if it did occur] or the expulsion of the 35), which might be interpreted as the Vice President was "misled." According to the President's Counselor, Kelly-Anne Conway: ["Misleading the vice president really was the key here."](#) Flynn continues to assert that he "crossed no lines" in his conversation with the Russian ambassador:

“If I did, believe me, the FBI would be down my throat, my clearances would be pulled. There were no lines crossed.”

In his final interview before resigning, Flynn indicated that he **“was most concerned” about classified information being leaked by people with security clearances**; he was (and is) more concerned about information leaks than he is with his own resignation.

*“In some of these cases, you’re talking about **stuff that’s taken off of a classified system and given to a reporter. That’s a crime,**”*

*“We have to wonder that **people who work for our government, who are entrusted with classified information, decisional-based materials are leaking that information out. That, I do believe is a big story,**” he said voicing serious concerns about **the “politicization of intelligence.”**”*

The “politicization of intelligence” (a euphemism for illegal leaks of information so highly protected that it is above “top-secret” [that is, it is off of the charts]), politicization of intelligence is a big story indeed, but *not* even Flynn knows where the leaks are coming from. **The intelligence community was monitoring the National Security Adviser himself** – that is how the information about his private conversation with the Russian ambassador made it to the desk of President Trump and then into the press. Flynn simply does not know where the information is coming from:

“One has to wonder, ‘Are they coming out of people in the National Security Council? Are they coming out of people in the intel community? Or State? Or Defense?’”

Not even the President of the United States knows how

information regarding statesmen on his administrative team is being leaked. President Trump [tweeted](#) that

“The real story here is why are there so many illegal leaks coming out of Washington? Will these leaks be happening as I deal on N. Korea etc?”

In other words, the intelligence community that works for the president is spying on the president. Events such as this leave us wondering, who is in charge here?

According to Eli Lake writing for [Bloomberg](#):

“Normally intercepts of U.S. officials and citizens are some of the most tightly held government secrets...Selectively disclosing details of private conversations monitored by the FBI or NSA gives the permanent state the power to destroy reputations from the cloak of anonymity. This is what police states do.”

Before jumping to the conclusion that Eli Lake is accusing Trump of running a police state, it is necessary to be cognizant of the fact that Lake is *not* referring to a police state run by President Trump – unless Trump is the one ordering the monitoring and making the leaks or ordering them too. In this case, apparently, not even the President knows what is going on. Which state is in charge, the duly elected one or the so-called “deep-state” controlled by people opposed to the president? To support this contention that the police state referred to by Lake is not one overseen by Trump, Trump himself thanked Lake for his reporting. Responding to this Article, Trump Tweeted:

“Thank you to Eli Lake of The Bloomberg View – ‘The NSA & FBI...should not interfere in our politics...and is’ Very serious situation for USA.”

 [Donald J. Trump](#)

[@realDonaldTrump](#)

Thank you to Eli Lake of The Bloomberg View – “The NSA & FBI...should not interfere in our politics...and is” Very serious situation for USA

[6:28 AM – 15 Feb 2017](#)

According to Devin Nunes (R), Chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

“There does appear to be a well orchestrated effort to attack Flynn and others in the administration,” he said. “From the leaking of phone calls between the president and foreign leaders to what appears to be high-level FISA Court information, to the leaking of American citizens being denied security clearances, it looks like a pattern.”

Retired Col. James Williamson, told The [Daily Caller](#) that,

“What is illegal is that Flynn has his conversations eavesdropped on.”

The fact is Flynn did not violate any laws; he was asked to resign for failing to fully inform the VP, which is *not* a criminal act. As reported and concluded by [NBC News](#):

“There had been no finding that Flynn did anything illegal.”

Related to this incident, it has been widely reported that there are many unanswered questions regarding Trump’s connections with Russia. This could be the key to unraveling this story; it could also involve an attempt to purge Flynn before he helps the President purge the intel community: According to [Bloomberg](#), Flynn:

*“...has cultivated a reputation as a reformer and a **fierce critic of the intelligence community leaders** he once served with when he was the director the Defense Intelligence Agency under President Barack Obama. **Flynn was working to reform the intelligence-industrial complex**, something that threatened the bureaucratic prerogatives of his rivals.” Flynn also “joined the crowd at the Republican National Convention from the dais calling for Hillary Clinton to be jailed.”*

Asked by Richard Pollock (The Daily Caller Reporter) why he was calmly avoiding confrontation, Flynn responded:

*“I haven’t been fighting back because I’m not that kind of guy. I’m behind the scenes. **I’ve always been behind the scenes**. But this is ridiculous. It’s so out of control. I’ve become an international celebrity for all the wrong reasons.”*

Will Flynn continue to work as a highly placed “behind the scenes” intel officer? This is a question that Newera is not prepared to approach until a thorough Intel analysis of our own has been conducted. Two safe presumptions can be made at this juncture, viz., the Neocons will do everything they can to assure (1) that one of their members is pegged to replace Flynn and (2) that hostilities with Russia reach a boiling point.

[Acces Part Two](#)