

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.

What to Expect from Trump's Military Foreign Policy

SINCE THE ELECTION OF DONALD TRUMP to be President of the United States, many think tank and intelligence agency executives have stepped forward to offer insight and make forecasts toward what a Trump presidency might bring. Among these stellar agencies, [Stratfor](#) is perhaps the foremost recognized global leader in the intelligence forecasting business. Stratfor, operating out of Austin, Texas is referred to by foreign policy experts world wide and is known for its insight and excellence in global forecasting. Unfortunately,

Stratfor is increasingly off with its forecasts, as are most intelligence agencies and US State Department analysts. Although their geopolitical analysis remains strong, they are increasingly off because they are using outdated models and assumptions that interprets things through the lens of a UK-US neoliberal hegemony, which is rapidly coming to a close. The fact is, the world is in transition to something new, thereby reducing the effectiveness of old forecast models. Stratfor has simply *not* caught on. New ideas, movements, and energies are underway around the globe that require an entire new set of assumptions and new models of forecasting that take into account the impact of morality and religion in the economic, political and cultural affairs of nations. New Era Global Intelligence refers to this model as "[Theopolitics](#)" in contradistinction to the "Geopolitical" model used by Stratfor *et al.*

Geopolitics remains essential, but it is limited due to its lack of moral, religious, and cultural variables that are increasingly at play in world politics. Thus, we prefer to look at the future Trump presidency and to make forecasts based on a theopolitical model, one which includes geopolitics, but a whole lot more. This article is therefore intended to demonstrate the weakness of old geopolitical models and the strength of new theopolitical models by using forecasts of a Trump presidency as an example. Because geopolitical Stratfor forecasts are, we believe, increasingly far off and different from the theopolitical ones made by New Era, time will soon tell which forecasting model has more strength and validity for the future.

So What Can be Expected of a Trump Foreign Policy?

This topic is approached by first considering what Stratfor analysts have to say followed by a completely contrary forecast made by New Era.

First, Stratfor adopts a neoliberal position on Russia as evidenced by its reporting on supposed Russian interference in US election without any evidence that such interference ever occurred:

“Given the friendly rhetoric during the campaign season (and the indirect assistance to the Trump campaign from alleged Russian cyber attacks), Russian President Vladimir Putin is expecting to sit down for a serious negotiation with Trump.”

A close reader cannot get by the first paragraph, without questioning the objectivity at Stratfor. If there is no evidence for a cyber attack and it is admitted that the allegation is only “alleged” why is it even in the report – this shows a bias against Russia that is not backed by any evidence. Besides, I for one, would like to know just what kind of support Mr. Trump would have received by a cyber attack? Did it increase votes for him some how? If so, then it should be demonstrated just how it accomplished such an objective. The whole issue is an amorphous allegation meant to confuse and somehow befuddle readers into thinking the election was effected by Russia and therefore Trump owes Putin. Just what exactly was this alleged “indirect assistance” received by Trump?

Stratfor analysts correctly point out that although President Trump will have “... the executive authority to ease sanctions”, and although Russia “can de-escalate its military campaign in Syria” there are limits imposed on a Trump-Putin dialogue from the American side:

“The U.S. military establishment, the U.S. Intelligence Community, Republican congressmen and even potential members of Trump’s Cabinet are hawkish on Russia and realize the high strategic cost of encouraging an expansion and entrenchment of its sphere of influence in the former Soviet sphere.”

“Putin is also not going to significantly compromise Russia’s

position in critical buffer states such as Ukraine. Moreover, the increasingly Putinized Russian state has coped with domestic challenges by demonizing the West and claiming a U.S. plot to dismantle Russia as a whole. If the Kremlin cannot secure big strategic concessions for its domestic audience, then it will need to keep vilifying the West to sustain nationalist support."

Although it begins with a basic logical presumption, this prognosis is highly biased, deceptive, and highly unlikely. Although it is true that Trump will face an intelligence community and Republican statesmen that are hawkish on Russia, Sen. McCain-Arizona for example, the article does not say which "potential Trump Cabinet" members are hawkish – there is a presumption of continued hawkishness. Moreover, why would any world leader, Putin included, compromise his or her position on securing borders and national security interests along lands shared with "critical buffer states"? This is a normal political reaction to perceived threats coming from the United States and NATO, which have given President Putin more than enough reason to want to secure his buffer zone. Stratfor makes it look as though Russia under Putin is some type of military aggressor while ignoring the aggression of the United States and NATO on Russia's critical borders and around the world.

What would happen if Russia fomented a *coup* against a democratically elected government in Mexico City and then threatened to move its troops to the Texas border? Would the United States have a compelling interest to secure its borders and complain of Russian aggression? But this is exactly what the United States did in the Ukraine, at a time that Sen. McCain boasted that the US was involved in the overthrow of legitimate governments. McCain even showed his face in Kiev at a critical moment of social unrest against a democratically elected government. Why was he even there? He certainly did not represent the interests of the reigning

government but wanted it to be overthrown as another victim in a series of ["spring times" he bragged about facilitating](#). If Russia is defending its interests on its Ukrainian border, so what? Any nation would do the same if provoked as Russia has been. Simply stated, the United States has over 2,000 military bases stationed worldwide; Russia has a handful in its own region – so who is the aggressor.

US military spending is higher than that of all the countries of the world *combined*. NATO alone spends ten times more on military than the entire Russian Federation – so who is the aggressor?

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

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

Putin continued:

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


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

"Everything we do is just a response to the threats emerging against us. Besides, what we do is limited in scope and

scale, which are, however, sufficient to ensure Russia's security. Or did someone expect Russia to disarm unilaterally?"

MAPS OF US BASES AROUND THE WORLD


Looking at the maps below, it seems that Mr. Putin has a valid point, a point that neoliberals at Stratfor want to ignore:



Graphic by 5W Infographics

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

else, consequently, Putin must be a demon.



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

RUSSIA WANTS WAR




look how close they put their country to our military bases

Donald Trump has indicated that NATO nations should start paying their fair share for military protection rather than letting the United States bear the burden as it has for decades. The US is just one of 28 members, but is responsible for approximately 70% of NATO spending. NATO accepted a policy (2104) that requires all members to contribute a minimum of least 2% of their gross domestic product to NATO. Only five nations out of 28 do so.

NATO Defense Spending: % of GDP

In 2015, five members are expected to meet the alliance goal of spending at least 2% of GDP on defense.



Kedar Pavgi | Defense One | defenseone.com

Source: NATO

In response to Trump's comments about NATO, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker, called for the creation of a European Union Army in lieu of NATO. After Donald Trump's election as US president, Juncker said the EU could no longer rely on America to assure its security and needed a "new start" by building a "European army." The idea is being hotly opposed. It seems that many in Europe want peace with Russia, not war, a cooling, not a heating of relations and are not afraid to blame the European liberals (and their American neoliberal and neocon partners) in the West for provoking Russia and telling the truth about our military failures in "spring" revolutions fomented in Iraq, Syria, Libya and Afghanistan:

It is clear, there are going to be consequences if the EU does not do its agreed part,

"We don't know what that consequence will be, but I think

most Americans are in favor of that. They think everybody should pay their fair share. "There's no reason why the United States of America has to put up with the nonsense of caring for the defense and the security of a country that doesn't pick up its fair share" (Carl Paladino, Trump's NY Campaign Chief).

It will be more cost effective for Europe to increase its support of NATO than to build an entire military system for itself, but it seems that they are getting the Trump message. In this regard, Jens Stoltenberg, [NATO Chief](#), delivered a strong warning following Trump's victory.

["Going it alone is not an option...This is no time to question the partnership between \[Europe and the United States\]\(#\)."](#)

"In these uncertain times we need strong American leadership, and we need Europeans to shoulder their fair share of the burden...But above all we need to recognize the value of the partnership between Europe and America. It remains indispensable."

Clearly, there is going to be an emphasis on NATO; however, it is not clear what direction Europe will take. It has behooved Eastern European nations like Poland to pay their fair share because being a beneficiary of NATO far outweighs the cost of military protection it would have to provide for itself otherwise. Nonetheless, as Europe continues to unravel, as other nations threaten to follow Britain's exit and the crisis with imposed liberalism continues, NATO will have to take these concerns into account if it intends to remain a viable entity. If the United States and Russia join hands to fight international terrorism, as Trump has indicated, it would not be surprising to see Russia become a member of a renewed NATO and a guarantor of world peace. Regarding the current international system, Trump reminds us that:

“I was establishment. Now I’m probably as anti-establishment as God ever created... The economy is rigged, the banks are rigged the whole deal is rigged, folks... It’s a bad system and it’s a dangerous system because people are angry as hell about what’s going on.”

Because Trump sees the current system as “rigged” and “dangerous” there are sure to be changes. As far as the military is concerned, a more likely forecast envisions Trump progressively removing gender confused senior officers placed by President Obama and restoring manliness to the military. This in itself will reduce concerns about homophobic Christian Russia coming from the neoliberal military brass and their civilian employers. In the past, they wanted to contain Russia because of Communism; today they want to contain Russia because of the “contagion” of Christianity.

Analysts at Stratfor are aware of American military presence around the globe; the problem is that they seem to be either neocon or neoliberal ideologues who prefer fiction to truth, *esp.* when the fiction appears to be true as it has for decades. The tide is turning. Stratfor reports that the Russian government claims that the US is engaged in a “plot to dismantle Russia as a whole.” Given American and NATO aggression and the demonization of Russian culture by Western media, the Russian claim does *not* seem unfounded.

Stratfor goes on to claim that countries such as Poland are vulnerable to Russian influences and must therefore “band together” to resist them. This is an old and faded dream by Stratfor founder George Friedman, known as the “*Intermarium*”

The *Intermarium*, George’s cherished vision for a future Europe, is a short-cited perspective that forecasts a soon to be unity of Slavic nations from the Baltic to Black Seas who align with the West against Russia. An *Intermarium* will most likely occur, but not along the lines predicted by Friedman – there will be no *Intermarium* as George Friedman envisions it.

New Era nonetheless, does forecast an Intermarium of sorts; it will consist of Slavic nations from the Baltic to the Black Sea united with each other by their common European and Christian patrimony and united with Russia, which has officially declared itself to be Christian, against the liberalism foisted on them all be the West.

Next years elections in Germany and France will significantly impact EU relations with Russia. If pro-Russia leaders are elected in France or Germany, the European Union will reconsider its relations with Russia. Christian political parties have already gained power in Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia, and Marie Le Pen is the Catholic front runner in France. She has already indicated her desire for positive-constructive relations with Russia. If she should win, Western Europe will move, along with Eastern Europe into a military, economic, and quasi-cultural alignment with Russia rooted in the common Christian patrimony of East and West.

New Era forecasts that the United States, under Donald Trump, will move in a similar direction: Peace with Russia and a reduction of US military involvement abroad *after* the threat of ISIS, Daesh and Al Qaeda is eradicated by a combined and cooperating force of US-European-Russian military units.

Please watch this forecast – it is already in motion.

**Clinton Warhawk for Global
Liberal Agenda Trump Agent of**

Reconciliation and Peace

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT FOR interventionist foreign policy is so common place it is assumed that any Neocon Republican candidate for president must be a war hawk and for good reason: Following the demise of the Soviet Union, Republican think tanks, such as the American Enterprise Institute, crafted the “Project for the New American Century” to spread America’s economic-political-social agenda around the globe as if a victory over the Soviet Union signaled the moment for American hegemony even if it was unwanted by many third world countries in Africa and Asia and newly developing nations in Eastern Europe.

Since that time things have changed considerably. Surprise, it is not Trump, but the Democratic candidate and former Secretary of State Hilary Clinton who has the support of Republican Neocons from the Enterprise Institute (*et al*) who relish her hawkish foreign policy, her ideas of American exceptionalism, and her desire to spread liberalism (esp. political and moral liberalism and American economic interests) abroad while opposing any nation that stands in the way.

The real problem facing the world today is the [“Neoconservative desire to make sure the United States is the lone guarantor of the geopolitical order. This is about Pax Americana. This is about resurrecting the faded dream of a new American century”](#) and it is being spearheaded *not* by the Republican candidate but by Hilary Clinton who is using it to “advance” her liberal agenda around the globe. Quite simply, [Hilary is on the Neocon team](#). According to [CNN](#), National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft has already endorsed Clinton and it is strongly rumored that even [George H.W. Bush is voting for her](#). The [Neocon war hawks want Hilary](#).

Barbara Nuland, the Assistant Secretary of State suffering

from a severe case of “Hawk Fever”, recently told the European Union to “F**k off” because it was seeking a peaceful resolution to the Ukrainian crisis.

According to BBC diplomatic correspondent Jonathan Marcus:

*“The EU is divided and to some extent hesitant about picking a fight with Moscow. It certainly cannot win a short-term battle for Ukraine’s affections with Moscow – it just does not have the cash inducements available. The EU has sought to play a longer game; banking on its attraction over time. But the US clearly is determined to take a much more activist role.” So [“F**k the EU”](#)*

Nuland’s husband, the leading Neocon [Robert Kagan, along with a host of other Republican Neocons, is backing Hilary](#). Speaking at a [“foreign policy professionals fundraiser for Hillary”](#) Kagan (co-founder of the neoconservative think tank Project for the New American Century) stated:

“I would say all Republican foreign policy professionals are anti-Trump...I would say that a majority of people in my circle will vote for Hillary.”

Nothing shouts Secretary Clinton’s status as an extreme war hawk more than the neoconservative propaganda periodical, *Weekly Standard*, which celebrated Clinton’s appointment as secretary of state as a victory, *not for the left*, but for the right, lauding her metamorphosis from “First Feminist” to [“Warrior Queen](#) who has become the [“Great Right Hope.”](#)

“As for the conservatives, many of those who began 2008 willing to do anything to defeat her tended to end it feeling

sorry she lost (to Obama in the Democratic Primary). They began to tell themselves and each other they would sleep better at night if she were the nominee of her party” ([CBS News](#)).

According to [conservative correspondent Noemie Emery](#), Clinton, had “begun the campaign as the former First Feminist” and “ended it as the Warrior Queen, more Margaret Thatcher than Gloria Steinem.”

In short, Ms. Hilary is speaking Neocon babble while Donald Trump appears to be the candidate that will promote global peace and “bring the boys home”.

Speaking ahead of a major foreign policy address in front of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee earlier this year, Trump stated,

“I do think it’s a different world today, and [I don’t think we should be nation-building anymore](#),” Trump said. “I think it’s proven not to work, and we have a different country than we did then. We have \$19 trillion in debt. We’re sitting, probably, on a bubble. And it’s a bubble that if it breaks, it’s going to be very nasty. I just think we have to rebuild our country.”

Donald Trump has also spoken of the Iraqi War as a mistake and accused George W. Bush of prevarication necessary for him to drag the US into the Iraqi conflict.

Trump is also “harshly critical” of John F. Kerry the current Secretary of State and has “questioned the United States’ continued involvement in NATO.” Along these lines, Mr. Trump has indicated that he seeks to remain neutral in relations with Israel. He also [told the Washington](#)

[Post editorial board that he would reduce expenditures on NATO](#), consider closing American bases abroad and adopt an “unabashedly non-interventionist approach to world affairs.”

According to the Post:

In spite of unrest abroad, Trump advocates a light footprint in the world, especially in the Middle East. Trump said the [United States must look inward and steer its resources toward rebuilding domestic infrastructure.](#)

Trump opposes the current American Foreign Policy of global intervention, while Clinton supports it with a fury:

Thus, according to the [CBS News](#):

“For the moment, Hillary Clinton will be the conservatives’ Woman in Washington, more attuned to their concerns on these issues than to those of the get-the-troops-home-now wing of her party, a strange turn of events.”

Branko Marcetic writing for “These Times” summed the situation up well:

It’s not just Neocons specifically. War hawks of all stripes have been happy to shower praise on Clinton’s foreign policy. In 2011, Lindsey Graham [told](#) the Council on Foreign Relations: “This is an outstanding national security team put together by President Obama. I hope he will listen to them. Secretary Clinton is a great choice to be our secretary of state.”

“Any time Lindsey Graham, who eagerly supported the Iraq War and has [repeatedly called](#) for a [war with Iran](#), endorses your national security team, it should stop and give you pause. Then again, given that Clinton [threatened](#) to “totally obliterate” Iran in 2008, perhaps it shouldn’t be surprising.”

Earlier this year, Clinton demonstrated why such a broad array of Neocons and Republican war hawks have been quick to support her. In a carefully planned speech before the American Israel Public Affairs Committee's (AIPAC), Clinton affirmed her adamant loyalty to the Zionist state of Israel and promised military intervention in Iran if necessary.

"Palestinian and human rights advocates were appalled by her remarks to AIPAC (March, 2016) saying that her speech represented 'everything that is bad' with U.S. imperialism and policy in the Middle East.'"

Clinton loves to rattle her saber and enhance that of Israel.

"As president, I will make a firm commitment to ensure Israel maintains its qualitative military edge... "The United States should provide Israel with the most sophisticated defense technology so it can deter and stop any threats. That includes bolstering Israeli missile defenses with new systems like the Arrow Three and David's Sling. And we should work together to develop better tunnel detection, technology to prevent armed smuggling, kidnapping and terrorist attacks."

[Rebecca Vilkomerson](#), Executive Director of Jewish Voice for Peace, said the AIPAC convention "is a reminder of the current limits of the mainstream discourse on Israel, which rely on racist and Islamophobic tropes to justify unquestioning support for Israel."

"From Democrats to Republicans, the message is the same: "More arms for Israel, a stronger relationship between Israel and the U.S., no mention of Palestinian rights, and no recognition of the impossible contradiction of being both democratic and Jewish when the state is predicated on maintaining systems of unequal rights and rule by military occupation."

View full Clinton Speech before AIPAC

Donald Trump Going in a Different Direction than the Neocons

Donald Trump does not appear to be a member of the Neocon-Neoliberal establishment that created the Taliban, Al Qaeda and ISIS in the first place. Strangely, neither Bush Clinton, nor Obama have been willing to team up with Russia to destroy the terrorists. The Neocons have flouted international law by waging unauthorized wars for decade after decade and have achieved very little in the way of positive results. Russia, on the other hand, was invited by Syria to assist it against the terrorists. Russia has achieved in a few months what NATO and the US have been unable to achieve in years. Their presence in Syria has sent the terrorists fleeing; they are now trapped inside of Aleppo. Unless NATO assists them, overtly or covertly, they will soon fall in Syria.

It seems to make sense that the United States and Russia would ally to defeat terrorism around the globe, but Obama, Clinton and the Neocon crowd seem bent against it to the chagrin of candidate Trump who cannot understand their reluctance to team up with Russia to defeat terrorism.

Forced to think about it, Trump, it appears is getting closer to figuring it out. In August (2016) he unleashed charges that [President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton permitted the rise of the Islamic State](#). Trump then rationally proposed alliances with Russia, in a campaign to destroy the terror group.

“In many respects, you know, they (Muslims) honor President Obama,” Trump said. [“He is the founder of ISIS.”](#)”

Trump often speaks off of the cuff and is later forced to clarify his statements. Given an opportunity to clarify the above statement Trump instead amplified it:

"He (Obama) was the founder, absolutely the founder," Trump said on CNBC. "In fact he gets the – in sports, they have awards. He gets the most valuable player award." (See also the [Washington Post](#) – [CBS News](#) – and [The Huffington Post](#)).

Trump drew a loud round of applause at Youngstown State University when he bellowed that U.S. "nation building" in the Mideast and elsewhere would come to an end in a Trump administration.

"It is now time for a new approach. Our current strategy of nation-building and regime change have been a total disaster – Instead, all we got from Iraq and our ventures in the Middle East, was death, destruction and tremendous financial loss. But it's time to put the mistakes of the past behind us and chart a new course...If I become president, the era of nation-building will be brought to a swift close" ([CNN Transcripts](#))

"Our new approach must be to halt the spread of radical Islam...All actions should be oriented around this goal and any country which shares this goal will be our ally. We cannot always choose our friends but we can never fail to recognize our enemies."

The neoliberal global agenda has not made the world a safer place but a much more dangerous one. Prior to Obama's taking office in 2009, Trump pointed out,

"Libya was stable, Syria was under control, Egypt was ruled by a secular president and ally to the U.S., Iraq was experiencing a decrease in violence and Iran was being choked off by economic sanctions."

American foreign policy is in disarray – nothing seems to be working. As Trump says, "It's time to put the mistakes of the

past behind us and chart a new course.” If the United States and Russia form a genuine alliance against terrorism, the terrorists will be defeated and the world can know peace. New Era forecasts that this will happen: A Trump victory and reconciliation with Russia to help usher in an Era of Peace or a Clinton victory and humiliation for the United States if it continues to advance a liberal agenda in defiance of God’s laws.

Kenya Withdraws its Troops from UN Sponsored Mission

KENYA ANNOUNCED THE WITHDRAW of its 1,000 troops from the United Nations sponsored mission in South Sudan. This comes days after the Kenyan Commander, Lt. Gen. Johnson Mogoia Kimani Ondieki, was released because he was so incensed by UN treatment of civilians that he released a report detailing the failure of UN peacekeepers to defend civilians and humanitarian aid workers when they were attacked by radicals in Juba (capital of South Sudan) last July.

In South Sudan 40% of the population is Catholic, with approximately 6.5 million Catholics out of a total population of 16.7 million.

According to Kenyan officials, following an independent investigation appointed by U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon Lt. Gen Johnson was dismissed:

“The investigation was instigated and demanded by certain current and future members of the United Nations Security

Council with vested interests in the political positions to protect in the contexts of what transpired in Southern Sudan during that particular incident that was under investigation,” [Ambassador Kamau said.](#)

Malaysia Follows Tilts Away from US Toward Russia and China

FIRST IT WAS PHILIPPINE PRESIDENT Rodrigo Duterte who promised to break ties with the US and work with China and Russia ([See Philippine President Tilts toward China and Russia](#)).

Less than a week later Malaysian Prime Minister Najib Razak headed to China for a seven day visit ending November 6. As expected, on November 2, Najib joined the growing global chorus when he told the West to “‘*stop lecturing*’ as Malaysia embraces China”.

The week-long trip by Najib Razak marks another potential blow for Washington’s “pivot” toward Asia, two weeks after President Rodrigo Duterte of longtime US ally the Philippines used a visit to China to say it was [“time to say goodbye to America”](#).

According to Asian political analyst [Bridget Welsh](#).

“This is the new regional norm. Now China is implementing the power and the US is in retreat,” she said, adding Washington’s Asia pivot was “dead in the water”.

Najib is expected to sign at least ten trade agreements and a “significant defense deal” in a strategic shift toward China. Chinese corporations are already involved in Malaysia; recently they negotiated a \$7 billion plan to develop a port in Malacca and are looking forward to building a high speed rail connecting Malaysia to the port city of Singapore.

Both the Philippines and Malaysia are members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Formed in 1967 to facilitate cooperation and regional solidarity, ASEAN consists of ten Southeast Asian Countries having a population of 625 million and a combined economic output of nearly three trillion dollars. Brimming with such potential, in 2015 they formed the Asian Economic Community (AEC) to facilitate free movement of economic services, products, supplies and personnel across one of the world’s largest markets.

ASEAN IS AT THE CENTER OF A DYNAMIC ASIA-PACIFIC REGION



Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa have already formed a new global economic cooperative referred to as BRICS. With a combined population of nearly 4 billion people (half of the entire global population), BRICS nations generate roughly 23% of the gross world product and boast a combined GDP of \$37 trillion with over \$4 trillion in foreign reserves.

President Duterte of the Philippines has already clearly articulated his nation's shift toward China and Russia. Now the Prime Minister of Malaysia seems to be moving in the same direction, it is fairly certain that the move will in some way involve the entire BRICS bloc adding to its continued growth and international economic and political clout.

Clearly, the ASEAN region is poised to be an economic and political battle zone pitting Western liberalism led by the US and the UK against the emerging BRICS alliance led by Russia and China.

As early as 1997 Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad manifested disdain for foreign investors operating behind the liberal shibboleth of "free market self interest" whose wealth he said, "must come from impoverishing others, from taking what others have in order to enrich themselves. Their weapon is their wealth against the poverty of others."[\[1\]](#) He specifically pointed out leading liberal ideologue and financier George Soros whom he said was

"..orchestrating Malaysia's economic crisis—the PM announced to an assembled group of economists and bankers that "Mr. Soros's ilk had to be stopped."[\[2\]](#)

Realizing that the *real source* of a nation's wealth is its natural resources and the human labor necessary to extract, transform, and improve them, the PM is opposed to easy money schemes, to usury, currency trading and the speculative derivative market. According to Mahathuir:

“I am saying that currency trading is unnecessary, unproductive and totally immoral. It should be stopped. It should be made illegal. We don’t need currency trading.” [3]

Quoting Pope Leo XIII, Mahathir said that “rapacious usury” is immoral. “It has precipitated economic decline and suffering throughout much of Asia and should be condemned.” [4]

In retaliation, Mr. Soros then called Mahathir a “menace to his own country.” [5]

Mahathir was ardently opposed to the IMF and allied International Banking System that instituted and then mandated neoliberal economic-political policies that drove third world nations around the world into economic and political dependency resulting in much of the unrest and animus toward the West being experienced today.

The World Bank/IMF system is no longer the only player on the block. Third world nations can now turn to BRICS and to other new financial institutions headed by China and Russia *et al* such as the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), which are defending national sovereignty and national self determination and therefore offering grants and aid without political strings attached. Thus, it is not surprising that Malaysian Prime Minister Najib is opening his arms to the AIIB, which he sad represents anew beginning of

“...peaceful dialogue, not foreign intervention in sovereign states”.

Indicating his displeasure with the IMF and World bank, Najib stated that

“Global institutions need to be inclusive of ‘countries that were given no say in the legal and security infrastructure that was set up by the victors of the Second World War.’”

It is hardly any wonder that third world nations fed up with ideological manipulation, paternalism, usury and financial exploitation are looking for alternatives and turning to Russia and China.

Western financial overlords are not going to take the ASEAN exit sitting down. Already naval operations in the South Pacific are turning hot as the US has increased its naval presence and has proliferated military exercises while China protests the intrusion and is engaged in joint naval operations and exercises with Russia. Western agents operating in the Philippines have apparently already swung into full gear facilitating protests against Duterte for his turn toward China. The Philippines has become a hot-spot, a place where unrest is easily predictable despite the fact that Duterte has an 86% approval rating among Filipinos.

Recognizing the trend and the destabilizing effect of foreign agents employed by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) operating in places of vital interest to US foreign policy. Mathew Maavak representing Risk Foresight at the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) comments:

“NGOs and the West-friendly media constitute a major subsidiary of the global social revolutions enterprise. Together, they seek out, identify and amplify public discontent in nations not aligned to the United States.”

“To the agitprop entrepreneur, the returns on revolutionary investments are immense.” [\[6\]](#)

[Tony Cartalucci writing for New Eastern Outlook](#), confirms the covert operations of foreign agents, operations which are no longer clandestine – everyone knows about them.:

“It is becoming clear that US influence – despite its “pivot toward Asia” – is waning across the Asia Pacific region. Washington has suffered geopolitical setbacks in virtually

every nation in Asia Pacific, including those now led by regimes it has meticulously organized, funded, and backed for decades. It is also waning, however, among those nations considered long-time and crucial US allies”

“Asia has for decades been made to “cave” to Washington’s every whim. It should be no surprise that a newspaper founded by a former US intelligence officer and funded by the US State Department would exhibit in its editorial pages the same sort of shameless exceptionalism that the US itself exhibits upon the international stage.”

The United States must rethink its foreign policy and find the political strength to reign in Wall Street and bring rapacious usury under control before it finds the entire world turned against it. The signs of the times indicate a clear trend against liberalism in the guise of friendly liberty, equality and fraternity. Equality went out with socialism, Liberty has reared her ugly head and everyone knows what a “fraternity is” and who it benefits. Amid a growing clamor for justice, morality and charity, developing nations around the world are increasingly turning to Russia. This is surprising only to those who lack a [theopolitical perspective](#). It is not surprising to those who expect an “Era of Peace” and know it is associated with the conversion of Russia.

Peace is coming with our cooperation or without. The United States needs leadership that will align it with Divine Providence and cease working against it.

NOTES

[\[1\]](#) Edward A. Gargan, (1997) “Premier of Malaysia Spars With Currency Dealer,” *New York Times*, September 22.

[\[2\]](#) Ibid

[\[3\]](#) Ibid

[\[4\]](#)

http://www.veteranstoday.com/2016/10/30/george-soros-wants-to-create-color-revolution-in-southeast-asia/#_ftn4

[\[5\]](#) Gargan, "Premier of Malaysia Spars With Currency Dealer," *NY Times*, September 22, 1997.

[\[6\]](#)

<https://sputniknews.com/politics/201610281046843489-soros-wiki-leaks-malaysia-leak/>