

US Foreign Policy Fail in Syria Will US Israel-Russia Policy Bring Peace or Further Failure?

New Era World News and Global Intelligence

RUSSIA'S ENTRY INTO THE SYRIAN conflict turned the tide in favor of Bashar al Assad. Syrian government forces backed by Russian air power and joined by allied forces from Iraq (as well as Iran and Lebanon) have resulted in the near final defeat of ISIS in Syria. Following the route of Terrorist forces in Bukamal (an East Syrian city situated on the Euphrates River in the Deir ez-Zor Governorate just over the border from Iraq), only a few isolated terrorist forces remain in Idlib Province and in small numbers scattered elsewhere waiting to be mopped up. As reported on October 11

“As a consequence of Russia’s decisive involvement, the six year war and propaganda effort waged by the United States and allied nations has failed; the war in Syria is basically over.”

New Era was *not* the only news and intelligence agency forecasting an end to the war in Syria, most analysts have been forecasting an end for months, an end contrary to that desired by war hawks in the United States who bragged the US is: “The best military in the world” a military that can beat any “two bit terrorist organization” and as such will smash Assad, remove this “butcher” from power and “bring Vladimir Putin (like a dog) to heel”.

<https://newera.news/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Syria.mp3>

Audio of Warhawk Senator John McCain on Syria: (See 2:20 – 3:00 and 4:04 – 4:21) – How Far are the Hawks from Reality?

Now, with a Syrian victory at hand, it appears as though Assad will remain in power and the people of Syria will exercise their democratic rights to determine who their future leader will be by recourse to a national election.

Near conclusive as this end might be, it does not sit well with conservative and liberal war hawks in American government representing the interests of the American military establishment. They are now joining in chorus to tell the public that Assad is incapable of winning the war due to massive casualties suffered by his military exacerbated by extensive damage to the country's vital infrastructure.



According to the [Washington Post](#)

“The government of Bashar al-Assad, lacking manpower, reliant on allies and almost broke, is no longer capable of a military win in Syria’s civil war, U.S. officials said Monday, pushing back against Russian and Syrian assertions that victory is only a matter of time.”

Warlords in the Trump administration seem to think that Assad's military has withered and that the war fought in his favor was due to allied forces from Iraq, Iran and Lebanon that might no longer be interested:

“When we look at what it would take to make a victor’s peace sustainable in any country, the Syrian regime does not have it...They’re not wealthy, they’re not rich in manpower, they’re not rich in other capabilities, and the grievances, if anything, are sharper now than they were at the beginning of this conflict.”

US hawks are making this the new pillar of justification for ongoing involvement, the reason for maintaining troops and weapons in Syria despite overt formal requests made by the Syrian government for them to leave.

The US-Jewish neo liberal military-economic-financial alliance is uncomfortable with the new geopolitical landscape inadvertently created by US foreign policy initiatives in the Middle East: With Assad in control of Syria buttressed by an ongoing alliance with Lebanon (and a new alliance with *both* Iraq and Iran), an Iranian land bridge has been created stretching from Persia to the disputed Golan Heights on the Israeli border. To make matters worse, the US has alienated Turkey by supporting the Kurds (whom the Turks consider terrorists) in Northern Syria and Iraq. Thus, any future scenario pits the United States, Israel and terrorist Kingpin Saudi Arabia against Russia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon and probably Turkey which has worked with Russia and Iran as a peace broker in the region along with [China whose interest in the conflict has peaked due to massive economic outlays planned and already implemented in Syria \(2 billion dollars planned\)](#) and the broader Levant and Middle East.

As noted by the Asian Times;

“Few remember that before the war China had already invested tens of billions of US dollars in Syria’s oil and gas industry. Naturally the priority for Damascus, once the war is over, will be massive reconstruction of widely destroyed infrastructure. China could be part of that via the AIIB

([Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank](#)). Then comes investment in agriculture, industry and connectivity – transportation corridors in the Levant and connecting Syria to Iraq and Iran (other two Obor hubs).”

“What matters most of all is that Beijing has already taken the crucial step of being directly involved in the final settlement of the Syrian war – geopolitically and geo-economically. Beijing has had a special representative for Syria since last year – and has already been providing humanitarian aid”

Given the unexpected input from Russia and China and the alliance between Iran and Iraq as well as the movement of Turkey away from the UN and toward Russia-China, **the political and military situation in the Middle East and around the globe has outgrown the ability of the United States to respond effectively.** The US is beset with problems in Latin America, North Korea, South Asia and elsewhere. US troops remaining in Syria are vulnerable because they are interpreted by indigenous forces as a destabilizing factor that has been overcome but refuses to leave.

The real problem for the US in the region is the ongoing request for continued support from the Zionist State of Israel against an emergent Iran, its significantly strengthened nemesis now cooperating with both Iraq and Turkey (as well as Russia and Lebanon) due to American and NATO foreign policy blunders. As noted by [Newsweek](#)

*“Moscow’s entrance to the conflict, along with growing jihadist influence among rebel groups, forced the U.S. to realign its position and settle on **a new, informal goal: stopping Iran.** The U.S., now led by maverick President Donald Trump, suspects Iran is seeking to establish a long-term foothold to build an international corridor of influence*

stretching from Tehran to Beirut and Washington is struggling to stop it."

As regards the Middle East, the real challenge for the United States is the structure of its international relations with Israel. Will America remain the guarantor of Zionist expansionist ambitions, disregard the two state solution favored by the United Nations, the Vatican and an increasing array of other nations as well as a growing number of supporters within the United States in opposition to the pro-Zionist forces governing Israel or will it continue to support destabilizing voices coming forth from the [Knesset](#) who claim that the capital of Israel is Jerusalem, a diplomatic reality shunned even by the Vatican, which supports the right of the Palestinian people to their own homeland?

As noted by the [Guardian](#)

*"Israel's mutant version of Jerusalem is far larger than any historical iteration of the city. It contains Palestinian towns, villages and refugee camps, as well as Israeli settlements....Jerusalem is not divided, impoverished and ungoverned because international law makes it so: **it is a situation that flows from the territorial ambitions unleashed by war. Successive Israeli governments have been unable to cope with problems they have created, and lacked the political will to make a peace that will see Palestinians controlling their own lives. Rather than honestly own the situation, Israel's leaders have tried to muddy the legal framework that defines the state of the city.**"*

Recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel will most likely be the most egregious mistake in tune with a long series of recent foreign policy blunders that have eroded peace, destabilized the region and worked satisfactorily to the Zionists, but to the detriment of everyone else in the region (except perhaps Saudi Arabia, who like Israel wants

Iran neutered). According to the [Palestinian Authority](#), if President Trump signs an act recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel:

“It will derail the last hope of peace, and degrade US influence in the world, as countries including Turkey have warned... Recognising Israel’s current version of Jerusalem would create enormous and new insoluble problems without addressing the real issues that beset the city.”

Thus, even the [Times of Israel](#) reports:

“Trump is eager to broker an Israeli-Palestinian final-status deal, and he knows that recognizing Jerusalem as Israel’s capital could be “the kiss of death” to the peace process, as Palestinian officials have warned.”

The PLO continues to that Israel should withdraw from Palestinian territories seized during the 1967 Six-Day War, after which Israel proclaimed ownership of East Jerusalem. Then in 1980, Jewish authorities declared that the entire city of Jerusalem was the capital of Israel. This declaration however, went unrecognized by the Vatican, the United States, Russia and by a majority of UN states and other international organizations.

Perhaps the United States should be a little humble and [take a lesson from Russia, which in April, 2017, compromised by not recognizing all of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, but only its Western part?](#) The Russian maneuver leaves intact significant ground for diplomatic wiggle room. By recognizing only the Western part of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, Russia seems to have denied Israel’s claims to the Eastern part, including the Old City, which Jewish forces captured in 1967 and subsequently effectively annexed.

Russia’s statement, specifically said that [Moscow views](#)

“East Jerusalem as the capital of the future Palestinian state.”

If he wants to avoid angering and further destabilizing the Arab world and hopes to keep alive his dream of brokering the “ultimate” Israeli-Palestinian peace deal, “Trump could choose a similar formulation.”

Will President Trump join hands with President Putin to broker peace in the Middle East or continue committing the US to an increasingly inept foreign policy hinged on support of Zionist expansion to the detriment of the Palestinians and other Secular states and Islamic government in the Middle East? New Era continues to forecast that Mr. Trump will choose the path of peace?

If not, the US will continue committing one foreign policy embarrassment after another, in this case losing Turkey as a long standing ally, an ally that we have already pushed into the Russian camp by supporting the Kurds and now risk pushing even further over the the broader issue of Jerusalem. The President of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, recently indicated what recognizing Jerusalem would do to US relations with Turkey. According to [Fox News](#):

*“Erdogan, while speaking to Parliament, said such a step by President Trump would force Turkey to cut off all diplomatic ties with Israel. **He pledged to rally other Muslim countries to oppose any move to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital.**”*

Likewise, the [Organization for Islamic Cooperation](#), a coalition of Muslim countries, stated that *“the move would constitute ‘naked aggression’ against the Arab and Muslim world.”*

Perhaps the Muslims and emerging Christian and popularity

forces in Europe are correct, *NeoLiberalism is an Emperor with no Clothes*. It is time for America to put its moral cloak back on and to help lead the peace process in accord with the peace promise made by Our Lady Fatima, a promise that President Trump seems mystically aware of:

Things will work out fine between the U.S.A. and Russia. At the right time everyone will come to their senses & there will be lasting peace!

– Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) [April 13, 2017](#)

Trump Wants Peace with Russia but Must Battle His Own Party & Avoid Impeachment

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

FOLLOWING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S November 11, 2017 exchange with Russian President Vladimir Putin, the US Commander in Chief seems to have recalled his election promises to seek friendly cooperation with Russia necessary to defeat terrorism and bolster chances for world peace thereby signaling a personal decision to take more vigorous control of his office, to more firmly exercise his executive powers and to more resolutely direct foreign affairs. If he fails to do so and continues to let himself get browbeat by Congress, he risks looking like an impotent "lame duck" to his executive peers in the international arena.

Pursuant to his impromptu conversation with Putin, President Trump declared ([CNN Nov. 12, 2017](#)):

*“We have to get to work to solve Syria, to solve North Korea, to solve Ukraine, to solve terrorism... People don’t realize Russia has been very, very heavily sanctioned. They were sanctioned at a very high level, and that took place very recently. **It’s now time to get back to healing a world that is shattered and broken.**”*

To secure peace and healing for a broken and shattered world requires that the United States first establish peace with Russia. Thus, [Newsweek \(Nov 12, 2017\)](#) also recorded the president advocating friendly terms with Russia:

“I feel that having Russia in a friendly posture, as opposed to always fighting with them, is an asset to the world and an asset to our country, not a liability.”

President Trump has indicated that the way forward is to show good will and a prudential amount of trust for the Russian leadership. Wanting to take the high road, and act as the bigger man, the president indicated his willingness to take the necessary first steps forward by hinting at reducing the impact of sanctions recently imposed by the US Congress and by offering his hand in trust to the Russian President. Referring to the accusation that President Putin interfered in the US Presidential Election, Trump revealed his willingness to extend a modicum of trust to his Russian peer:

*“Every time he sees me he says, ‘I didn’t do that,’ and **I really believe that when he tells me that, he means it,**” Trump told reporters. “I think he is very insulted by it.”*

Yes, President Putin is insulted, very insulted and perplexed. Thus according to the Russian President:

“Relations between the United States and Russia are at a ‘state of crisis’” (Video 2:41-2:46).

Relations are at a “state of crisis” because Congress under the influence of Neocon war hawks and liberal democrats are interfering with the president’s ability to engage productively in foreign affairs. Unable to fend them off, the president reluctantly agreed to enforce a new round of sanctions recently imposed by Congress. However, President Trump noted that Congress has blatantly interfered with his powers as Chief Executive, thereby insulting him. According to the new Congressional Legislation the president is *not* permitted to amend or lift any of the provisions imposed by Congress without Congressional approval (see video below 40 sec – 1:00) Thus, the [New York Times](#), reported that President Trump is not satisfied with the Congressional sanctions and might ignore them. According to Mr. Trump, the congressional legislation contains:

“‘...Clearly unconstitutional provisions.’” Thereby leaving “open the possibility that he might choose not to enforce them as lawmakers intended.”

The president’s ire was also reported by [NBC News](#) who recorded his telling words:

“The Framers of our Constitution put foreign affairs in the hands of the President. This bill will prove the wisdom of that choice.”

According to [Radio Liberty](#), Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev rejoined:

“‘The hope for improving our relations with the new U.S. administration is now over,’ after Trump reluctantly signed the bill he once opposed, calling it “significantly flawed” and signaling that he might not fully implement the sanctions....’Trump’s administration has demonstrated total impotence by surrendering its executive authority to Congress in the most humiliating way,’ Medvedev said adding; ‘The American establishment has won an overwhelming victory over Trump. The president wasn’t happy with the new sanctions, but he had to sign the bill.’”

Prime Minister Medvedev seemed totally surprised at the ability of Congress to tie an American President’s hands:

“The U.S. establishment has fully outwitted Trump – the president is not happy about the new sanctions, yet he could not but sign the bill,” he added. “New steps are to come, and they will ultimately aim to remove him from power” ([NBC News](#)).

Nonetheless, for these sanctions to be successful, the President as the Executive arm of government must be willing to enforce them. His threat *not* to do so is *not* without precedent; he could always pull an Andrew Jackson and refuse.



President Trump in the Oval Office with Picture of President Andrew Jackson Conspicuously Hovering over His Executive Desk

Andrew Jackson and The Trail of Tears

Andrew Jackson, Trump's esteemed predecessor, was caught up in a similar political imbroglio that involved the removal of Cherokee Indians from their native lands in Georgia onto reservations located on the westbank of the Mississippi River. Jackson displayed his Executive Power by ignoring a Supreme Court ruling in a historic move that became known as the "Trail of Tears". The State of Georgia claimed it had rights to the lands inhabited by the Cherokees. The Cherokee Indians, on the other hand, argued that the land was private property belonging to them and therefore could not be legally alienated. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Cherokee, the land was theirs and they could stay on it.. The court's decision, however, meant little without the executive arm of the President to enforce it. President Jackson favored moving the Indians westward into the Oklahoma Territory and therefore opposed Chief Justice John Marshall's decision. When the decision came across Jackson's desk he vehemently uttered his

famous landmark words:

“Mr. Marshall has made his decision. Now let him enforce it!”

In other words, “Tough s–t; This decision means nothing if unbacked by the my Executive arm.” The indians were forcibly removed to Oklahoma.

As much as President Trump might admire the strong arm abilities of his nineteenth century predecessor, it is doubted that he will resort to Jacksonian politics. Mr. Trump will most likely have to find an alternative route to normalize relations with Russia thereby obtaining his desire for a significantly amended foreign policy emphasizing cooperative relations with the Kremlin as a means toward world peace. One possible route toward this end involves winning support in the upcoming (Nov 2018) Congressional elections.

If Mr. Trump lacks congressional support (as he currently does), and likewise chooses *not* to enforce the sanctions of the Congressional Act that imposes, *against his will*, additional stringent sanctions on Russia, if he chooses to refrain from enforcing these sanctions, he will surely spark legitimate flames intended to immolate his presidency by impeachment. Nonetheless, a man like President Trump, a man used to careful calculations related to getting it his way, a man such as this, might be willing to risk impeachment if he has enough pull in the Senate – This maneuver is also with precedent: [President Clinton was impeached by the House but acquitted in the Senate](#). Moreover, **there was plenty of animus to impeach Andrew Jackson but the House could never muster enough votes necessary to make it happen.** The Republicans currently hold majorities in both the House and the Senate; depending upon how the upcoming Congressional Elections turnout, President Trump might be willing to risk impeachment and avoid acquittal.

Facing the Intelligence Community – Neocon Warhawks and their Liberal Allies

With impeachment looming in the background and lacking necessary support from his own Intelligence Community, Mr Trump is facing an uphill battle, a battle that will require an adroit foreign policy maneuver, one which carries unusual risks. The risks are unusual because President Trump is in an unusually weak position *vis a vis* many members in his own party in addition to stiff opposition from the American Intelligence Community which, based upon paltry, some would say, non-existent, evidence continues to rally against and demonize Russia.

Despite all the verbose and daily rhetoric about Russia hacking American elections, **the best US Intel has come up with (so far) is to blame Russian news outlets such as Sputnik and RT for writing articles that offer a contrary perspective than that put forward by CNN and other US agencies.** Russia does have its propaganda mouthpieces and Sputnik and RT appear to be in the forefront of their propaganda efforts; nonetheless, **the US also has its propaganda outlets such as [Foreign Policy](#), [Foreign Affairs](#), [Radio Free Europe](#) and [Radio Liberty](#)**, to name a few, all operating on foreign soil under the penumbra of 'Freedom of the Press". Thus, if the US wants to charge Russia with interference by Sputnik and RT, then it must be ready to admit its own guilt – **the US runs covert operations and overt news agencies thereby interfering in the elections of sovereign nations worldwide.**

US interference in the political affairs of sovereign nations has reached such a fever pitch that both [Poland](#) and [Hungary](#) are risking sanctions by endeavoring to nationalize their own presses, purging them of foreign influence and liberal values that run contrary to their own traditional values; both Poland and Hungary are fed up with Western interference and are insisting that they have the right as sovereign nations to control their own media outlets. In response, the EU, US and

UK have labeled the Polish and Hungarian governments as autocratic threats to European liberal values and therefore deserving of economic sanctions and judicial review. It seems that the liberal Western nations demand freedom of the press and defend it to the hilt when it involves their interests, but when it works against their interests it is somehow a bad thing. This is the type of hypocrisy that has inflamed Euroscepticism, the type of hypocrisy that brought Trump to power in the USA. Poland and Hungary simply want freedom over their own presses. If the US wants to operate in Poland and elsewhere under the shield: "Freedom of the Press", they are going to have to permit others to do the same and admit that Russia's freedom to operate Sputnik and RT is legal, and licit; it does *not* constitute criminal interference in American elections; **Freedom of the Press is a legal inalienable freedom available to all nations, not just some.**

If the US can employ its propaganda arm operating freely within other nations as a basic democratic right, why is it *not* a democratic freedom when Russia does the same? Why is it a crime for Russia to voice its political opinion in another country and not a violation of freedom when the United States does so, and continues to do so even over the voice of executive and parliamentary opposition in countries such as Poland and Hungary who are being denied freedom of the press in their own countries while Germany, the US and UK operated on their soils under the shield of free press. The United States even operates its press and propaganda campaigns within Russia itself. If the US can do so, it is overt hypocrisy to deny Russia the same right? In other words, there is no case against Russia as Trump has continually stated – the intel community has come up with nothing but the Sputnik – RT accusations.

The lack of a compelling evidence to support the allegations of Russian espionage affecting the US election is so weak that President Trump has called those who advocate increased

tensions and pressure on Russia as “haters” and “fools”:

When will all the haters and fools out there realize that having a good relationship with Russia is a good thing, not a bad thing. There always playing politics – bad for our country. I want to solve North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, terrorism, and Russia can greatly help!

– Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) [November 12, 2017](#)

Trump’s Desire for Peace is Risky in a Political Milieu Wherein Major Players Profit by War and Propagation of a Liberal Agenda

By indicating his willingness to trust Putin and perhaps reduce sanctions against Russia, Trump risks alienating himself from his own intelligence community. He is fully aware of the risks, **but clearly trying to balance them:**

*“I believe that he (Putin) feels that he and Russia did not meddle in the election. As to whether I believe it or not, **I am with our agencies**, especially as currently constituted with the leadership... I believe that our intel agencies, our intelligence agencies, **I work with them very strongly... as currently led**, by fine people, **I believe very much in our intelligence agencies.**”*

Clearly, Trump recognizes the risks and is trying to play both sides of the coin. He would benefit by a cooperative intelligence community, one that promotes the interests of the American people, not one that spies on them, by a foreign policy that advances global peace rather than political and military interference in the affairs of other sovereign

nations in the name of liberal democracy. He is being hindered by an ideology that produces ongoing conflict instead of long desired peace. Warhawks such as Senator McCain who serve the interests of special lobbies and an outdated global vision, a vision locked in World War II-Viet Nam nostalgia and Soviet espionage, warhawks such as these are a plague to peace initiatives. Although they continue to exercise strong influence, in the last analysis it is President Trump who is Commander in Chief; it is he who will decide when and where to commit American Troops and when to use them to back sanctions and engage in military operations. Despite stern opposition to his Russian peace initiatives, Mr. Trump has the large swathe of the American electorate behind him.

In this regard, he seems to have broad support of the **American people** who, according to a recent [Rasmussen Poll](#) (November 13-14, 2017), **agree by nearly a two-to-one margin that a friendly relationship with Russia is of greater value to the United States and the international community than the current hawkish policy that exacerbates relations with Moscow.**

The specific question asked by Rasmussen pollsters was lifted from Trump's own statement about Russia. They asked: *"Do you agree or disagree with the following statement:"*

"Having Russia in a friendly posture, as opposed to always fighting with them, is an asset to the world, and an asset to our country, not a liability."

[The results](#) (according to the Rasmussen) [indicate that a "sharp turnaround" has occurred among the American](#) electorate since the Cold War years during which the broad majority were against improved relations with Russia. Today however,

"Voters by a two-to-one margin agree with President Trump that it's better for the United States – and the world – to have Russia on our side."

Looking further into the issue, Rasmussen found that

“79% of conservatives agree that it’s better to be friends with Russia, but just 27% of liberals share that view.”

The **21% of Conservative Republicans who oppose friendly relations** are drawn from Neocon Warhawks such as Sen. McCain. The **73% of Liberal Democrats who also oppose friendly relations** with Russia are drawn primarily from those who are opposed on moral grounds: [their liberal freedoms such as abortion and homosexuality are being combatted in Russia.](#)

Although 79% of all Republicans agree with President Trump, the 21% who disagree represent **POWERFUL LOBBIES** in the Arms Industry and Intelligence Community supported by Neocon War Hawks in Congress who are further emboldened by a strange alliance with a broad spectrum of liberals (73%), who, like [Hillary Clinton,](#) are hawkish about American Foreign Policy as are Republican Neocons (Republican [Neocon Hawks surprisingly preferred and voted for Hilary Clinton](#) NOT Trump). The **Neocon Republicans and Liberal Democrats; are both purveyors of broadscale liberalism.** Both insist, contrary to President Trump, that America should be the world’s police force and its moral majority, the strong arm enforcer of its liberal moral policies and neoliberal economic initiatives.

The 21% Republican and 73% Democratic cohorts should *not* be considered separately; ON THE ISSUE OF FOREIGN POLICY, THEY ARE IN AGREEMENT. One desires American Foreign Policy to protect its economic hegemony and the other to advance its liberal moral agenda.

Although the president has the majority of his party with him, and a two to one majority among the American electorate (on the Russian Issue) he nonetheless is operating from a near minority. His **opponents consist of 73% Liberal Democrats and a very strong 21% of his own Party.** What this means is that the 2-1 advantage in the American electorate reported by Rasmussen

is negated in reality.

Conclusion

The reason for the 2-1 result is based on the fact that, according to Rasmussen, a full **21% of the American electorate** (Republican and Democratic) **are still “undecided”** about relations with Russia. **This 21% will be pivotal in the struggle over US relations with Russia.** A small group rose to catapult Trump into the presidency, now he needs a similar small group to advance his peace initiatives. Will warhawks, neocons, and their liberal allies continue to get their way, continue to keep America in a constant posture of global policeman threatening war and economic sanctions on all nations that disagree with their neoliberal economic and moral policies, or will President Trump who is seeking a new path toward peace prevail?

Judging from the *corrected* Rasmussen numbers (corrected by the 21% undecided), the President is in a difficult position. He wants peace, which he sees is contingent in many ways upon cooperation with Russia. He has the support of a large segment of the American population, while a lesser but very powerful group of Republicans and Democrat warhawks representing the Intelligence Community, Arms Industry, and Ideological Left are opposed to peace with Russia while another 21% of the electorate remain undecided. The President will have to assume more oversight of the intelligence community, reign in his generals, somehow deal with the greed of those men and women economically invested in expanded military operations, and, of course, deal with the liberal left who stand opposed to any *rapprochement* with a Christianizing Russia that threatens their hard won “liberal freedoms”.

Although it looks daunting, Rasmussen did report a 2-1

advantage. **If a majority of the undecided 21% support Trump candidates in the upcoming (Nov. 2018) Congressional elections, the scenario becomes much more favorable for a rapprochement with Russia and global peace.** In the context of the Virgin Mary's promises at Fatima for an Era of Peace, New Era forecasts a victory for the US President and looks forward to cooperation between the United States and Russia, cooperation that will result in the defeat of terrorism and a real possibility for an Era of Peace..

As concluded in a [December 2016 article](#):

"The age of liberal global hegemony is coming to an end. Increasingly, the nations of the world are opting for national sovereignty and a restoration of traditional family values as the Era of Peace promised at Fatima continues to dawn upon the nations."

If the US continues down its overworn, liberal, neocon path, a path heavily trodden by both Democrats and Republicans, by both Presidents Bush and Obama, if it continues down this path, the US will continue to suffer one foreign policy embarrassment after another – it is opposing the Queen of Heaven who has promised an Era of Peace.

Trump Presidency to be Met by Resistance from Liberal Leaders and their Minions

ALL OVER THE WORLD CHRISTIAN affiliated political parties

committed to traditional moral values, to economic fairness, and the securing of indigenous cultural patrimonies (being challenged by rampant global liberalism), are making their voices heard and their political clout felt. Such new parties are to be found in France, Greece, Poland, Hungary, the Philippines, Nigeria, Uganda, Malaysia, Russia and Slovakia to name the most prevalent (Scroll Down to [“Fast Track to Truth” at newera.news](#)). A similar occurrence is taking place in the United States. Although the Republican Party is by no means a new party, it has activated a previously uninvolved group of white rural married (presumably Christian men or men rooted in traditional moral values) who, like people worldwide, have had enough of the global liberal agenda and are therefore rising in, what the *New York Times* refers to as a “stunning repudiation of the establishment”. These previously latent men have made their voice heard; that voice was the unexpected and decisive factor in the election of Donald Trump to the presidency with the expectation that the president-elect will take the country back from *those few among* the rich and powerful who are misusing their blessings to advance a rebellious clash with Western culture.

“The [Reuters/Ipsos early exit poll](#) found that 75 percent of respondents agreed “America needs a strong leader to take the country back from the rich and powerful.”

Mr. Trump has not yet taken the Oval office and he is already being warned by the aberrant rich and powerful that liberals worldwide are going to raise their guns in opposition. First, he was warned by Hilary Clinton in her concession speech in which she promised a peaceful transition in the best American tradition. Apparently, her showing up to make a concession speech, rather than resisting a Trump victory and refusing to show at all, is all that can be expected from the Clinton camp – her showing up and being cordial represents her idea of a peaceful transition. Although she did not complain and acted

civilly, she wasted no time rallying the troops *against* Trump. Hilary gracefully accepted defeat, as is expected in America. However, those who are expecting peace are in for quite a surprise. Clinton's idea of a peaceful transition has already been witnessed; it took place on stage this morning – that is, the transition is over. After accepting Trump as president in the morning, it was all out war a few hours later, as she had indicated in her speech.

Her first words were a veiled threat:

"Last night, I congratulated Donald Trump and offered to work with him on behalf of our country. I hope that he will be a successful president for all Americans."

Yes, Hilary offered to work with Donald, but on the condition that he will be successful for "all" Americans. She gracefully conceded and offered him an open mind and a "chance" to lead.

"Donald Trump is going to be our president. We owe him an open mind and a chance to lead,"

He will be given a chance, a slim chance. If President Elect Trump does not bring "success" to "all" (LGBT language) or should he trespass on any liberal agenda item that Clinton believes is necessary for "progress" she will *not* work with Mr. Trump but against him. She used her speech to rally the troops urging them *not* to join forces with the new president but to fight on.

"I know we have still not shattered that highest and hardest glass ceiling, but someday, someone will, and hopefully sooner than we might think, right now (double entendre-perhaps)."

Ms. Clinton put Trump on warning: Although she honors the peaceful American transfer of power, she will not remain

peaceful should her agenda be challenged. In other words, she is not behind the president at all, nor will she give him any chance to advance new ideas or initiatives if she thinks they oppose her agenda.

“Our constitutional democracy enshrines the peaceful transfer of power and we don’t just respect that, we cherish it. It also enshrines other things: the rule of law, the principle that we are equal in rights and dignity, freedom of worship and expression. We respect and cherish these values too and we must defend them.”

Hilary is banking on the law and the “rule of law” protecting her and the liberal legion against Mr. Trump; that is why she refers to the “enshrined” rule of law. In other words, Mr. Trump we (the liberal camp) have spent over a hundred years perverting the laws of this country and too bad, you must follow them – so fat chance of success; the LGBT community now has the protection of law. Unfortunately, for Ms. Clinton, with both Houses of Congress and the Presidency in the hands of Republicans backed by a *new cohort of Christian men*, laws are about to change.

Clinton might be right on the topic of equality of human rights and dignity and on freedom of worship, but she is wrong about “*expression*”, which she erroneously tries to sneak in on the coattails of the former correct three. Error does not have any rights. Thus, Pope Pius XI wrote in his encyclical [Mit Brennender Sorge](#):

“Charity, intelligent and sympathetic towards those even who offend you, does by no means imply a renunciation of the right of proclaiming, vindicating and defending the truth and its implications. The priest’s first loving gift to his neighbors is to serve truth and refute error in any of its (expressed) forms. Failure on this score would be not only a betrayal of God and your vocation, but also an offense

against the real welfare of your people and country.

Hilary seems to lack cognizance of the fact that God too is a person and as a Divine Person, he too has rights, Divine Rights:

“It is part of their (the clergy) sacred obligations to do whatever is in their power to enforce respect for, and obedience to, the commandments of God, as these are the necessary foundation of all private life and public morality; to see that the rights of His Divine Majesty, His name and His word be not profaned; to put a stop to the blasphemies, which, in words and pictures, are multiplying like the sands of the desert; to encounter the obstinacy and provocations of those who deny, despise and hate God, by the never-failing reparatory prayers of the Faithful, hourly rising like incense to the All-Highest and staying His vengeance.”

Although error does not have rights, those in error do.

However, one of those rights is *not* the arrogant *expression* of their error. Arrogant expression of ones ideas and aberrant thoughts cannot be a right because human ideas can obviously be erroneous or sinful, in which case, they conflict with Divine Ideas. When that happens, there is a violation of God’s rights. Natural Law and Divine Law are superior to any human law; unless of course, the United States Constitution is accepted as the supreme law of the land, even higher than the Law of God. Hilary, is banking on this long-standing American verity; supreme court justices acting under the penumbra of the US Constitution have given error rights. Nonetheless, although error may be tolerated, it does not have an absolute right to exist especially no right to arrogantly exist:

“In the social life of nations, error may be tolerated as a reality, but never allowed as a right. [Error “has no right to exist objectively nor to propaganda, nor action”](#) (Pius XII Speech Ci Riesce 1953)

All rights are contingent upon human necessities, on those basic things necessary for life and the pursuit of happiness (food, clothing, shelter, education etc.), on those things that are necessary for human advancement, that is the actualization of human potential for wisdom, understanding, and knowledge as well as growth in love and the moral and theological virtues that help men and women to bear fruit and to live the beatitudes. Unlike items in the liberal; agenda, none of these items conflicts with the mind and will of God as He has made them known in the life and teachings of His Divine Son, Jesus Christ.

Hilary pushes the bar to the extreme. She stated in her concession speech that "[our constitutional democracy...demands our participation](#)...so let's do all we can to keep advancing the values and causes we all hold dear."

In other words, it is the sworn obligation of democratic government, as understood by Hilary Clinton, to demand the participation of aberrant thoughts, words and ideas in the public forum, in the courts, schools, and halls of congress while those professing Christian ideas must be demanded to remain silent and keep their thoughts, words, and ideas out of the courts, schools, and halls of Congress, (and to themselves) because the constitution, she sites, has erected a wall of separation between church and state – so "three cheers for the Constitution".

With this type of logic, it is clear – the fight will go on as the liberal cohort continues to defy the laws of God because they believe they have not only a right to voice their errors but also a sacred constitutional right to demand abortion, homosexuality, legalization of drugs, disrespect for authority etc., while any idea rooted in Christianity must be removed from the public forum. Why, because the constitution demands it.

As she tried to sneak in a false right of *expression* upon the

coattails of actual rights, she also tried to sneak in protection of the “American Dream” for aberrant LGBT activists on the legitimate coattails of equal protection for all races and religions, men and women, immigrants and those with disabilities. Following this deviant move, she urged her followers to do everything in their power to advance the LGBT and broader liberal vision.

“We need you to keep up these fights NOW and for the rest of your lives.”

This was the second time Hilary called for a fight “Now”. except, this time, it is not an entendre. The result: hours later in liberal bastions across the country, liberal minions took to the streets shouting slogans such as “Racist, sexist, anti-gay Donald Trump Go Away” and “Not our President”:

[SEE NY TIMES VIDEO: Clinton Minions Take to Streets Fighting “Right Now” – Moments after Hillary Called for it in Her Veiled Concession Speech.](#)

But it is not Hilary alone who will challenge the new president, Hilary was joined in the refrain by fellow champion of the liberal cause, German Chancellor Angela Merkle who has already set liberal conditions on her relationship to the new president and by extension to America itself. In her congratulatory communication Merkel stated:

“Germany and America are connected by values of democracy, freedom and respect for the law and the dignity of man, independent of origin, skin color, religion, gender, sexual orientation or political views.... [I offer the next President of the United States close cooperation on the basis of these values.](#)”

Because Trump received no similar cold shoulder from the Prime Minister of England, the Liberal *New York Times* is looking for

a new champion and thinks they have found one in Germany:

“He (Trump) received no pushback on Wednesday from Theresa May, the British prime minister, who simply congratulated Mr. Trump on his win. The two leaders’ (May and Merkel) reactions were further proof that, after Britain’s decision to leave the European Union, we will have to look to Mrs. Merkel not just to lead Europe but to replace America in leading NATO as well.”

The liberal ideologues are too filled with hate to reconcile with Christian men and women of good will.

Look anywhere on the social media and you can find liberal hatred being fomented. Quite unlike the Obama win eight years ago when Republicans reluctantly put aside their differences and closed rank around President Obama as expected in the best American tradition, no such thing is happening in 2016. Instead of a hand shake, Trump is receiving a loud FU (see video below).

<https://youtu.be/Z1Np4dbqplk>

To bad for the liberals, but they are going to be outplayed by the emerging global forces arrayed against them ([see the “Fast Track to Truth” at newera.news](#)). Trump will find support among the international community to battle the Leviathan of liberalism. All over the world people are rising against the sea of liberal pollution – it is coming to an end and very soon.

The Mother of God promised at Fatima that Russia would be converted and corollary to that conversion she added [“in the end my Immaculate Heart” will triumph.](#) The Triumph of the Immaculate Heart is underway world wide and misguided souls being led by blind guides, such as Ms. Hilary Clinton, Barack O’bama, and Nancy Pelosi *et al* who are clueless, are, like their guides, totally unaware of what is going on. They are no

longer fighting against a mere set of disorganized and muzzled human beings; they are fighting against Divine Providence, which has decreed that the Immaculate Woman and her Divine Son shall triumph over the feculent Prince of Darkness and his enslaved followers ([Genesis 3:15](#) and [Revelation 12:1-6](#)).

S