

From Bush to Trump: Culture, Economy and War. The Pillars of the New World Order

By [Federico Pieraccini](#)

Global Research, November 30, 2016

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 30 November
2016

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [History](#), [US NATO](#)
[War Agenda](#)

Looking at US history over a fairly long period of time, it is easy to see the destructive path that has accompanied the expansion of the American empire over the last seventy years.

While World War II was still raging, US strategists were already planning their next steps in the international arena. The new target was immediately identified in the assault and the dismemberment of the Soviet empire. With the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Soviet economic model as an alternative to the capitalist system, the West found itself faced with what was defined as 'the end of' history, and proceeded to act accordingly.

The delicate transition from bipolarity, the world-order system based on the United States and the Soviet Union occupying opposing poles, to a unipolar world order with Washington as the only superpower, was entrusted to George H. W. Bush. The main purpose was to reassure with special care the former Soviet empire, even as the Soviet Union plunged into chaos and poverty while the West preyed on her resources.

Not surprisingly, the 90's represented a phase of major economic growth for the United States. Predictably, on that occasion, the national elite favored the election of a president, Bill Clinton, who was more attentive to domestic issues over international affairs. The American financial oligarchy sought to consolidate their economic fortunes by expanding as far as possible the Western financial model, especially with new virgin territory in the former Soviet republics yet to be conquered and exploited.

With the disintegration of the USSR, the United States had a decade to aspire to the utopia of global hegemony. Reviewing with the passage of time the convulsive period of the 90's, the goal seemed one step away, almost within reach.

The means of conquest and expansion of the American empire generally consist of three domains: cultural, economic and military. With the end of the Soviet empire, there was no alternative left for the American imperialist capitalist system. From the point of view of cultural expansion, Washington had now no adversaries and could focus on the destruction of other countries thanks to the globalization of products like McDonald's and Coca Cola in every corner of the planet.

Of course the consequences of an enlargement of the sphere of cultural influence led to the increased power of the economic system. In this sense, Washington's domination in international financial institutions complemented the imposition of the American way of life on other countries. Due to the mechanisms of austerity arising from trap-loans issued by the

IMF or World Bank, countries in serious economic difficulties have ended up being swallowed up by debt.

Too many nations have experienced the tragedy of an economic collapse due to the obligation to privatize or grant to foreign corporations the rights to exploit their primary resources – the long arm of Western governments. Such an economic model has generated an epidemic of predatory finance and speculation, enormously strengthening the domination of the capitalist system on the rest of the globe. It is not a coincidence that in 1995 the WTO was founded, which imposed conditions of trade that strongly favored the European powers and the American empire.

In the event of a failure of cultural or economic pressure, Washington has often opted for real military aggression. An act of war is the most explicit form of abuse and is normally reserved for nations that refuse to comply with Atlanticist directions. In this sense, towards the end of Clinton's term, the tone of the presidency shifted from a predilection towards focussing on the economy to aggression against sovereign nations. The first victim was Somalia, then in short order followed by the bombing of Serbia and the breakup of Yugoslavia. A relatively new phase in the recent history of the United States began, whereby economic and cultural expansion gave way to the reign of destructive bombs and missiles.

Although the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia was successful, the US image in the world began to be diminished, including its cultural leadership. Military action always produces consequences in the functioning of international relations, although history is often written by the winners.

By the end of the 90's, although no country was in a practical position to oppose a cultural, economic or military resistance against Washington, the first thoughts of an alternative alliance to the Western bloc were beginning to emerge. The United States, while sniffing the danger, did not change direction, committed as it was to the idea of a cultural imposition, which became even more pronounced as a result of the expansion of the Internet as well as the effects of economic globalization.

The decision to shift gears, accelerating the triad of cultural, economic and military pressure, was eloquently expressed by the elites with the controversial victory of George W. Bush in 2000.

The successor to Bill Clinton had necessarily to be a president with a strong military angle, a high capacity to expand the capitalist globalization model, and a huge sense of patriotism to spread American propaganda of every possible cultural form in every corner of the planet. The ultimate goal was to surround the Heartland (China + Russia + Eurasia generally) as was expressed by MacKinder, to control their resources. Thus began an uncertain mission, requiring the election of a president friendly to the project of a unipolar New World Order created by the elite.

In the following years, thanks to the September 11, 2001, Washington had a perfect way to expand its wars and terror to every corner of the world. Economic aggression experienced a further boost with the creation of the EURO, a maximal expression in the financial domain. The Internet and increasing growth of interconnectivity ended up accelerating globalization, centralizing even more decision-making power into a few hands. The sum of these factors made it possible to fruitfully continue the devastating work of evangelization according to

the Western economic model.

Yet despite the apparent economic and cultural expansion of the United States, as well as an incessant war operation in Iraq in 2003 and Afghanistan in 2001, the dream of a triumphant march towards global hegemony began to suffer the first setbacks.

The economic or cultural factor began to no longer be sufficient, requiring the opting of an armed solution as in Afghanistan and Iraq, demonstrating in practice how the American empire was serious about expanding eastwards, expanding its ambitions and influence. In this cultural, economic and military march, Washington often ignored or underestimated the consequences of its actions thanks to its unique position as the world superpower. This is a strategic mistake that will cost the United States and its utopian dreams of global domination.

However, the earliest forms of Eurasian resistance already began to emerge in the mid 90's, first with the creation of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in 1996 and then with the Eurasian Economic Union in 2000 (the first discussions began in 1994), two factors that changed the course of history several years later.

The Republic of China, thanks to the pressure resulting from globalization, became the global farm, accumulating wealth and rapidly becoming over the coming fifteen years the first global economic power. The Russian Federation, on the other hand, after a decade of hunger and hardship, elected Putin, a strongman emanating from the intense nationalistic view. Thanks to a protectionist attitude towards the economy and a strong determination to reinvigorate the military role of Russia, in the space of 15 years he brought Moscow to be global power status.

In the end, the Bush era, degraded by destruction in Iraq and Afghanistan, has brought more harm than good in Washington. Bush laid the foundation for a process of unification of the opposing powers to American imperialism and forced them into each other's' arms (BRICS) to mount an effective counter to the cultural, economic and military action of the euro-American elites.

As well as unifying the enemies of Washington, the American home front was beginning to show signs of unrest, both economically and militarily. The two wars deeply shook Western public opinion, forcing the elite to propose a candidate representing rupture who was focused on internal needs. Obama has been the perfect representation of this intent.

Elected with less warlike intentions of Bush and the clear need to reform a financial system that was out of control, he has failed in both cases, dragging the world into an unending conflict while giving high finance absolute control over the levers of economic power. The Fed and the private banks have increased their power enormously under Obama, coming to determine directly the democratic order of even allied nations with mechanisms such as spread or the ability to print money at zero interest. Instead of regulating the perverse financial mechanisms, their influence has increased. Instead of trying to mediate with hostile nations, Obama embarked on a mission of nation-building, regime change and color revolutions, using the whole arsenal of soft-power at his disposal. these were of course intentional and deliberate choices.

Obama was forced to adopt new destabilization techniques to obscure their purpose in the eyes of the population without losing sight of the objectives of the elites established in the

early 90's. Drones, economic manipulation, TTIP, TTP, special forces, color revolutions, the Arab Spring, sanctions and cyber warfare - these have become the Obama administration's modus operandi.

The key factor remains the possibility of denying direct involvement in wars harmful to the image of the United States and its continuing economic, cultural and military expansion. From here these techniques can be seen in 2010 in the Middle East and North Africa, the spread of speculation in some European countries, and drone attacks in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen and Somalia. This is not to mention the hundreds of troops belonging to special forces spread over five continents and the coup financed and organized by the US government organs in Ukraine.

The Obama administration has been accelerating global hegemony by swapping tools, but the effects and causes have remained the same as, or even worse than, previous administrations.

Meanwhile, the economic unions, cultural and military between the three nations pioneer of anti-imperialism, Iran, China and Russia, have accelerated their strategic alignment as an instrument of deterrence against advancing American hegemony.

The war in Syria, combined with the worsening of the crisis with Russia, tensions with China in the South China Sea, and the aggressive posture toward Iran's orbit of Shiite nations, have accelerated the erosion of American power. The main causes are the failed cultural model imposed through the Arab Spring; the economic coup in Ukraine (the nation is on the brink of bankruptcy); and the military impossibility of direct intervention in Syria. The United States, in the space of a decade, has found itself facing a reality no longer compatible with the plan of global hegemony.

The Trump victory fits into this decadent scenario. Are we facing a true revolutionary who intends to rid forever global hegemonic aims, or is he simply a well-thought-out pause, created by the elites to revitalize the economy, arrest the internal discontent in the country, and rebuild the army to resume the march toward global hegemony in 2020?

This is the typical million-dollar question that I tried to give an [answer](#) to in a previous article. At the moment, it is difficult to interpret and predict which path will be taken by the elected president. Both have many arguments to support them and can easily be disputed or accepted. Only time will tell if the reality around us is already now placed in a multipolar world order, or if we are in a convulsive transition phase in which the United States remains anchored to the role of global power hoping to preserve the 'unipolar moment' it began in 1989.

The original source of this article is [Strategic Culture Foundation](#)
Copyright © [Federico Pieraccini](#), [Strategic Culture Foundation](#), 2016

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Federico Pieraccini](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca