

Is it Fact or Fiction? US Media Says that New World Order is in Jeopardy with a Trump Presidency

By [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

Global Research, November 11, 2016

[Silent Crow News](#) 10 November 2016

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

The establishment including the Military-Industrial Complex and the mainstream-media (MSM) put their money on Hillary Clinton and lost. They placed their bets on Clinton who was supposed to become the U.S. president but were clearly defeated as Donald Trump cruised to victory. Hillary Clinton sent her campaign chairman John Podesta to inform her loyal grieving supporters to “go home and get some sleep” and that “We will be back and we’ll have more to say tomorrow.” The following day she conceded to Donald Trump. Clinton must have been completely distraught by her loss (she was probably crying her tears out the night before on the missed opportunity to start World War III by launching a thermo-nuclear war against Russia). For now, Hillary Clinton is history.

The mainstream-media (MSM) particularly The New York Times published an article titled ‘*Donald Trump’s Victory Promises to Upend the International Order*’ by Peter Baker which claims that Trump’s victory is “*upending an international order that prevailed for decades and raising profound questions about America’s place in the world.*” America is the engine of the ‘*international order*’ or the ‘*New World Order*’ (NWO) in fact; it has intervened in numerous countries by launching wars of aggression and has instigated numerous coups since the end of World War II. They have imposed international trade policies that favored U.S. corporations, advocated for open borders on an international level and maintained U.S. dollar hegemony as the world’s reserve currency. The New York Times article claims that Trump’s “*America First*” policy will have repercussions worldwide:

For the first time since before World War II, Americans chose a president who promised to reverse the internationalism practiced by predecessors of both parties and to build walls both physical and metaphorical. Mr. Trump’s win foreshadowed an America more focused on its own affairs while leaving the world to take care of itself.

The outsider revolution that propelled him to power over the Washington establishment of both political parties also reflected a fundamental shift in international politics evidenced already this year by events like Britain’s referendum vote to leave the European Union. Mr. Trump’s success could fuel the populist, nativist, nationalist, closed-border movements already so evident in Europe and spreading to other parts of the world

Global markets fell after Tuesday’s election and many around the world scrambled to figure out what it might mean in parochial terms. For Mexico, it seemed to presage a new era of confrontation with its northern neighbor. For Europe and Asia, it could rewrite the rules of modern alliances, trade deals, and foreign aid. For the Middle East, it foreshadowed a possible alignment with Russia and fresh conflict with Iran

Is Donald Trump really an anti-establishment president?

The establishment is concerned that Trump would “shake-up” long standing policies under the Democratic and Republican duopoly that benefitted private interest groups:

He promised to build a wall along the Mexican border and temporarily bar Muslim immigrants from entering the United States. He questioned Washington’s longstanding commitment to NATO allies, called for cutting foreign aid, praised President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia, vowed to rip up international trade deals, assailed China and suggested Asian allies develop nuclear weapons

“I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall” Trump said in 2015. Trump’s plan to build a wall along the borders of Mexico will not stop immigrants from crossing the borders without addressing the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) which has devastated millions of small Mexican farmers. In a February 2014 report by *Public Citizen’s Global Trade Watch* titled ‘*NAFTA’s 20-Year Legacy and the Fate of the Trans-Pacific Partnership*’ specified NAFTA’s impact especially on Mexican farmers:

The agricultural provisions of NAFTA, which removed Mexican tariffs on corn imports and eliminated programs supporting small farmers but did not discipline U.S. subsidies, led to widespread dislocation in the Mexican countryside. Amidst a NAFTA-spurred influx of cheap U.S. corn, the price paid to Mexican farmers for the corn that they grew fell by 66 percent after NAFTA, forcing many to abandon farming. Mexico’s participation in NAFTA also helped propel a change to the Mexican Constitution’s land reform, undoing provisions that guaranteed small plots – “ejidos” – to the millions of Mexicans living in rural villages. As corn prices plummeted, indebted farmers lost their land, which newly could be acquired by foreign firms that consolidated prime acres into large plantations.

As an exposé in the New Republic put it,

As cheap American foodstuffs flooded Mexico’s markets and as U.S. agribusiness moved in, 1.1 million small farmers – and 1.4 million other Mexicans dependent upon the farm sector – were driven out of work between 1993 and 2005. Wages dropped so precipitously that today the income of a farm laborer is one-third that of what it was before NAFTA. As jobs disappeared and wages sank, many of these rural Mexicans emigrated, swelling the ranks of the 12 million illegal immigrants living incognito and competing for low-wage jobs in the United States

Mexico’s economic problems caused by NAFTA did not end there; in fact hunger became increasingly prevalent. NAFTA increased the poverty rate adding more than 19 million more Mexicans. More Mexicans are now living in poverty than they did 20 years ago. Today 60 percent of people live below the poverty line due to NAFTA’s policies:

Although the price paid to Mexican farmers for corn plummeted after NAFTA, the deregulated retail price of tortillas – Mexico’s staple food – shot up 279 percent in the pact’s first 10 years. NAFTA included service sector and

investment rules that facilitated consolidation of grain trading, milling, baking and retail so that in short order the relatively few remaining large firms dominating these activities were able to raise consumer prices and reap enormous profits as corn costs simultaneously declined. This result stands in sharp contrast to promises by NAFTA's boosters that Mexican consumers would benefit from the pact.

Prior to NAFTA, 36 percent of Mexico's rural population earned less than the minimum income needed for food, a share that grew by nearly 50 percent in the agreement's first three years. On the 10-year anniversary of NAFTA, the Washington Post reported, "19 million more Mexicans are living in poverty than 20 years ago, according to the Mexican government and international organizations. About 24 million - nearly one in every four Mexicans - are classified as extremely poor and unable to afford adequate food." Today, over half of the Mexican population, and over 60 percent of the rural population, still fall below the poverty line, despite the promises made by NAFTA's proponents

NAFTA was a decisive victory for U.S. President Bill Clinton and the interest groups he represented behind closed doors. Trump wants to rewrite NAFTA. If Trump's plan is genuine and it moves forward, Mexico can possibly regain its farming sector and provide the Mexican people with jobs that would allow Mexican immigrants residing in the U.S. to return home. One of Trump's policies is the mass deportations of undocumented immigrants which is highly unpopular among many Latinos and pro-immigrant advocates.

As for NATO troops who are supported by U.S. taxpayers, Trump told Charles Lane and the editorial board of the Washington Post on March 21st, that he does "not" want to pull out NATO. Here is what he said:

LANE: As you know, the whole theory of NATO from the beginning was to keep the United States involved in the long term in Europe to balance, to promote a balance of power in that region so we wouldn't have a repeat of World War I and World War 2. And it seems to be like what you're saying is very similar to what President Obama said to Jeffrey Goldberg, in that we have allies that become free riders. So it seems like there's some convergence with the president there. What concerns me about both is that to some extent it was always thought to be in our interest that we, yes, we would take some of the burden on, yes, even if the net-net was not 100 percent, even seven, with the Germans. So I'd like to hear you say very specifically, you know, with respect to NATO, what is your ask of these other countries? Right, you've painted it in very broad terms, but do you have a percent of GDP that they should be spending on defense? Tell me more. Because it's not that you want to pull the U.S. out.

TRUMP: No, I don't want to pull it out. NATO was set up at a different time. NATO was set up when we were a richer country. We're not a rich country. We're borrowing, we're borrowing all of this money. We're borrowing money from China, which is a sort of an amazing situation. But things are a much different thing. NATO is costing us a fortune and yes, we're protecting Europe but we're spending a lot of money. Number 1, I think the distribution of costs has to be changed. I think NATO as a concept is good, but it is not as good as it was when it first evolved. And I think we bear the, you know, not only financially, we bear the biggest brunt of it. Obama has been stronger on the Ukraine than all the other countries put together, and those other countries right next door to the Ukraine. And I just say we have, I'm not even knocking it, I'm just saying I don't think it's fair, we're not treated fair. I don't think we're treated fair, Charles, anywhere. If you look everything we have. You know, South Korea is very rich. Great industrial country. And yet we're not

reimbursed fairly for what we do. We're constantly, you know, sending our ships, sending our planes, doing our war games, doing other. We're reimbursed a fraction of what this is all costing

Trump will support NATO as long as the EU pays for it.

One other positive note, Trump does want a better relationship with Russia who has been fighting alongside Syrian government forces against the Islamic State. Trump wants the U.S. and Russian forces to work together to defeat the Islamic State. Putin has expressed his willingness to work with Trump to rebuild a relationship that is mutually beneficial. *The New York Times* also made accusations that "with Mr. Trump praising Mr. Putin and American investigators concluding that Russians had hacked Democratic email messages." There is no proof that Russia hacked the *Democratic National Convention's* (DNC) emails or that Trump is linked to Vladimir Putin. *The New York Times* itself reported on October 31st 'Investigating Donald Trump, F.B.I. Sees No Clear Link to Russia', perhaps Mr. Baker forgot to read his own news organization's articles on the subject:

Law enforcement officials say that none of the investigations so far have found any conclusive or direct link between Mr. Trump and the Russian government. And even the hacking into Democratic emails, F.B.I. and intelligence officials now believe, was aimed at disrupting the presidential election rather than electing Mr. Trump

Baker's article also mentions that Trump has "assailed China" when it comes to trade. Will Trump create a trade war against China? Trump has criticized China and wants to start "levying tariffs" on China's exports to the U.S. In an interesting twist, Trump also wants to stop the *Trans-Pacific Partnership* (TPP), a trade agreement with 12-nations led by the U.S. designed to isolate China. U.S-China trade deals will become complicated under Trump. A trade war between the U.S. and China could become a possibility under a Trump presidency.

Trump supports Israel and some in Israel support Trump. However, Baker makes the case for Israel's concerns regarding the U.S. role in the Middle East:

Israel was another place where Mr. Trump enjoyed some support, mainly because of the perception that he would give the country a freer hand in its handling of the longstanding conflict with the Palestinians. But Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and other Israeli leaders and commentators worried about a broader disengagement from a Middle East awash in war, terrorism and upheaval.

"Decisions cannot be postponed," said Yohanan Plesner, a former member of the Israeli Parliament now serving as president of the Israel Democracy Institute. "The situation in Syria is very chaotic. The unrest in the region is continuing. America has to decide whether it wants to play an active role in shaping the developments of the region"

Washington wants to remain in the Middle East for its natural resources. Israel also needs Washington to continue to fund their military (Israel Defense Forces) for any conflict against their neighbors and to maintain their illegal occupation. Trump will not change that arrangement. In fact, Trump will recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital defying international

law standards which would instigate an uprising by the Palestinians. Trump would also raise tensions with Iran (who he called a “state sponsor of terror”) by insisting that Iran’s Nuclear Deal must be renegotiated. The question is will the Iranian government renegotiate with the Trump administration? I don’t think so. Expect more conflicts and regime change in the Middle East. A Trump presidency would be a disaster in the Middle East.

Will Donald Trump Stop the ‘New World Order’? Questions Linger

Can Trump’s foreign policies stop the NWO in its tracks? Will Trump expand the military and give it unconditional support with more federal funding or will he close U.S. bases around the world? Would Trump escalate or deescalate the war in Syria? Will Trump reach out to Vladimir Putin and work together to defeat the terrorist networks originally created by Washington? Will he pull back U.S. bases out of Europe and elsewhere encircling Russia and China? Will Trump support “regime change” in Latin America? Would he pull out U.S. troops in Afghanistan and Iraq? Would he continue to sell arms to Saudi Arabia to bomb Yemen? Would he give Israel a free hand in dealing with the Palestinians or its neighbors including Hezbollah and Syria? All remains to be seen. Trump has said that he will be both “reliable” and “unpredictable” as president in his foreign policy speech last April. So tighten your seatbelts, the planet might be in for a ride.

As for Trump’s domestic policies, he said he would cut taxes for businesses and working class families and would immediately eliminate Obamacare, which is something he can move forward with in the first 90 days in office. Would he eliminate unnecessary bureaucracy of doing business in the U.S.? Would he also implement a nationwide “Stop and Frisk” policy in an attempt to reduce crime which is clearly a fascist policy? Would he seek the arrest of Hillary Clinton and seek a criminal investigation into the Clinton Foundation? There are many more questions on what Trump would do when he assumes office this coming January.

✘ Many say Trump is “*anti-establishment*” but at the same time he is choosing prominent members of the establishment like James Woolsey, a former CIA director and a neoconservative as his senior advisor on national security issues. Woolsey was an advocate for the war in Iraq and the Middle East. Trump initially has called the war in Iraq and Libya “disasters” now he selects an extremist advocate who is for war in the Middle East. You know where this is going. Trump’s Vice-President Mike Pence is also an ultra-right wing war monger. Pence mentioned that a safe zone should be established and launch a military strike against the Syrian government of Bashar al-Assad to protect civilians in Aleppo. He would also like to deploy a missile defense shield in the Czech Republic and Poland to counter Russia. That is something Russia would not tolerate. Trump would most likely authorize regime change in Latin America as Telesur reported on October 25th “With a victory in November everything will change, that change includes standing in solidarity with the suffering of the people of Cuba and Venezuela against the oppression of the Castro and Maduro regimes” Trump said at campaign rally in St. Augustine, Florida. Trump has said many things that are questionable especially when it comes to U.S. foreign policy.

What is interesting about Trump’s victory is that the MSM was writing him off as a serious contender. Trump did it without spending enormous amounts of money as did the Clinton campaign. The MSM gave him all the publicity he needed and ran with it. The majority of people who voted for Trump were voting against Hillary Clinton and the establishment. Many voters were also Bernie Sanders supporters (who were angry with Hillary Clinton undermining his campaign) and independents. With Trump, there are many uncertainties

and that is something the world would have to learn to live with. The irony is that as horrible as Hillary Clinton was, at least you knew what to expect and that is something no one can ever deny.

The original source of this article is [Silent Crow News](#)

Copyright © [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#), [Silent Crow News](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **[Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)**

About the author:

Timothy Alexander Guzman is an independent researcher and writer with a focus on political, economic, media and historical spheres. He has been published in Global Research, The Progressive Mind, European Union Examiner, News Beacon Ireland, WhatReallyHappened.com, EIN News and a number of other alternative news sites. He is a graduate of Hunter College in New York City.

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