

The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy

Vol. 13, Nos. 1/2 (Winter-Summer 2017)

A theoretical journal published by
the International Network for Inclusive Democracy

www.inclusivedemocracy.org

ISSN 1753-240X

Table of Contents

Contributors

Prologue (27.12.2017)

Takis Fotopoulos, The crisis of the ideology of neoliberal globalization (12.03.2017)

Takis Fotopoulos, The systematic effort of the Transnational Elite to crush the 'Brexit revolution': From Brexit and Trump to Le Pen (05.05.2017)

Arran Gare & Takis Fotopoulos, The New World Order (NWO) of neoliberal globalization in Australia (17.06.2017)

Neil Clark, Brexit, Trump, the AfD and the "New World Order in Action" (30.09.2017)

Barry Seidman & Takis Fotopoulos, 2017 Barry Seidman's interview with Takis Fotopoulos on "The New World Order in Action" for "Equal Time for Freethought" radio show (23.12.2017)

Contributors

Arran Gare is a well-known Australian philosopher known mainly for his work in environmental philosophy, philosophy of science, philosophy of culture and the metaphysics of process philosophy. He currently holds the position of Associate Professor in the Faculty of Life and Social Sciences at Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne, Australia. His research focuses on transforming culture to create an environmentally sustainable social order.

Neil Clark is a UK-based journalist, writer and broadcaster, regular contributor to newspapers and magazines in the UK and overseas including *The Guardian*, *The Week*, *Morning Star*, *Daily & Sunday Express*, *The Mail on Sunday* & *The Spectator*. He describes himself as a strong opponent to the neo-conservative war agenda - and says he believes in the urgent necessity of a left-right anti-war coalition.

Takis Fotopoulos is a political philosopher and economist who founded the Inclusive Democracy movement, aiming at a synthesis of classical democracy with libertarian socialism and the radical currents in the new social movements. He was an academic, and has written many books and thousands of articles which have been published in British, American and Greek theoretical journals, magazines and newspapers, several of which have been translated into over twenty languages. He is the editor of *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy* (which succeeded *Democracy & Nature*) and is the author of *Towards An Inclusive Democracy* (1997) in which the foundations of the Inclusive Democracy project were set. His latest book is *The New World Order in Action. Volume 1: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the "Left". Towards a Democratic Community of Sovereign Nations* (December 2016).

Prologue

The opening article in this volume (**Takis Fotopoulos** “The Crisis of the Ideology of Neoliberal Globalisation”) shows that it is not only neoliberal globalization itself which is in crisis but also the very ideology used by the elites to justify it. In fact, it was this ideological failure which has led the globalists, including the so-called liberal as well as the communist “Left”, to launch a huge smear campaign against the sovereignty movements, which thrive all over Europe at the moment, characterizing them as ultra-right, if not neo-nazi and racist!

Takis Fotopoulos shows next how the frontal attack against the Brexit revolution has succeeded briefly, in the first semester of 2017, to create ‘victories’ for the elites particularly in France. Yet, it is shown that the rise to the French Presidency of Emmanuel Macron, the purest candidate of the Transnational Elite so far, was mainly due to the indirect help given to the elites by the “Left” French candidate Melenchon, who managed to divide the victims of globalization, fighting a two-front war against the elites but also against the victims of globalization themselves, who dared to support Marine LePen rather than himself!

Next, **Arran Gare**, who is well known to the readers of this journal, as well as its predecessor *Democracy & Nature*, for his important contributions, is engaged in a very interesting exchange with Takis Fotopoulos. In it, he gives a brief but utterly meaningful description of how Australia was fully integrated into the NWO, providing in effect an original and meaningful intervention on the debate about the New World Order of neoliberal globalization.

Neil Clark, an exceptional case of a honest and courageous British left journalist, who has not been absorbed by the pseudo-Left of *Guardian*, the flagship of globalist “Left”, provides an insightful analysis of the real reasons behind the rise of Brexit in Britain and of the AfD in Germany. It should be noted that after Brexit, it was the unexpected good showing of AfD in the German Presidential elections, which has already led to a government paralysis even in a country and an elite famous for their Teutonic thoroughness.

Finally, the publication of the full transcript of **Barry Seidman’s** interview with Takis Fotopoulos on the “*Equal Time for Freethought*” radio show provides our readers with an excellent opportunity to grasp the significance of the latest important book by TF on globalization, the Brexit revolution and the “Left”, which completes his seminal work on Inclusive Democracy.

The Editorial Committee (27 December 2017)

The crisis of the ideology of neoliberal globalization*

TAKIS FOTOPOULOS

(12.03.2017)

Abstract: In this article it is argued that it is not only globalization itself, which is generally recognized to be in a state of serious crisis but that the ideology used to 'justify' (supposedly objectively) neoliberal globalization seems also to be going through a parallel terminal crisis. It is shown that the cause of this crisis is that this ideology never passed the 'reality test', despite the strenuous efforts of the globalist ideologues. It was this recognition and the parallel success of neo-nationalist movements in attracting the masses of the working class victims of globalization from the globalist 'Left', which has led the latter to invent the myth of racism in order to smear the Brexit revolutions in UK, USA and beyond.

It is generally recognized today that globalization goes through its most serious crisis since it developed into the present New World Order (NWO) of neoliberal globalization at the end of the 20th century, as even the flagship of globalist 'Left' admitted very recently reflecting the views of multinational corporations' chief executives.¹ I am talking of course about neoliberal globalization because a capitalist globalization can only be neoliberal, as it implies open and 'liberalized' markets for capital, labor, goods and services — the infamous 'four freedoms' of the EU Maastricht Treaty. No wonder the globalist academics and politicians, i.e. all those taking globalization for granted, have been trying hard lately to counter the widespread and growing discontent against it, which has already taken the form of pure anger. This anger became plain as day in the Brexit revolution, as well as in the results of the US Presidential election, which established a pattern expected to be repeated shortly in the forthcoming elections in France, Italy and so on.

This pattern, as I described it in my latest book,² involves, in the first stage, the launching of a frontal attack by the transnational elites and the local elites associated with them against those questioning in any way the NWO and its institutions, such as the EU, using frequently the 'fear weapon' (aiming at the feeling of insecurity that any radical change inevitably generates to most people) but, also, pure lies and slanders

* This article draws heavily on the author's new book under the title *The New World Order in Action: Globalization, The Brexit Revolution and the "Left"* (Progressive Press, November 2016) which has been published in a second edition (December 2016) with a new chapter on the Brexit Revolution in the USA. <[http://inclusivedemocracy.org/fotopoulos/english/brbooks/The New World Order In Action 2016/The New World Order In Action.htm](http://inclusivedemocracy.org/fotopoulos/english/brbooks/The%20New%20World%20Order%20In%20Action%202016/The%20New%20World%20Order%20In%20Action.htm)>

¹ Larry Elliott, "Executives more upbeat but share doubts over globalisation," *The Guardian* (17/1/2017).

² *The New World Order in Action: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the 'Left'* (San Diego: Progressive Press, December 2016), ch.8.

about the supposed racist, if not 'fascist', nature of the anti-EU forces and so on. Then, a barrage of polls follows which, invariably, predict the defeat of the political forces questioning globalization. These predictions are not simply the result of data manipulation by the pollsters (who are usually funded by the economic and political elites with a clear interest in influencing voters) but may also express their inability to establish the voters' true intentions — some of whom, clearly terrorized by the mass establishment campaign, hide their real intentions of voting. Finally, at the last stage, *catharsis* follows with the reversal of all expectations and the victory of the anti-establishment (i.e. the anti-NWO) forces.

The Ideology of Globalization vs. Reality

The ideology of globalization, which is of course the dominant ideology today, is simply the set of ideas and beliefs which are used to 'justify' (supposedly objectively) neoliberal globalization in all its aspects, i.e. economic, political, cultural and so on. This is the ideology which one can easily find in the publications of the IMF, the World Bank etc., which is repeated ad nauseam by the establishment economists, politicians, academics (who brainwash accordingly their own students) and of course the mass media of the transnational and local elites that express the interests of the minority of the world population benefiting from neoliberal globalization. Inevitably, this ideology is increasingly resented today, either directly or indirectly, by the victims of globalization, i.e. the vast majority of the world population.

This ideology is usually presented under a pseudo-scientific cover, reflecting the dubious scientific nature of economics as such. This nature of economics became particularly evident in the latest two economic crises (in the late 1990s and, particularly, in 2008-9) which no economist has successfully predicted. This is of course something that reflects the fact that economics (and I am talking about both orthodox and Marxian economics) was never a science in the strict sense of the word as I have shown elsewhere³ and most philosophers of science agree on this.

The basis of the ideology of globalization is that the opening and liberalization of markets (or the removal, in IMF parlance, of 'structural deficiencies' or barriers), which are due to inflexibilities of the market mechanism and barriers to free competition, would boost competitiveness and therefore growth and employment. Such barriers that were mentioned in the Cecchini Report,⁴ on which the official ideology of the single market for the EU rested, were the various physical, technical and fiscal barriers that were assumed to obstruct the flow of commodities, capital and labor. As regards to the capital market in particular, freeing this market from any controls, that is, the creation of conditions for the easy and unrestricted flow of capital between countries, was considered to be a basic requirement in this process. This is why the

³ See *Towards an Inclusive Democracy*, (London & N.Y.: Cassell, 1997), ch.8.

⁴ P. Ceccini, *The European Challenge* (London: Wildwood House, 1988)

abolition of all foreign exchange controls has always been considered an essential condition for the 'Single European Market' of 1993.

However, the most important barriers were not the ones explicitly mentioned in the Report, but those implied by it and, in particular, the emphasis it placed on competition. These implied barriers were the 'institutional' barriers to free competition, which had been introduced by the social-democratic consensus (1945-1975) and which the agreement for the Single Market undertook to eliminate — a task brought to completion by the Maastricht treaty. Such institutional barriers were the Keynesian type of state interventionism to secure full employment and the large welfare state that created fiscal and therefore competitiveness problems, the labor unions' "restrictive practices" and the nationalized industries, which did not always act on the basis of micro-economic criteria to raise economic efficiency.

Yet, the systematic removal of these 'barriers', that the opening and liberalization of markets entailed, far from boosting income and employment, it led to massive inequalities and chronic underemployment through the vast expansion of part time work, zero contract hours and so on. Furthermore, the opening and liberalization of markets has led to a tremendous concentration of economic power, which in the last two decades has taken the dimensions of hyper-globalization. A significant recent study⁵ on globalization, among others, confirms the above trends. The main feature of this hyper-globalization has been the rise of Transnational Corporations (TNCs) that, by 2009, numbered more than 80,000, accounting for about two-thirds of world trade. However, hyper-globalization is beneficial only to small sections of the world population, whereas the vast majority of people are victims. This was the inevitable outcome of the opening and liberalization of markets that has led to a huge concentration of power in the hands of TNCs, as scientific studies, such as a 2011 study by the *NewScientist*, have established.⁶ This study, using a database listing 37 million companies and investors worldwide, identified 43,060 TNCs and the share ownerships linking them. It revealed that, of these TNCs, just 1,318 core companies, through interlocking ownerships, own 80% of global revenues. Furthermore, they found that just 147 companies (i.e. less than 1 per cent of the network) form a 'super entity', controlling 40 per cent of the wealth of the entire network!

Furthermore, the supposed benefits of globalization to non-advanced capitalist countries such as China, India, Brazil etc. is in reality a myth. What happens is that TNCs are involved in a huge pursuit of the places all over the globe which secure the minimization of the cost of production in terms of labor cost in particular but also taxes and similar company costs. Multinationals are, rightly (from their own point of view), responding as quickly as possible to those new demands and, as a result, we are

⁵ Arvind Subramanian and Martin Kessler, "The Hyper globalization of Trade and Its Future," Global Citizen Foundation, *Working Paper 3* (June 2013).

⁶ Andy Coghlan and Debora MacKenzie, "Revealed – the capitalist network that runs the world," *NewScientist* Magazine, issue 2835 (24/10/2011). <<https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg21228354-500-revealed-the-capitalist-network-that-runs-the-world/>>

witnessing a level of international outsourcing that we could never have imagined. As it was observed by an expert on the field:

“‘Made in’ labels mean little nowadays: companies based in the west often have their production plants elsewhere and use components sourced from third countries; and are financed by investors in yet other countries. If that were not complex enough, when countries impose trade barriers and erect controls, companies simply move overnight. Regulators and governments often do not stand a chance.”⁷

So, in the NWO, it is no longer nation-states that rule the world, fighting among themselves for the division of world markets, but rather the transnational corporations. It is these huge oligopolies that are always the victors, irrespective of where they base their activities. Therefore, the fact that today China or India look like economic superpowers (or rising superpowers) is not, in effect, an economic miracle but rather an economic mirage. If any of these countries stopped offering the ‘comparative advantages’ they presently do, particularly in terms of cheap production cost they offer to the TNCs, then the economic miracle would end overnight — i.e. as soon as the TNCs move to one of the other countries begging them to invest in their own area.

The mechanism through which the real incomes of the victims of globalization have declined works through the lifting of any significant *social* controls on markets imposed in the past to protect society and environment from markets. The effective lifting of social controls aiming at the protection of society from the markets means that transnational corporations are today free to move capital and commodities all over the world, while having to face regulatory controls only. Furthermore, the ‘liberalization’ of labor markets, which is part of the same process, implies effectively the lifting of social controls to protect labor, for the sake of attracting foreign capital (i.e. the transnational corporations), and making the economy more ‘competitive’. ‘Flexible’ labor is the norm in this process, i.e. a vast expansion of part-time or occasional labor, zero hours contracts etc. — all of which have the effect of artificially reducing the level of unemployment at the expense of real incomes, i.e. incomes which are essentially frozen in real terms.⁸

Furthermore, liberalization of labor markets meant also the opening of borders that facilitated the movement of labor, particularly among the EU countries, through the Lisbon and Schengen Treaties. The result of this was the present migration crisis in the EU that threatens its very foundations. The EU elites are of course in favor of labor market liberalization, so that real wages are suppressed in the EU area but the precondition for such a policy to be effective is that they would be in control of the labor flows. It is exactly the violation of this precondition that has created the present crisis.

Therefore, coming back to the economic ‘miracles’ of countries such as China and India, in fact, they are both characterized by hundreds of millions of starving people and

⁷ Miriam González, “Free trade has won: adapt or die is the only option left to us,” *The Observer* (17/4/2016).

⁸ See e.g. Ed Conway, “The UK is paying the price of its jobs miracle,” *The Times* (14/10/2014).

just a few hundred billionaires, as well as a small (proportionately to their population), but utterly greedy, middle class. India, for instance is a country where Mercedes saw a 47% surge in sales recently and where its super-rich have long raised eyebrows around the world with their spectacular spending,⁹ whereas at the same time nearly half of India's 1.2 billion people have no toilets at home¹⁰ and nearly 2 million children under the age of five die every year from preventable illness as common as diarrhea, and of those who survive, half are stunted owing to a lack of nutrients.¹¹ Yet, the Indian elite recently decided that the country could afford to have its own space program and even launched the first satellites!¹²

The myth, in particular, of the emerging new economic superpower in China is based on crude statistical indicators, such as GDP and the concentration of industrial and trade power within that country. But such indicators ignore the huge size of its population, and the fact that it is basically the TNCs which created the alleged economic miracle, including the post-Mao industrial and trade power. Thus, taking into account relative population sizes, the per capita GNP of China and India is still 11% and 3.5% respectively of that of the USA,¹³ despite the fact that the celebrated growth rates achieved by both countries in the last decade were over six times higher in China and more than four times higher in India, than in the USA.¹⁴ In other words, the so-called economic 'miracles' of globalization (China, India etc.) are, in fact, the myths of globalization, as their rapid growth and industrialization, in the last 35 years or so, simply mirrors the de-growth and de-industrialization of the West. It was from the West that many TNCs moved to China and India to maximize their profits, exploiting the huge comparative advantage of these countries in terms of cheap production cost (mainly cheap — and usually skilled — labor), as well as in terms of markets free of significant social controls, low taxes, and other facilities offered to investors, particularly in the 'special economic zones' of slave labor emerging lately in countries like China. Similarly, the allegation repeated by Obama and all globalist ideologues of the supposed drastic reduction of world poverty as a result of globalization can also be shown to be a statistical myth. The presumed 'elimination' of poverty is almost exclusively due to the fact that the Chinese 'communist' leadership removed from the list of the poor more than 400 million Chinese in the period 1981-2001, simply because they became proud earners of US\$ 1 dollar a day, thus decreasing with one stroke of the pen the percentage

⁹ Jason Burke, "As India's super-rich list explodes, the shopping has only just begun," *The Guardian* (25/7/2014).

¹⁰ "India unveils cheap new village toilets," *BBC News* (1/9/2014). <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-india-29008713>>

¹¹ John Pilger, "In India's land of extremes, resistance is on the rise," *The Guardian* (3/1/2014).

¹² Josh Hrala, "India just launched 20 satellites in 26 minutes and made history," *Science Alert* (22/6/2016). <<http://www.sciencealert.com/india-just-broke-a-record-by-launching-20-satellites-in-one-mission>>

¹³ World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2014*, Table 1.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, Table 4.

of absolutely poor in China by two-thirds and reducing accordingly world poverty — something that every self-respecting ideologue of globalization celebrates!¹⁵

As for the supposedly huge trade power of China, although this is prima facie true, many, if not most, of its high technology exports and imports are due to the activities of foreign TNCs. This means that the moment the country decides to impose drastic social controls on markets to reduce their ‘freedom’ to move capital and commodities in and out of their country (e.g. in order to protect local labor or the environment from the wild exploitation of TNCs), the Chinese ‘miracle’ could end overnight.

Also, one can draw similar conclusions with regards to the other dimensions of transnational economic power, e.g. China’s technological power. As Wolf & Pilling pointed out in their study, a clear indication that China is still well behind is that “economy wide average productivity remains a fifth of US levels.”¹⁶ Even more important is the absence of world-leading Chinese technology companies, as the same study shows, with the principal exception of Huawei, whereas the US by comparison, hosts a significant number of world-leading companies.

The Consequences of Globalization and the Propaganda of the Transnational Elite

But let us see briefly how the globalization process has already led to an unprecedented concentration of income and wealth, which several studies have confirmed.

As regards to the concentration of income, according to Nobel laureate in economics Joseph Stiglitz:

“Large segments of the population in advanced countries have not been doing well: in the US, the bottom 90% has endured income stagnation for a third of a century. Median income for full-time male workers is actually *lower* in real (inflation-adjusted) terms than it was 42 years ago. At the bottom, real wages are comparable to their level 60 years ago.”¹⁷

Also, as regards the concentration of wealth, according to a Credit Suisse report, the richest 1 percent on the planet owned 48.2 percent of the world’s wealth in 2014 (up from 46 percent the year before), whereas the bottom half of the global population owned less than 1 percent of the total wealth!¹⁸ Furthermore, more recent data suggests there has been an acceleration in the concentration of wealth. Thus, according to a very recent OXFAM report, the net worth of the 62 richest people is equal to the combined wealth of half the world (3.5 billion poorest people). Furthermore, as the same study showed, this

¹⁵ World Bank, *World development indicators* 2005, Table 2.5a. See Takis Fotopoulos, “The ‘elimination’ of poverty,” *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol.4, No.1 (January 2008).

<http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol4/vol4_no1_takis_poverty.htm>

¹⁶ Martin Wolf and David Pilling, “China: On top of the world,” *Financial Times* (2/5/2014).

¹⁷ Joseph E. Stiglitz, “Globalization and its New Discontents,” *Project Syndicate* (5/8/2016).

<<https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/globalization-new-discontents-by-joseph-e-stiglitz-2016-08>>

¹⁸ “Richest 1% own 50% of world wealth- Credit Suisse report,” *RT* (16/10/2014). <<http://rt.com/business/195816-richest-1-percent-credit-suisse/>>

trend has accelerated sharply, in the last five years or so, as the wealth of a circle of billionaires consisting of 388 people has risen by 44 per cent (or half a trillion dollars) since 2010, while the wealth of the poorest fell by 41 per cent (more than a trillion)!¹⁹

The social consequences of the huge inequality created by globalization, even in the USA, the country that played a leading role in promoting the opening and liberalization of markets throughout the post-war period, are well known. Thus, a very recent study published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* implicitly showed that the more a country is integrated into the NWO the greater the negative impact on health and life expectancy. The result is that, as average life expectancy in developing nations continues to rise, lifespans in parts of America are getting shorter. This has reached the point where the poorest American men, at the age of 40, have a life expectancy comparable to the average 40-year-old man in Pakistan and Sudan! Rightly, therefore, Dr Deaton, a professor of economics at Stanford University, noted that the “infamous 1 per cent is not only richer” they have “ten to 15 more years to enjoy their richly funded lives,” with their life expectancy being better than the average for any nation on earth.²⁰

Even the *Financial Times*, the systemic financial organ of the Transnational Elite *par excellence* recently had to admit the catastrophic consequences of globalization. As one of its main commentators pointed out: “We are close to the point where globalization and membership of the Eurozone in particular have damaged not only certain groups in society but entire nations,” describing in some detail the economic shocks that ‘inevitably’ result from globalization.²¹ The economic shocks concerned are: the stagnation of real average incomes for two decades but also the global financial crisis — a consequence of globalization — and its permanent impact on long-term economic growth. The overall effect, according to the same report (written just before Brexit!) was:

“In large parts of Europe, the combination of globalization and technical advance destroyed the old working class and is now challenging the skilled jobs of the lower middle class. So, voters’ insurrection is neither shocking nor irrational. Why should French voters cheer labor market reforms if it could result in the loss of their jobs, with no hope of a new one? (...) In 2014, almost 90 per cent of Germans were in favor of free trade, according to a YouGov poll. That has fallen to 56 per cent. The number of people who reject TTIP outright has risen from 25 per cent to 33 per cent over the same period of time.”²²

No wonder that, following in particular the victory of Brexit and the fact that President Trump, during the election campaign, adopted many of the demands of the victims of globalization, the Transnational elites have been terrified by this rapid rise of the anti-globalization movement. Particularly so as it is not anymore just the neo-nationalist

¹⁹ Sam Joiner, “Richest 62 in world worth the same as poorest 3.5 billion,” *The Times* (18/1/2016).

²⁰ Will Pavia, “Poor Americans have same life expectancy as Sudanese,” *The Times* (13/4/2016).

²¹ Wolfgang Münchau, “The revenge of globalization’s losers,” *Financial Times* (23/4/2016).

²² *Ibid.*

movements in East Europe (such as those in Hungary and Poland) which challenge globalization. Following Brexit, the Eurosceptic Alternative for Germany party (AFD) came second, ahead of Chancellor Angela Merkel's CDU, in regional elections held in September, while similar parties and movements in Italy, France, Austria and the Netherlands have also seen a significant rise in their popularity.

This could explain the concerted attack against the rising new anti-globalization movement by some of the prominent members of the Transnational elite, such as the head of the IMF, the president of the European Central Bank and the president of the European Council.²³ All of them suddenly discovered the gross inequality in the distribution of income and wealth as a result of globalization (followed belatedly by the globalists all over the world) — and blamed (not globalization itself, of course!) but just the political elites for not taking enough measures to boost support for low income workers and reducing inequality. Yet, all of them are fully aware of the fact that any such measures are impossible, in an environment of open and liberalized markets. This is because any such measures, if they are designed to be effective (as present circumstances demand), they are bound to affect negatively competitiveness — the foundation of globalization itself.

Not surprisingly, the arch-gatekeeper of globalization, the EU Commission President, immediately came out to 'restore order' and declare that the recipe for combating growing discontent in Europe was "more union" including a military headquarters "to co-ordinate efforts towards creating a common military force". This rightly prompted Le Pen, the leader of the French FN, to ask "What is the EU protecting us from — are you protecting us against prosperity?"²⁴

The Myth of an Implicit Racism behind the Brexit Revolutions of UK and USA

Finally, a particularly odious myth promoted by ideologists of globalization (and explicitly or implicitly by the globalist 'Left') is that both Brexit and Donald Trump were victorious mainly because of an implicit racism in both societies. The obvious intention of this kind of slander was to discard any idea that the Trump vote in the USA (or, similarly the Brexit vote in the UK) had anything to do with class and anti-globalization, and everything to do with racism and anti-immigration! Yet, even orthodox academics could not escape some indirect hints to the class nature of the vote, as when they mention the fact that "Donald Trump was remarkably successful in such mid-West Rust Belt states as Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin, where the decline of manufacturing industry has seemingly created a part of America that can also be said to have been 'left behind'."²⁵

²³ Claire Jones & Alec Barker, "Do more to help globalization's losers, say champions of liberalism," *Financial Times* (13/9/2016).

²⁴ David Charter, "Juncker calls for more union to beat 'galloping populism'," *The Times* (14/9/2016)

²⁵ John Curtice, Professor of politics at Strathclyde University, "The Trump-Brexit voter revolt," *BBC News* (11/9/2016). <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/election-us-2016-37943072>>

On the other hand, two British academics with admitted connections to EU funding (although — as they stated in advance — not for this particular work!) attempted to do exactly this: to use high powered statistical analysis to draw conclusions consistent with the Brein propaganda. That is, the black propaganda that those who voted Brexit did so mainly because of their anti-immigrant or racist feelings rather than because they were angry with the phasing out of their country's economic and national sovereignty within the EU and the fact that their economic position had significantly deteriorated since the opening and liberalization of markets for capital, commodities and labor imposed by Thatcherism first and then by the Maastricht Treaty and the other EU treaties that followed.

Thus, according to this supposedly 'objective' scientific research, those who voted for Brexit did so simply because they were ignorant anti-immigrant (the implicitly insinuation is that they were racists) who in fact live in areas where immigration is low and therefore were hardly in a position to judge whether immigration is good or bad! The two academics, starting with the clearly biased premise that "the EU referendum was, for many people, a referendum on immigration", made a major 'discovery' based on supposedly "hard evidence". Their 'discovery' was that "in most cases, high proportions of Leave voters were not concentrated in areas of high immigration. Apart from a few outliers, the districts with the highest vote for Leave were those with the lowest levels of immigration."²⁶ However, you do not need any sort of statistical analysis but just common sense to realize that immigrants do not have any economic or other incentive to move to deprived areas populated mostly by the victims of globalization and, instead, they tend to concentrate in areas where the beneficiaries of globalization also live, such as London, although, inevitably, many of the victims of globalization also live in such big urban areas and inner London areas. But, at this point, this 'objective' analysis makes another heroic jump to 'justify' the biased premise it started with. Relying on the conclusions of the well-known systemic think-tank *Demos* (presumably based on a similar kind of 'research') according to which "contact with migrants and members of ethnic minority communities 'takes the edge off negative perceptions', something reinforced by assimilation," they drew, hey presto, the pre-conceived conclusion they wanted to 'prove':

"So, where migrants were not present, it appears they were held partly to blame for the all-too-real, but much deeper-seated, economic difficulties experienced by locals."²⁷

Clearly, this is just another distortion of the voting behavior of the victims of globalization. The "economic difficulties experienced by locals" that the research mentions refer, mainly, to the squeezing of wages as a result of immigration. The obvious

²⁶ Chris Lawton and Robert Ackrill, "Hard Evidence: how areas with low immigration voted mainly for Brexit," *Conversation* (8/7/2016). <<https://theconversation.com/hard-evidence-how-areas-with-low-immigration-voted-mainly-for-brexit-62138>>

²⁷ *Ibid.*

inference is that the absence of such a serious squeeze in an area should be taken to mean that, if Brexit was victorious in it, the locals should have been motivated by anti-immigration feelings.

However, the victims of globalization voted for Brexit not just because they suffered a squeezing in their wages during the globalization era but, even more important, because of the general deprivation in their areas, as a result of the closing down of entire industries following the move of the TNCs to the 'labor paradises' of the Far East. Furthermore, they voted for Brexit because of the decaying of the social welfare system, which of course has been directly due to the drastic cut in social spending in the globalization era, as a result of the adoption of tax cutting neoliberal policies. Obviously, the mass influx of immigrants, on top of the cuts in social spending, had surely made the situation worse.

In other words, the real motives of those who voted for Brexit cannot be found on the basis of empirical research, as this sort of analysis idiotically implies, but only on the basis of historical analysis. Thus, the fact that before globalization there were no serious anti-immigrant or Islamophobic trends in Europe is far from accidental. Common sense makes crystal clear that the effects of globalization I mentioned above, as well as those of the mass Islamophobic campaign — supposedly aimed against terrorism but, in fact, aimed to cover up the crimes of the Transnational and Zionist elites in the Middle East during the globalization era — are highly related to the present outburst of anti-immigrant and Islamophobic trends.

Similarly, the Trump victory in the USA simply confirmed the fact, recognized also even by systemic writers, that the movement for Brexit in Britain, as well as the movement for Trump in the United States and similar movements all over Europe, are in fact all parts of a rising new anti-globalization movement which began in Europe and has spread all over the world. As I tried to show in my latest book with respect to Brexit, globalization is a class issue, and Brexit reflected the popular reaction to the class nature of globalization. Furthermore, it was exactly the abysmal failure of the 'Left' in the UK and US to grasp this fact (either for dogmatic reasons or because it has already been fully integrated in the NWO) which has led to its theoretical and consequently political bankruptcy. Therefore, the Trump victory in the USA simply confirmed the fact, recognized also even by systemic writers, that the movement for Brexit in Britain, as well as the movement for Trump in the United States and similar movements all over Europe, are all parts of a rising new anti-globalization movement which began in Europe and has spread all over the world.

Yet both the globalists in the US (i.e. the Democrats as well as the globalist 'Left') and those in the UK did not have any qualms about playing the racist card, in their desperate effort to root out 'Trumpism' and Brexit respectively. The pretext in the US was Trump's senseless promise to build a wall around America and particularly on the border with Mexico to stop mass illegal immigration from that country. On this, he was conveniently 'forgetting' in the process that it was the US elites in the first instance, which, in collaboration with the Mexican elites, created the present dependent development of Mexico, whose growth depends on foreign (i.e. US) investment and

trade, as these elites destroyed any possibility of economic self-reliance in that country. Of course, Mexico's dependent development goes back to the history of its relation to the USA in the last century and NAFTA (the agreement between the local and US elites), simply institutionalized this dependence relationship (exactly as the EU agreement institutionalized Greek dependence on Northern Europe).

Towards A Democratic World Community of Sovereign Nations

As Prof. John McMurtry aptly described the causes underlying the rise of the present anti-globalization movement:

“An underlying revolution in thinking has occurred. Trump has tapped the deep chords of worker rage at dispossession by forced corporate globalization, criminally disastrous Middle East wars, and trillions of dollars of bailouts to Wall Street. He never connects the dots on stage. But by Clinton's advocacy of all of them, she has made them her own and will go down because of it (...) But this is not a Republican-Democrat division. It is as deep as all the lost jobs and lives since 2001, and it is ultimately grounded in the tens of millions of dispossessed people which the life-blind global market system and its wars have imposed on America too.”²⁸

In fact, It is this realization of dispossession by the victims of globalization in Europe and the USA, as a result of the loss of their economic sovereignty (and for many peoples in Europe of their national sovereignty as well), which has led them to move en masse to the neo-nationalist movements:

- from the globalist 'Left', which has been fully integrated into the NWO (Socialists, social democrats as well as political crooks of the SYRIZA and Podemos kind) and also,
- from a myopic anti-systemic Left which, like the millenarians, waits for the socialist revolution, instead of fighting for national and economic sovereignty by breaking the ties with the NWO and its institutions (EU, IMF, WTO and the likes).

No wonder the huge political gap created by the historical Left was quickly filled by neonationalist parties and movements (most of which, however, have nothing to do with old nationalist and racist parties).

In conclusion, only an economic and political union of peoples resisting today's uni-polar NWO would be in a position to create the pre-conditions for transcending the present homogenization and put, instead, the foundations for a different, really self-managed society — something obviously impossible today when the vast majority of the world population, the victims of globalization, live under conditions of effective

²⁸ Prof. John McMurtry, “President Trump: Big Liar Going to Washington or Tribune of the People?,” op.cit.

occupation fighting for their own survival. This requires a new transition strategy aiming to create the conditions for the development of a democratic world community of sovereign and self-reliant nations to replace the present New World Order of neoliberal globalization. It is also hoped that such a strategy would allow a genuine new form of internationalism to be built 'from below', which will be inspired by the principles of solidarity and mutual aid, rather than the catastrophic principles of competitiveness and profit-making, as at present.

The systematic effort of the Transnational Elite to crush the 'Brexit revolution': From Brexit and Trump to Le Pen

TAKIS FOTOPOULOS

(05.05.2017)

Abstract: It is shown that the Brexit revolution of the victims of globalization against the Transnational Elite, which began with the Brexit referendum in 2016 and continued with the US and the French presidential elections, shows presently signs of decline, following the frontal attack of the elites against it. There are strong indications that the Brexit revolution in UK may be being derailed, whereas the corresponding revolution in USA is being betrayed and in France the coronation of a faithful member of the same elites, as the new President of the Republic, looks almost certain. It is argued that only the self-organization of the victims of globalization in the form of Popular Fronts for National and Social Liberation could create the conditions to overcome the new, and worse ever, Middle Ages that the present NWO of neoliberal globalization has heralded.

There is no doubt anymore that a frontal attack has been launched by the entire Transnational Elite¹ against the "Brexit revolution", i.e. the phenomenal insurrection of the victims of neoliberal globalization against the elites, which began in Britain last year and quickly spread all over the world, first to USA and then to France and beyond. However, it is now clear that the systematic attempt to derail the Brexit revolution in UK, as well as Trump's reversal of almost all his pre-election promises to the American victims of globalization within the first 100 days in office, and, finally, the present looming disaster in the French Presidential elections with the almost inevitable coronation of the candidate of the Transnational Elite, the ex-Rothschild banker Macron, are all parts of the same puzzle. This apparent collapse of the 'Brexit revolution' far from reflecting the feelings of the victims of globalization, which, if anything, get stronger all the time, it simply reflects the vicious attack of the elites against any political expression that the Brexit revolution has taken within the last 12 months, either in UK, the USA or France. Therefore, through suppression and mostly deception, they may have succeeded in temporarily suppressing the growing anger of the victims of globalization. Particularly

¹ This is the network of the elites mainly based in the G7 countries, which control the world economic and political/ military institutions (WTO, IMF, World Bank, EU, European Central Bank, NATO, UN and so on. For further analysis of the role of the Transnational elite see Takis Fotopoulos, *The New World Order in Action: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the "Left"* (San Diego, Calif.: Progressive Press, 2nd ed., Dec. 2016), ch.2.

so as the Left, which historically was on the side of society's victims, has clearly changed sides in the globalization era supporting (though not openly) the present New World Order (NWO) of neoliberal globalization and fighting for the improvement of its main institutions, (EU, WTO, IMF, NATO, etc.) instead of fighting for the breaking of the NWO and its institutions, as the historical role of the real anti-systemic Left has always been.

Following an introduction to the myth of the anti-fascist struggle propagated by the ubiquitous media of the Transnational Elites, in the context of their usual diversionary tactics and their tried and tested 'divide and rule' strategy, I will deal first with the on-going counter-revolution against the Brexit revolution itself and the systematic effort to derail it (the general election in June is part of this effort) and then I will continue with the systemic victory to usurp and completely distort the meaning of Brexit revolution in the USA. I will conclude with the attempted crushing of the neo-nationalist movement in France, which could only be successful because of the role of the Left in this country, which, historically, has always been much stronger than in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Thus, given the present murky role of today's 'Left' in directly or indirectly supporting the NWO of neoliberal globalization — as it was shown most clearly in the case of the conversion of Greece, at the hands of a "left" government, into a full protectorate of the Transnational Elite² — what used to be a blessing for a country (i.e. the existence of a strong Left) has become the curse of our day and age!

1. THE RISE OF NEO-NATIONALISM AND THE ELITES' MYTH OF THE ANTI-FASCIST AND ANTI-RACIST STRUGGLE

As I tried to show in my latest book³, when a country today is fully integrated into the NWO of neoliberal globalization and at the same time it does not exert any significant control over the major economic power centers (in which case it can exercise transnational power, e.g. the G7 countries) then its economic sovereignty, is nil. This, in turn, means that, in the present globalization era, the only kind of sovereignty that a country could have is national sovereignty, provided that it can achieve the necessary degree of economic self-reliance. However, the more a country is integrated into the NWO, the lower the degree of self-reliance possible and, correspondingly, the degree of economic and national sovereignty attainable. Only therefore the break with the NWO could allow the degree of self-reliance necessary for national sovereignty. This is why a new Democratic Community of Sovereign Nations⁴ is a vital and imperative need today in the process of building a new society and a new world based on the values of solidarity,

² See Takis Fotopoulos, "The sell-out of Greece by SYRIZA and the bankruptcy of the globalist "Left", *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 11, Nos. 1/2 (Winter-Summer 2015).

<http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol11/vol11_no1_The_Sell-out_of_Greece_by_Syriza_and_the_bankruptcy_of_the_globalist_Left.html#>

³ *The New World Order in Action: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the "Left"*, op. cit. ch.3.

⁴ *ibid.* ch.12.

mutual assistance and democracy in the real sense of the word, i.e. of an Inclusive Democracy (political, economic, social and ecological).⁵

The phasing out of nation-states and economic sovereignty in the NWO

It is clear now that the aim of the Transnational Elite that administers the NWO is to convert nation-states — within the process of the phasing out of their economic and national sovereignty — into, at best, some sort of ‘local authorities’ within a system of global governance, or, at worst, into informal protectorates (e.g. Greece). In this context, the Transnational Elite launched a series of major wars against peripheral countries, which resisted their integration into the NWO. As it can be shown, all these wars of the Transnational Elite were aimed at the forceful integration of the respective countries into the NWO: from the NATO war against Yugoslavia and the war in the Gulf that was followed by the invasion of Iraq and the war against Afghanistan, to the war against Libya and the proxy war on Syria.⁶ In other words, all these wars, which marked the era of neoliberal globalization, were implicitly or explicitly due to the social struggle that followed the phasing out of national and economic sovereignty within the New World Order.

There is therefore no doubt that the Transnational Elite, since the emergence of the NWO, has been engaged, in a systematic campaign to destroy national sovereignty in order to secure the free movement of capital, labor and commodities. The means used for this aim ranged from military ones to economic ones. The former included the campaigns in the Middle East to destroy any regime based on a national liberation movement, e.g. the Ba’athist regimes in Iraq and Syria (i.e. military violence). The latter consisted mainly in economic pressures to integrate peoples into the NWO (through joining its transnational institutions like the World Trade Organization or the European Union), as well as in the activities of well paid by the Transnational Elite NGOs to help the movement of hundreds of thousands of emigrants, under the label of ‘refugees’, from Asia and Northern Africa into Greece and Italy and from there to Europe (i.e. economic violence).

In all these wars, as well as in the Transnational Elite-engineered new conflict in Ukraine,⁷ there were no qualms about allying with various local butchers, which specialize in the use of purely fascist methods to overthrow national liberation regimes:

⁵ Takis Fotopoulos, *Towards an Inclusive Democracy* (Cassell: London & N.Y. 1997), chs. 5-6.

⁶ See Takis Fotopoulos, “New World Order and NATO’s war against Yugoslavia”, *New Political Science*, Vol. 24, No.1 (March 2002), pp. 73-104; “Iraq: the new criminal ‘war’ of the Transnational Elite”, *Democracy & Nature*, Vol.9, No.2 (July 2003), pp. 167-209; “The global “war” of the Transnational Elite”, *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 8 No 2 (July 2002), pp. 210-240.

⁷ Takis Fotopoulos, *Ukraine: The attack on Russia and the Eurasian Union* (Vol. 2 of the *NWO in Action* - to be published later this year).

from the jihad butchers in Libya and Syria (who later took the name ISIS, Al Nusra, etc.) to the self-declared fascists of the Right Sector in Ukraine. The result of all these, essentially fascist wars, was hundreds of thousands of dead people and millions of people whose lives have been destroyed and uprooted, many of them in their desperate effort to avoid the catastrophe of their own countries, as is being shown today with the conversion of the Mediterranean into a 'vast cemetery' of refugees from these areas⁸ and the corresponding conversion of Greece into a huge concentration camp for refugees with its borders blocked by its 'partners' in the EU.⁹ These wars were fascist not only in terms of the ideology used to justify them, which is of course the ideology of neoliberal globalization — although neoliberal globalization itself is a structural change and not simply an ideology, as the 'Left' characterizes it, disorienting the victims of it. But, also, in terms of both the deceitful methods used to secure their fake 'legitimacy' and, even more so, in terms of the massive war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by the Transnational Elite and its organs in overthrowing the targeted regimes. Rightly, therefore, John Pilger, the veteran anti-war journalist, called the 'fascism' of the Transnational Elite 'a modern kind of fascism', which the elites try to hide at all cost, inciting instead the people to fight the old historical fascism and anti-Semitism, in an obvious attempt to disorient the victims of globalization, within the context of the old 'divide and rule' tactics:

"Fascism is preserved as history, as flickering footage of goose-stepping Blackshirts, their criminality terrible and clear. Yet in the same liberal societies, whose war-making elites urge us never to forget, the accelerating danger of a modern kind of fascism is suppressed; for it is their fascism."¹⁰

Instead, the same elites incite the peoples to fight the old historical fascism and anti-Semitism, which, in the present globalization era of the phasing out of nation-states nowadays are just relics of the past with no massive popular support behind them. This is an obvious attempt to disorient the victims of globalization, within the context of the old 'divide and rule' tactics. No wonder, the same organs of the Transnational Elite, assisted by the Zionist elite — which through such organizations as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) (that has been accused of having a "stranglehold" on the US Congress with its power and influence) and George Soros (through his Open Society Foundations and various NGOs) have been accused of being behind all major 'color revolutions' since the fall of the USSR — have been involved in a huge propaganda

⁸ Gianluca Mezzofiore, "EU migrant policy turns Mediterranean into 'vast cemetery' says UN rights chief", *International Business Times* (20/4/2015). <<http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/eu-migrant-policy-turns-mediterranean-into-vast-cemetery-says-un-rights-chief-1497418>>

⁹ Editorial, "Europe turns its back on Greece over refugees", *Financial Times* (28/2/2016).

¹⁰ John Pilger, "Why the rise of fascism is again the issue", *RT* (26/2/2015). <<http://rt.com/op-edge/235807-fascism-mideast-ukraine-neo-nazi/>>

campaign, as well as a campaign to organize 'anti-fascist' demonstrations in Britain, the USA and now in France against the Brexit revolution and its spread.

The aim is to create the false impression that neo-nationalists, who supported Brexit in UK, Trump in the USA, and Le Pen in France are some kind of fascists and/or racists, so that the victims of globalization in these countries are dissuaded from supporting these movements. Yet, these anti-Brexit elites failed both in Britain and USA, as the Brexit revolution won in both countries, although of course the same Transnational Elites then mobilized the local elites in both countries to secure the reversal of the electoral results, as we shall see next. However, in France, their success was even more significant as they managed to isolate the neo-nationalist movement there, with the obvious connivance of the supposedly anti-systemic candidate of the 'Left' Melenchon, who, instead of calling his supporters to vote for the only anti-globalist candidate in the second round, securing this way a possibly mortal blow to the EU he, effectively, endorsed the worst organ of the Transnational Elite today, what he called until yesterday the arch-capitalist enemy, Emmanuel Macron! Why? Because according to this supposedly 'antisystemic' radical, the alternative is fascism, personified by Marine Le Pen! This was the biggest proof to the victims of globalization all over the world that the 'Left' today is their enemy and that therefore only if they abandoned it, as they have been doing en masse lately, and form Popular Fronts for National and Social Liberation (FNSL) all over the world, they have any chance to overthrow the NWO.

In this context, today's social struggle is not anymore just a struggle for social liberation, as it used to be in the past but, also, a struggle for national liberation. This does not of course mean the return to an era of nation-states fighting each other for economic reasons (the division of markets) or geopolitical reasons (allocation of spheres of influence). In other words, this struggle has nothing to do with "a reordering of world affairs based on 'spheres of influence'" — as the ideologues of neoliberal globalization and promoters of the plan for world governance argue, in an obvious attempt to denigrate the struggle of peoples for sovereignty and self-determination.¹¹ Instead, this struggle could lead to the creation of a new democratic world order of sovereign nations.

Neo-nationalism vs. fascism and racism

But, are the 'Brexit revolution' movements in UK, USA and France fascist, nationalist or racist? At the outset, we must show why these movements have nothing to do with fascism and racism, and, in fact, with the pre-war nationalism as such. In truth, what we face today is the rise of a new social movement all over the world, which is smeared by the elites: the neo-nationalist movement.

¹¹ Gideon Rachman, "China, Russia and the Sinatra doctrine", *Financial Times* (24/11/2014).

Thus, the phasing out of the nation-state and national sovereignty, almost inevitably, led to the flourishing of neo-nationalism, as a movement for self-determination. Yet, this development became inevitable only because the alternative form of social organization, confederalism, which was alive even up to the time of the Paris Commune, had in the meantime disappeared. In other words, the peoples' need for self-determination, in the NWO, had no other outlet but the nation-state. Particularly so, as up to a few years ago the world was dominated by nation-states, within which communities with a common culture, language, customs, etc. could express themselves. Therefore, the nation-state became again a means of self-determination, as it used to be in the 20th century, for peoples under colonial rule struggling for their national liberation.

The national culture is of course in clear contradiction with a globalist culture like the one imposed now 'from above' by the Transnational and national Elites. This globalist culture is based on the globalization ideology of multiculturalism, identity politics, the protection of individual human rights (as opposed to collective self-determination), etc. In fact, the globalization ideology is an extension of the classical liberal ideology. Not accidentally, globalist ideologists characterize the present flourishing of what I called neo-nationalism, as the rise of 'illiberalism.'¹²

The neo-nationalist movement had already created strong roots all over the EU, from its older Western part (France, UK, Austria) up to the newly added Eastern part (Hungary, Poland) — and even in the USA itself. Of course, given the huge political and economic power that the elites have amassed against these neo-nationalist movements, it is possible that none of them will ever take over, and even if they do, they may well be forced to fizzle out, as is happening today with the Brexit revolution in the UK, or disappear without trace, as it seems already happening in the USA. Yet, this will not of course stop social dissent against the phasing out of national and economic sovereignty, which is an aspect of today's class struggle between the victims of globalization and its beneficiaries.

On the basis of the above discussion we may therefore distinguish the following differences between old (or classical) nationalism and present neo-nationalism:

- Nationalism developed in the era of nation-states, as a movement for uniting communities with a common history, culture and usually language under the common roof of nation-states. Such states were emerging even as late as in the 20th century when various national liberation movements managed to get their independence from the last colonial empires. On the other hand, neo-nationalism has developed in the era of globalization i.e. the last 30 years or so, when various movements emerged aiming to protect the sovereignty of their nations (national

¹² Tony Barber, "Illiberalism takes root in Europe's fertile centre", *Financial Times* (13/5/2016).

- sovereignty), which was under extinction because of the integration of their states into the NWO;
- Nationalism's emphasis was on the nation-state (or the aspiration for one), whereas neo-nationalism's emphasis is not so much on the nation-state as such, but rather on sovereignty, which has been phased out in the globalization process at the economic but also at the political and cultural levels;
 - Unlike old nationalism, neo-nationalism raises also demands that in the past were an essential part of the Left agenda, such as the demand for greater equality (within the nation-state and between nation-states), the demand to restore social services, the demand to minimize the power of the elites, even anti-war demands;
 - As a result of the above characteristics of neo-nationalism, unlike old nationalism, it is not an aggressive movement. Its aim is not the expansion of a nation's territory or even the change of any borders, but only the defense of the economic and national sovereignty of each nation and consequently of its culture and civilization against the globalist bulldozing of it.

Naturally, given the political origin of many neo-nationalist parties and their supporters, it is not difficult for elements of the old nationalist ideology to penetrate them (e.g. various Islamophobic and anti-immigration trends), which then provide the excuse to the elites and the media to dismiss these movements *in toto* as 'far right', anti-immigrant, racist, etc. However, it can easily be shown that the refugee problem itself is also part and parcel of globalization and of the '4 freedoms' (capital, labor, goods and services) that its ideology preaches. In other words, the anti-immigrant nature of several neo-nationalist movements arises out of the economic consequences of globalization rather than out of any racist or anti-immigrant beliefs of their supporters.

Therefore, neo-nationalism is basically a movement that arose out of the effects of globalization, particularly the liberalization of labor markets, so that labor could become more competitive. The present 'job miracle', for instance, in Britain (which is characterized as "the job creation capital of the western economies"), hides the fact that, as a systemic analyst pointed out, "unemployment is low, largely because British workers have been willing to stomach the biggest real-terms pay cut since the Victorian era."¹³ It is not therefore surprising that even the conservative London *Times* had to admit that this was due to globalization — a fact that the globalist left ignores!

"The surge in support for UKIP is not simply a protest vote. The party has a constituency among those left behind by globalization (...) the globalization of the economy has produced losers as well as winners. As a rule the winners are among the better off and the losers among the least affluent."¹⁴

¹³ Ed Conway, "The UK is paying the price of its jobs miracle", *The Times* (14/10/2014).

¹⁴ Editorial, "The People's Revolt", *The Times* (11/10/2014).

Furthermore, as it was also stressed in the same FT report, “the FN is not the only supposedly rightwing European populist party seeking to draw support from disaffected voters on the left. Nigel Farage, the leader of the UK Independence Party has adopted a similar approach and has been discussing plans to ring-fence the National Health Service budget and lower taxes for low earners, among a host of measures geared to economically vulnerable voters who would typically support Labor.”¹⁵ Similar trends are noticed in other European countries like Finland, where the anti-NATO and pro-independence parties effectively won the last elections,¹⁶ as well as in Hungary, where neo-nationalist forces are continuously rising.¹⁷ In fact, Orbán’s government in Hungary has done a lot in protecting its country’s sovereignty, being as a result, in constant conflict with the Euro-elites, up to the point that one of the EU’s gatekeepers, Luxembourg, has even called for the exclusion of Hungary from the EU!¹⁸ Finally, the rise of a neo-nationalist party in Poland enraged Martin Schulz, the ex-loudmouthed gatekeeper of the Transnational Elite in the European Parliament, who accused the new government as attempting a “dangerous ‘Putinization’ of European politics.”¹⁹ However, what arch-Eurocrats like Martin Schulz ‘forgot’ is that since Poland joined the EU in 2004, at least two million Poles have emigrated, many of them to the UK.

Almost inevitably, in view of the campaigns of the Transnational Elite against Muslim countries (Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Syria), worrying Islamophobic trends have developed within several of these neo-nationalist movements, some of them turning their old anti-Semitism to Islamophobia, supported on this by Zionists themselves!²⁰ Even Marine Le Pen did not avoid the temptation to lie about Islamophobia and anti-Semitism, stressing that there is no Islamophobia in France, although she accepted a rise in anti-Semitism. Yet, she is well aware of the fact that Islamophobia was growing in France well before Charlie Hebdo,²¹ with racial attacks against Islamic immigrants (most of whom live under squalid conditions in virtual ghettos), being very frequent. At the same time, it is well known that the Jewish community is mostly well off and shares a very disproportionate part of political and economic power in the country relative to its

¹⁵ Adam Thomson, “France’s far-right National Front seeks voters from the left”, *Financial Times* (4/1/2015).

¹⁶ “Anti-NATO parties grab top spots in Finland general election”, *RT* (19/4/2015). <<http://rt.com/news/251065-finland-election-centre-party/>>

¹⁷ Hungary’s far-right Jobbik party wins key seat, *BBC News* (13/4/2015). <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-32281713>>

¹⁸ “Exclude Hungary from EU, says Luxembourg’s Asselborn,” *BBC News* (13/9/2016). <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-37347352>>

¹⁹ Martin Summers, “Poland, Hungary used by US as wedge between EU and Russia”, *RT* (13/1/2016). <<https://www.rt.com/op-edge/328758-eu-poland-hungary-putin/>>

²⁰ Adam Sage, “French Jews turn to Le Pen after Muslim attacks,” *The Times* (24/2/2015).

²¹ See e.g. Clemence Douchez-Lortet. “Growing Islamophobia in France: towards a revival of the extreme right?”, *St. Andrews Review* (16/10/2014). <<http://foreignaffairsreview.co.uk/2014/10/growing-islamophobia-france/>>

actual size, as it happens of course also — and to an even larger extent — in the UK and USA.

This is one more reason why Popular Fronts for National and Social Liberation have to be built in every country of the world to fight not only Eurofascism and the NWO — which is of course the main enemy — but also any racist trends developing within these new anti-globalization movements and neo-nationalist parties. This would also prevent the elites from using the historically well-tested ‘divide and rule’ practice to divide the victims of globalization.

Euro-fascists and neo-nationalists

There is a sharp division between Euro-fascists and neo-nationalists in the globalization era. Euro-fascists, although they usually use as their point of reference National Socialism, they do not really question their countries’ membership of the EU and sometimes they are even funded by the Transnational and European elites (e.g. the Ukrainian Euro-fascists)! In fact, their only relation to historical fascism (in a general sense, covering also National Socialism) concerns their practices, but not their real ideology. On the other hand, neo-nationalists are patriots and nationalists, who are ‘recruited’ from every part of the political spectrum, from Left to Right, including sometimes people with sympathies to historical fascism and Nazism, as for instance is the case with the Golden Dawn party in Greece. As we saw above, the unifying element of neo-nationalists is their struggle for national sovereignty, which they (rightly), see as disappearing in the era of globalization. Therefore, even when their main immediate motive is the fight against immigration, indirectly their fight is against globalization, as they realize that it is the opening of all markets, including the labor markets, particularly within economic unions like the EU, which is the direct cause of their own unemployment or low-wage employment. Yet, this is not a racist movement but a purely economic movement, although the Transnational Elite and the Zionist elites, with the help of the globalist ‘Left’, try hard to convert it into an Islamophobic movement — as the *Charlie Hebdo* case²² and today’s war against burkas and burkinis clearly show — so that they could use it in any way they see fit for the support of the NWO.

But, what is the relationship of both neo-nationalists and Euro-fascists to historical fascism and Nazism? As I tried to show elsewhere,²³ fascism, as well as National Socialism, presuppose a nation-state, therefore this kind of phenomenon is impossible to develop in any country fully integrated into the NWO, which, by definition, cannot have any significant degree of national sovereignty. Therefore, the only kind of sovereignty available in the NWO of neoliberal globalization is transnational

²² See *Subjugate the Middle East. Integration into the New World Order* (Vol. 3 of *The NWO in Action*).

²³ Takis Fotopoulos, *Ukraine: the attack on Russia and the Eurasian Union* (Vol.2 of *The NWO in Action*).

sovereignty, which, in fact, is exclusively shared by members of the Transnational Elite. In other words, fascism and Nazism were historical phenomena of the era of nation-state before the ascent of the NWO of neoliberal globalization, when states still had a significant degree of national and economic sovereignty.

However, in the globalization era, it is exactly this sovereignty that is being phased out for any country fully integrated into the NWO. Therefore, the only kind of 'fascism' still possible today is the one directly or indirectly supported by the Transnational Elite, which is in fact a kind of pseudo-fascism — although in terms of the bestial practices it uses, it may be even more genuine than the 'real thing' of the inter-war period. This is, for instance, the case of the Ukrainian fascists who are the closest thing to historical Nazism available today, not only in terms of their practices but also in terms of their history. However, as there is overwhelming evidence of the full support they have enjoyed by the Transnational Elite and (paradoxically?) even by the Zionist elite,²⁴ they should more accurately be called Euro-fascists.

It is therefore clear that the neo-nationalist parties, which are all under attack by the Transnational Elite, constitute cases of movements that simply filled the huge gap left by the integration of globalist 'Left' into the NWO. That is, the kind of Left which, instead of placing itself in the front line of all those peoples fighting globalization and the phasing out of their economic and national sovereignty,²⁵ indirectly, promoted globalization itself, using arguments based on an anachronistic internationalism, developed a hundred years ago or so. As a result, the neo-nationalist parties are embraced today by most of the victims of globalization all over Europe, particularly the working class which used to support the Left,²⁶ whilst the latter has effectively embraced all aspects of globalization (economic, political, ideological and cultural) and has been fully integrated into the NOW — a defining moment in its present intellectual and political bankruptcy.

2. THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION AGAINST THE 'BREXIT REVOLUTION'

A movement for national sovereignty

As I showed elsewhere,²⁷ the UK referendum result in favor of BREXIT from the EU was very much a popular revolution, as almost the entire movement — apart from a small section consisting of a conservative nationalist minority and that tiny part of the economic elite which is not controlled by the multinationals — was a movement 'from

²⁴ "Communists seek Jewish denouncement of oligarch over E. Ukraine raid sponsorship", *RT* (7/11/2014).

<<https://www.rt.com/politics/203111-russian-communists-kolomoyskiy-denounce/>>

²⁵ See e.g. "Globalization is barbarous, multinationals rule world – Marine Le Pen", *RT* (8/12/2014).

<<http://rt.com/news/212435-france-pen-globalization-barbarity/>>

²⁶ Francis Elliott et al., "Working class prefers Ukip to Labour", *The Times* (25/11/2014).

²⁷ *The New World Order in Action: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the "Left"*, op. cit., ch. 8.

below', i.e. from the victims of globalization themselves. In other words, Brexit was in fact a class issue, reflecting the popular reaction to the class nature of globalization. It is exactly for the same reasons that almost immediately after the initial elite shock of the referendum result, the Transnational Elites, in full coordination with the local elites and the corresponding mass media, launched a systematic counter-revolution. The ultimate aim of the counter-revolution was the effective annulment of the referendum result, given that a formal annulment of it was — at present at least — politically prohibitive. This would involve a Britain, formally outside the EU, but essentially implementing all the main constraints on social and economic policies imposed by the full integration of the country into the New World Order of neoliberal globalization, apart perhaps from some (minor) controls on immigration.

The movement for Brexit was effectively a movement for national sovereignty, which was shown to be impossible within the EU. This is because when a government takes for granted the institutional framework of the internationalized market economy and its institutions (such as the EU and the WTO), then, it will simply *have to* implement the same neoliberal policies irrespective of whether it calls itself a government of the Left, including the communist Left. This is exactly what the globalist 'Left' does today when, in the name of an outdated internationalism, does not raise the issue of a new world order based on sovereign nations. Therefore, the issue is not simply one of 'Left betrayal' and this is also why any radical change of the institutional framework 'from within' is not possible. This was proved both in the past (Mitterrand, Lafontaine and so on), as well as at present (SYRIZA) and will, undoubtedly, prove once more to be the case in the future if Podemos take over in Spain, or the Labor party, under Jeremy Corbyn, in Britain.

In fact, sovereignty is a necessary condition (though not a sufficient one) for any radical social change, given that such a change is impossible within the NWO of open and liberalized markets for commodities, capital and labor. Therefore, those like Varoufakis, Zizek and the self-declared 'anarchist'²⁸ Chomsky (who promptly joined Varoufakis' movement!), as well as the rest in the globalist 'Left' (including 'anarchists'), who talk today about open borders, are in fact deceiving the victims of globalization. That is, they exploit the old libertarian ideal for 'no borders' in order to indirectly promote the NWO. No borders is of course an important ideal, provided however that the peoples themselves control the economy — not 'the markets' (i.e. Goldman Sachs²⁹ people and the likes, recently joined by Emmanuel Barroso the ex-President of the European Commission!) or, alternatively, some central planners.

²⁸ Chomsky, according to Murray Bookchin, the doyen of post-war anarchism, has very little, if any, relation to anarchism; see Murray Bookchin's interview in Janet Biehl's *The Politics of Social Ecology* (Black Rose Books, 1998), pp.148-149.

²⁹ Matt Taibbi, "Goldman Sachs – in the center of World Power", *Defend Democracy Press* (25/7/2016).
<<http://www.defenddemocracy.press/goldman-sachs-center-world-power/>>

Open borders in an internationalized capitalist market economy simply mean that multinational corporations will be absolutely free to exploit the productive resources of any country in the world — and particularly labor — in order to maximize their economic power at the expense of societies. In other words, societies, in a state of open borders, will be unable to impose any effective social controls to protect themselves from markets, as Polanyi aptly pointed out long ago.³⁰ Furthermore, as regards the free movement of people in general — rather than just of labor — it was the policy of open borders that was secured by the Schengen Treaty, which contributed significantly to the present huge migration problem. It is exactly for these reasons that a huge resentment has been created among European peoples at the moment against uncontrolled migration, which is of course another indication of the effective undermining of national sovereignty. Thus, according to a recent poll carried out by France's Institute for Opinion Research (IFOP), Europeans overwhelmingly would like to see Schengen halted and the re-establishment of border controls between neighboring countries: 72 percent of French want their borders sealed, while 66 percent of Germans and 60 percent of Italians want the same for their own countries.³¹

It was therefore the resentment of the British people at the loss of their national sovereignty within the EU (despite the fact that the British elites are a constituent part of the Transnational Elite), which has led to a growing anti-EU popular movement in Britain. Thus, as a result of globalization and the consequent freeing and liberalizing of markets, as well as the privatizations and general de-industrialization following the migration of Transnational Corporations (TNCs) to low-cost 'paradises', the jobs of tens of thousands of people have been condemned to oblivion, as has happened repeatedly in the recent past. No wonder Britain today is a service economy with three quarters of its national output produced in the services sector.

The general mobilization of the elites to torpedo Brexit was solely motivated by the knowledge that a Brexit could well lead to a breakup of the EU, therefore thwarting, for many years to come, the completion of the Transnational Elite's plan for global governance. A plan that, in the first stage, seems to assume the creation of economic unions like the EU, NAFTA, etc., which, in a second stage, are going to be united through agreements similar to the TTIP agreement (the Trans-Atlantic trade & investment agreement), towards a final stage of global governance. In fact, Obama's enthusiasm about the EU and his rage against Brexit was purely motivated by the need to protect at all cost the TTIP, as a step towards global governance.

As regards the stand of the British 'Left' on Brexit, particularly damaging to the campaign — although far from surprising — was the stand of the Labor Party. Whereas in the 1975 referendum the Party was split on the Common Market issue — despite the

³⁰ Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation* (Beacon Press, 1944), chs. 5-6.

³¹ "French, Germans & Italians overwhelmingly in favor of abandoning border-free Europe – poll", *RT*(7/4/2016). <<https://www.rt.com/news/338837-europeans-want-border-control/>>

fact that at that time the issue of sovereignty was far less significant — the Party (consisting mainly of Blairites, effectively selected by the war criminal Tony Blair) was now almost unanimous in supporting the EU. Thus, apart from a few exceptions, all sections of the Labor Party were united against Brexit, including its ‘progressive’ leadership under Corbyn, who in the 1975 referendum was himself against the EU! Further to the Left, there was some condemnation of the EU but mainly because of its ‘undemocratic character’, exactly as, Varoufakis, a Soros-supported man,³² argued in his Diem25 Manifesto.³³ At the same time, Trotskytes supported Brexit only tactically, because of the supposedly racist nature of UKIP! In other words, what all the aforementioned ‘Left’ trends effectively were trying to hide was the fact that globalization is the class issue par excellence in the era of globalization. No wonder therefore that the blue-collar workers, the unemployed and those paying the consequences of globalization have moved towards neo-nationalist parties in Europe in general and, in Britain, towards UKIP. This is, of course, another indication of the total political bankruptcy of today’s ‘Left’.

Brexit as a class issue

It is, therefore, clear that the Brexit revolution, far from being an isolated incident, related — as some globalists argued in order to slander it — to the ideological paraphernalia of old British imperialism, reflects, in fact, a world revolutionary phenomenon. In fact, it was the IMF itself that came out in recognizing the revolutionary character of Brexit — of course, in order to express the Transnational Elite’s panic about it and draw the appropriate conclusions. Thus, as *The Times* described the statement by Maurice Obstfeld, the IMF’s chief economist on recent world economic developments:

“Brexit may be the start of a growing revolt against globalization and technological advance in the developed world that threatens to depress living standards, the International Monetary Fund has warned. Persistently weak growth is unleashing ‘negative economic and political forces’ that are fueling protectionism in Britain, the rest of Europe and the US, according to the IMF, and governments need to respond before the problem gets worse.”³⁴

³² See the promotion of Varoufakis (among several other ‘Soros men’) in the following Open Democracy promotional film (an organization mainly funded by Soros).

<<https://opendemocracy.net/civicrm/contribute/transact%3Freset%3D1%2526id%3D19>>

³³ See Takis Fotopoulos, “DIEM25: A Manifesto for Democratizing Europe or for Perpetuating the EU Elites’ Domination of the European Peoples? — Towards a Democratic Community of Sovereign Nations” (19.02.2016), *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 12, Nos. 1/2 (Winter-Summer 2016), pp.5-25.

<http://inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol12/vol12_no1_Diem25_manifesto_democratizing_europe_or_for_eu_elites_domination.html>

³⁴ Philip Aldrick, “Brexit was just the start of a global revolt, IMF warns”, *The Times* (5/10/2016).

In effect, Brexit is a class issue although we have to re-define 'class', so that it could reflect the new realities of the globalization era, as I tried to do elsewhere.³⁵ Briefly, 'class' has to be redefined to include not just the old working class (which has diminished in Europe in general and Britain in particular as a result of de-industrialization — a by-product of globalization itself) but also:

- all those who became unemployed;
- those who became partially employed at subsistence wages;
- those working at zero hours contracts;
- those trying to survive in some sort of self-employment and, finally;
- all those (pensioners, children and so on) who cannot adequately cover even basic human needs like health, education and social care because of the systematic destruction of the welfare state in the NWO of neoliberal globalization.

The fact that Brexit is, in effect, a class issue, expressing the popular reaction to the class nature of globalization, has even prompted some of the world's most powerful investment houses to turn their focus to inequality, with both Bank of America and the international investment firm Pimco warning their clients about the growing risks resulting from the fact that the gulf between rich and poor has been continually rising in the globalization era. Thus, Joachim Fels, global economic adviser at Pimco, wrote in a research note: "The vote in the UK is part of a wider, more global, backlash against the establishment, rising inequality and globalization."³⁶ Similarly, in a research note entitled "Brexit and the war on inequality", Bank of America strategists stressed, "Brexit is thus far the biggest electoral riposte to our age of inequality."³⁷

Furthermore, as I will try to show here, Brexit was very much a popular 'revolution' as the entire movement was a movement 'from below', i.e. from the victims of globalization themselves. The main factor which created a movement 'from below' for Brexit was the growing realization by the British people that its national and economic sovereignty has been decisively eroded within the EU, forcing the elites, albeit reluctantly, to accept the demand for a referendum. This realization was inevitable if one takes into account that Britons, who used to live in one of the strongest nation-states in the world, have now been forced to watch, powerless, the effective destruction of their industrial base, in the very place where industrialization was born.

Needless to add that the globalist 'Left' academic/politicians supporters of the EU, such as Piketty and Varoufakis (the two 'left-wing gurus who try to save Europe' (i.e.

³⁵ Takis Fotopoulos, "Class Divisions Today — The Inclusive Democracy approach", *Democracy & Nature*, Vol.6, No.2 (July 2000). <http://www.democracynature.org/vol6/takis_class.htm>

³⁶ Katie Allen, "UK vote is part of global backlash, investors told", *The Guardian* (28/6/2016).

³⁷ *ibid.*

the EU), according to another EU acolyte³⁸) have nothing to say about all this and the loss of national sovereignty. Instead, they talk about a mythical and disorienting European 'sovereignty', which just suffers from the present lack of internal democracy. This, while at the same time, both Varoufakis and Piketty, following Soros, are in full favor of open borders, without bothering to explain how exactly open borders are compatible with any conception of sovereignty in an internationalized capitalist market economy!³⁹

No wonder most members of the old working class have abandoned their 'natural' leaders, i.e. the Left parties (Labor party, Green party, etc.) and even their own Trade Union leaders, who (apart from a very few honorable exceptions), declared themselves against Brexit on the basis of a variety of excuses, as we shall see next, usually centered around the issue of immigration. Similarly, French Trade Unions, usually controlled by the Left tried everything they could to prevent the 'fascist' Le Pen from winning, presumably because anybody else, even the real Euro-fascist Emmanuel Macron, is better!

In fact, this was a referendum in which an unprecedented number of voters took part, and in which well over a million more people voted for change than for the status quo on UK's membership of the EU. Two important characteristics of the referendum were usually minimized by the Transnational Elite's media: first, the geographical pattern of the vote, which is particularly revealing as regards the class nature of Brexit and, second, the age pattern of the vote, which is very much related to the ideological and cultural aspects of globalization.

As regards first, the geographical pattern of the vote, the way in which people voted was a clear indication of the fact that this was a 'revolution from below' of the victims of globalization. Thus, the only region in England to vote for Remain was London, which voted for this option by 60 to 40 percent. Every other region voted Leave, by 58 percent in Yorkshire and Humberside, 54 percent in the North West, 59 percent in the West Midlands, and more than 50 percent in both the South East and South West. The London result is far from surprising as it is well known that, as the major urban center of the country dominated by the City of London (effectively the financial center of Europe), it attracts not only the economic elites and the upper-middle class, but also the victims of globalization from Britain, the EU and beyond. Therefore, the Bremain victory in London is due to the fact that the majority of the population there consists of either those benefiting from globalization, who are concentrated in the capital that attracts the relevant lines of activity (finance, management and services in general), or of those immigrants or descendants of them, who may or may not belong to the beneficiaries of globalization but aspire to become ones or, alternatively, have been persuaded by the

³⁸ Paul Mayson, "Can two leftwing gurus save Europe?", *The Guardian* (1/4/2016).

³⁹ Piketty: "EU should welcome one million immigrants a year", *BBC News* (7/4/2016).
<<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-35982528>>

EU propaganda that a Brexit could somehow lead to their expulsion from UK. On the other hand, the Brexit victory was overwhelming in the deprived areas of England, where the victims of globalization live, i.e. the victims of the criminal de-industrialization imposed by the multinational corporations, which they moved *en masse* to the Chinese and Indian labor 'paradises'. That is, to the places offering multinationals not only a very disciplined work on survival wages, but also all the tax concessions possible, in order to induce them to invest and create a pseudo kind of development. This was the kind of development that led to the emergence of a few hundred billionaires in those countries, while the mass of the population has suffered the effects of economic as well environmental strangulation.

Finally, as far as the age distribution of the Brexit vote is concerned, the most significant exception to the voting pattern described above was among those under the age of 24, where the Remain vote was 75 percent in favor.⁴⁰ In fact, Remain was supported by an apolitical youth — the perfect subject for manipulation by the elites and its media (including social media) — who are brainwashed by ideological and cultural globalization. Thus, it has been estimated that while there was a turnout of 82% among those aged 55 and over, barely a third of the 18-24 age group managed to cast their vote. But those youngsters who did bother to vote were fanatical opponents of Brexit, who as soon as the referendum result was announced, began demonstrating against it with the direct or indirect support of the local elites, as well as of the Transnational Elite (George Soros, the well-known 'master of ceremonies' of pink revolutions of every kind, played a leading role on this).⁴¹ Yet, when these youngsters were asked to explain their fanatical support for the EU, they were usually at a loss to justify their stand!

Exactly the same pattern of vote, with very similar geographical and age distributions of the vote, marked the voting for Trump in the USA and for Le Pen in the first round of French elections. Remarkably, exactly the same pattern of protest followed the victories against globalization in UK and USA, as well as in France. In all these cases, it was the globalist "Left" which mobilized its supporters (with the 'discreet' support of Soros' organizations and the likes) to protest against the victories of the victims of globalization, which conveniently they characterized as victories of fascism and/or racism!

The counter revolution against the Brexit revolution in UK

⁴⁰ Chris Marsden & Julie Hyland, "'Seismic Shock': UK Vote to Leave the EU Triggers Economic and Political Crisis", *Global Research* (24/6/2016). <<http://www.globalresearch.ca/seismic-shock-uk-vote-to-leave-the-eu-triggers-economic-and-political-crisis/5532656?print=1>>

⁴¹ G. Soros, "The promise of Regrexit", *Project Syndicate* (8/7/2016). <<https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-promise-of-regrexit-by-george-soros-2016-07>>

In the aftermath of the Brexit revolution a new smear campaign began by all those at the service of the NWO of neoliberal globalization aiming, directly or indirectly, to justify the parallel counter-revolution against it, which was launched immediately after it. The obvious aim was to effectively reverse the results of the referendum. Some pundits talked about the return of nationalism and therefore of nationalist wars, which plagued Europe, particularly in the 20th century. Others talked about the victory of German 'imperialism', which allegedly attempts to reverse the results of its defeats in the last two world wars, while still others talked about the nostalgia for British imperialism among many of the voters for Brexit. Most, however, of the 'serious' commentators stressed either the supposed re-emergence of nationalism, or, alternatively, the assumed increase of anti-immigration feelings and the related rise of Islamophobia and xenophobia in general.

In fact, as I tried to show elsewhere,⁴² these are all parts of a huge propaganda campaign orchestrated by the Transnational Elite and its media, NGOs, etc. to divert attention from the real revolutionary nature of Brexit that I described above. That is, from the fact that Brexit was a victory of the victims of globalization against the NWO and as such it was a class victory, in the sense I defined 'class' above. Briefly, I will only point out that neo-nationalist movements are not purely 'nationalist' movements, which ignore class issues and fight only for the 'nation-state', as used to be the case with the old nationalist movements. Neo-nationalists, unlike old nationalists, raise also demands that in the past were an essential part of the Left agenda, such as the demand for greater equality (within the nation-state and between nation-states) and the demand to minimize the power of the elites. In fact, neo-nationalist movements raise even anti-war demands, as when they side against the NWO's wars in the Middle East,⁴³ taking effectively sides in favor of informal patriotic movements such as the Russian one (which also fights against its own globalist 'Left' that is supported by Russian oligarchs, the media and so on). In other words, neo-nationalist movements become themselves, even by default, class movements, as when they fight, directly or indirectly, against globalization, which as we saw above is a class issue.

So, on the one side, are the pro-globalization movements and parties appealing to all those benefiting from globalization (the elites, the upper middle class and part of the petty bourgeoisie which aspires to join them), and, on the other, are the anti-globalization movements and parties appealing to the victims of globalization. No wonder therefore that the old working class (or the remnants of it, following globalization) moved *en masse* towards the latter movements in countries such as Britain,⁴⁴ France and Austria, abandoning the old Left parties, which now survive mainly

⁴² *The New World Order in Action: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the "Left"*, ch.8.

⁴³ See e.g. Anne-Sylvaine Chassany and Roula Khalaf, "Marine Le Pen lays out radical vision to govern France", *Financial Times* (5/3/2015).

⁴⁴ Francis Elliott, et. al. "Working class prefers Ukip to Labor", *The Times* (25/11/2014).

through the support they receive from that part of the middle class which benefits from globalization. In a nutshell, the 'Left' today mostly expresses those benefiting from globalization (or those believing the 'Left' mythology about the benefits of globalization in general and the EU in particular). At the same time, the pro-globalization Left parties (which I called the globalist 'Left') do not have any qualms about characterizing the popular strata which have moved to the neo-nationalist parties as nationalist, fascist, racist, anti-immigrant and so on.

Similarly, some 'nationalists' have found another roundabout way to draw the same conclusion with the transnational elites, the globalist 'Left' and their media, i.e. that Le Pen should be stopped! This time the reason is not the usual supposed 'fascist' or 'racist' and anti-immigrant nature of FN but, instead, some sort of conspiracy theory according to which the EU project is the product of a plot by the German and French elites for the restoration of the Vichy regime!⁴⁵ Of course, this approach, which suffers from a complete lack of any real historical perspective on how the EU was really created, exonerates in the process from any responsibility the post-war US hegemony of the capitalist world, as well as the NWO of neoliberal globalization. The latter, as I showed in *The New World Order in Action* was the inevitable outcome of the opening and liberalization of markets that was set in motion by the main post-war economic institutions in the West, which were created by the hegemonic US elite: i.e. the 'Holy Triad' of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) — all of which aimed at the maximization of the freedom of markets. However, it is now known that in the context of the creation of this US-inspired post war economic architecture, the EU project was also a product of the US capitalist elite, as extensive historical research has shown.⁴⁶ It was within this post-war architecture that multinationals flourished and the era of neoliberal globalization began, which has led to the development of a new kind of economic and political union of European nations, as a first step to global governance. No wonder that this plot theory has nothing to say about the NWO and the globalization process itself, beyond the plot of the Franco-German elites for a united Europe!

One main element of the counter revolution propaganda against the Brexit revolution, particularly in UK and France, was the supposed anti-immigrant feelings of Brexiteers. However, this is another blatant lie of the Transnational Elites and the world media they control, as immigrants were initially welcome by indigenous populations (e.g. by Germans and Britons in the immediate post-war period), when there was a sharp shortage of labor, following the huge war losses. However, this is not the case today

⁴⁵ Dimitris Kazakis, "What Exactly Did the French Vote for? The European Union against the French Nation", *Global Research* (27/4/2017). <<http://www.globalresearch.ca/what-exactly-did-the-french-vote-for-the-survival-of-france-as-a-nation-state/5587192>>

⁴⁶ See e.g. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, "The European Union always was a CIA project, as Brexiteers discover", *The Telegraph* (27/4/2016).

when the policy of 'open borders' is a deliberate policy of the Transnational Elites to equalize conditions of work and real wages all over the world, where multinational corporations extend their operations today.

In this context, cultural globalization is not only some sort of 'automatic' effect of globalization. It can be shown that it is also a deliberate policy of the Transnational Elites with the aim of creating a mass immigrant flow to the EU — something which euphemistically is called the 'refugee problem'. Thus, Peter Sutherland, the UN migration chief, has authoritatively expressed the Transnational Elite line on immigration and cultural homogeneity. It should be noted that Sutherland is a prominent member of the Transnational Elite himself, as he was the first director-general of the World Trade Organization — one of the main institutions of neoliberal globalization. He has also served for twenty years as Chairman of Goldman Sachs International and is a former chairman of oil giant BP. Given his high NWO 'qualifications' he naturally played a significant role in the campaign against Brexit. Yet, what is even more important is to examine his views with respect to 'the migration crisis' and the 'refugee problem', as revealed by the BBC itself, a leading organ of the Transnational Elite propaganda.⁴⁷ Thus, Sutherland, quizzed by the UK House of Lords committee a few years ago on migration, inadvertently revealed why and who created the mass exodus of migrants into Europe in the last few years, as well as the motives behind the so-called 'refugee problem'. That is, he revealed that, in fact, it was the Transnational Elite which, in order to meet the needs of neoliberal globalization for cheap labor, used the ideology of globalization (in terms of multiculturalism, open borders etc.), effectively, in order to achieve its aims of both economic and cultural globalization. The means to achieve this major aim was through the undermining of cultural homogeneity of EU nations, i.e. of the national cultures of member-states!

So, for Sutherland, a frequent attendant of the meetings of the Bilderberg Group,⁴⁸ the EU, through its migration and refugee policies, should be doing its best to undermine cultural homogeneity at the national level, on the pretext of supporting the 'sacred' right of freedom of choice and the humanist 'European values' on refugees respectively. It is on the basis of this disorienting argument, expressing the liberal values of individual autonomy (in contrast to the libertarian and socialist values of collective or social autonomy), that the huge Transnational Elite propaganda to 'save the refugees' was built (Greek state TV stations have even created daily special programs to reproduce this propaganda). So, the reason why indigenous populations in European countries now turn against immigrants (frequently masquerading as refugees) has nothing to do with racism and anti-immigrant feelings but simply with the fact that the mass immigration

⁴⁷ Brian Wheeler, "EU should 'undermine national homogeneity' says UN migration chief", *BBC News* (21/6/2012). <<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-1851>>

⁴⁸ This the well-known top level international networking organization, which has been often criticized for its alleged secrecy and clearly constitutes another informal institution of the Transnational Elite.

of the last few years has undermined both the conditions of work of local workers (it is well known that economic immigrants would accept lower pay and conditions of work than the locals in order to secure a place in the European 'paradises'), as well as their own cultural homogeneity.

As regards the counter revolution in Britain in particular, the path chosen by the elites to achieve their main aim — i.e. to keep Britain fully integrated within the NWO even if outside the EU — was to follow the Byzantine exit process envisaged by the EU Treaty (article 50 of the EU Lisbon Treaty), which has been designed with the clear aim to make the exit of any member state almost impossible and certainly absolutely controlled by the Euro-elite. This process could take up to two years of negotiations, i.e. a process long enough to soften people up for eventual surrender of their most radical demands, i.e. those that were incompatible with the position of Britain as a fully integrated member of the NWO. In fact, the UK government formally set in motion article 50 of the Treaty at the end of March 2017, delaying actual Brexit further, well into 2019! The outcome therefore of the negotiations with the EU is predetermined: a new Treaty with the EU, which for all intents and purposes will secure the continuation of Britain's full integration of into the NOW — the difference being that the country will, formally, not be an EU member anymore, although it could still remain a member of the European Economic Area (EEA). So, one way or another, UK will still have to implement fully the '4 freedoms' of the Maastricht Treaty (open and liberalized markets for capital, labor, goods and services), which it will have to implement anyway as a member of the World Trade Organization. Perhaps, as a 'concession' to the popular will, some modifications concerning the number of refugees allowed into Britain and also the number of new immigrants from the EU may also be allowed.

What would seem to be the object of hard negotiations is the degree of British access to the single EU market vs. the degree of immigration control. It seems the EU elites want to 'punish' Britain for Brexit, as a lesson to any other EU elite thinking of holding a similar referendum and may not allow any access to the single market unless the British elite is prepared to water down significantly any immigration controls, particularly against EU citizens — something which is of course against the spirit of the result of the referendum. In fact, the main reason why the British establishment called for a general election in June 2017 was exactly to strengthen the hand of the British side in the hard negotiations with the other EU elites that will start immediately afterwards. Needless to add that all this hard bargaining (from the British viewpoint) simply aims to make the life of the British economic elites outside the EU easier and not to open the way for a real exit from the EU, which was the popular demand in the referendum. In other words, the Euro elites seem ready to blackmail the British elites either to completely water down Brexit, in which case they would face the anger of the British people, or, alternatively, to proceed to a hard Brexit that may have dire economic (and

electoral) consequences. Some even threaten Britain to have Greece's fate!⁴⁹ No wonder George Soros, almost immediately after the Brexit victory, came out calling for "a movement to save the EU by profoundly restructuring it. I am convinced that as the consequences of Brexit unfold in the months ahead, more and more people will be eager to join this movement (...) the EU must strengthen its defences to protect itself from its external enemies, who are liable to take advantage of its current weakness. The EU's greatest asset is Ukraine, whose citizens are willing to die in defence of their country. By defending themselves, they are also defending the EU — rare in Europe nowadays."⁵⁰

No wonder that all Soros' men repeat, since then, the same mantra: the EU should not be dismantled at all cost, although it does need to be 'restructured'. In other words, every EU supporter, from Varoufakis and his Diem 25 Manifesto up to Emmanuel Macron, keep repeating the same slogan *ad nauseam*. This, in full knowledge that this is simply a disorienting stand of some political crooks, as it is well known that no radical restructuring of the EU according to the wishes of the European peoples could ever take place, given that what the victims of globalization want (i.e. national sovereignty and control of markets) is completely incompatible with the very essence of the EU, which is summarized in the '4 freedoms'!

The counter revolution against Brexit signified what Graham Vanbergen aptly put it, when he stressed that "what you are witnessing is anarchy by the rich and powerful and now the gloves are off. Get ready to be bludgeoned like never before until you are on your knees begging for their neoliberal mercy." This is particularly so if one takes into account, as he went on to point out, that "Britain's rich are 64% richer than before the recession, while the poor are 57% poorer — all that in just 8 years. Overall, about 20 per cent of the population is doing much better and 80 per cent are doing much worse. This was the real reason for 'Brexit'."⁵¹

Needless to add that the almost cataclysmic effects of a Brexit victory predicted by Transnational Elites, their academics and the media controlled by them never materialized. In fact, the post-Brexit statistical data were so good that they made even the deputy governor of the Bank of England (and a sworn enemy of Brexit, like the Governor himself) to start worrying about the effectiveness of the counter revolution and warned not to rely on short run statistical data, as "the Brexit effect is coming!"⁵²

As regards the forthcoming general election, the British 'Left' predictably sided with the Labor party,⁵³ despite the fact that it is dominated by Blairites, who had no

⁴⁹ Bruno Waterfield, "Brussels will gang up on UK like it did to Greece", *The Times* (5/10/2016).

⁵⁰ G. Soros, "The promise of Regrexit", *Project Syndicate* (8/7/2016). <<https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-promise-of-regrexit-by-george-soros-2016-07>>

⁵¹ Graham Vanbergen, "Brexit – Why Things will get Worse and What's coming Next", *Global Research* (26/6/2016). <<http://www.globalresearch.ca/brexit-why-things-will-get-worse-and-whats-coming-next/5532899>>

⁵² Phillip Aldrick, "We can't rely on data — the Brexit effect is coming, says Bank deputy", *The Times* (5/10/2016).

⁵³ George Monbiot, "If ever there was a time to vote Labour, it is now", *The Guardian* (26/4/2017).

problem with the wars of the Transnational Elite and the policies imposed by the EU — supposedly — because within the EU they are in a better position to secure the party's social conquests won since the war. Yet, the victims of globalization are well aware of the fact that the collapse of these social conquests did not start with the Tory governments but with Labor governments (Callaghan), were continued by Thatcherite Tories and were further refined by the Blairite governments (Blair and Brown). Furthermore, it can easily be shown that irrespectively of whether a Labor Party or a Tory Party is in power they will implement the same policies, which are in fact imposed by open and liberalized markets. It is a fact, by now, that either the country is governed by the Tory or the Labor party, it will have to implement the same policies prescribed by the open and liberalized markets — a fundamental EU requirement.

However, as I showed in my latest book, the fundamental *necessary condition* for real self-determination and national sovereignty, so that the dependence on the NWO of neoliberal globalization and the Transnational Elite administering it could be eliminated, is *economic sovereignty*. This is the necessary condition so that it is each country's people alone that determines — through the method of allocation of resources that itself decides and without any foreign interference on the entire process — the sort of economic policies (monetary/fiscal policies) and social controls needed to meet basic needs. On the other hand, there is no need to stress that the opening and liberalization of markets, inevitably, leads to the dismantling of economic sovereignty. Furthermore, the main *sufficient condition* for real self-determination is economic self-reliance, i.e. reliance primarily on a country's own resources, human and natural.

Therefore, only the full mobilization of a social movement fully conscious of its aims, and the strategies needed to achieve them, would be able to succeed. This is also another reason for people to press for a real Brexit, involving a self-reliant economy, which is a precondition for economic and national sovereignty. However, given that neither the governing Tory Party, nor of course the Labor Party would ever move in such direction, a Front for National and Social Liberation, which would function as a catalyst for fundamental political and economic change, is the only kind of change that could get the victims of globalization out of the current mire, while also creating the basis for a new true internationalism based on the self-determination of each nation.

However, to my mind, in the absence of such a Front at the moment in Britain, the only real choice available to radicals believing in self-determination is, first of all, to fight against any political party or candidate which does not accept a full (or 'hard') Brexit and, second, to support only candidates and parties who have fought a consistent struggle against remainers, provided that their flag in this struggle was national and economic sovereignty, as a precondition for self-determination.

This duty becomes particularly important today when the old war criminal Tony Blair seems to be playing the role of an informal leader of a movement against Brexit, as he has already declared that a second referendum on a final EU deal is desirable. With this aim, he is now suggesting tactical voting, i.e. supporting every candidate, (irrespective of political party), who is against Brexit, or, at least, seeks a 'softer' Brexit.⁵⁴ Furthermore, a remain group under the name Open Britain plans to target seats where the majority voted to stay in EU, with voters being urged to unseat prominent Brexit-supporting MPs. Furthermore, Open Britain has drawn up an "attack list" of 20 seats held mostly by Conservative MPs where constituents largely voted to stay in the EU, and hopes to mobilize the half a million supporters it has on its database to oust them. Open Britain has teamed up with two other grassroots pro-EU organisations, the European Movement and Britain for Europe, providing access to 600,000 supporters for what it has dubbed its "20/20 key seat strategy". As well as the 20 seats marked out for attack, the group has drawn up a list of 20 Labour, Lib Dem and Conservative MPs who have been powerful advocates of the closest possible relationship with the EU 27. They plan to provide activists to help defend these MPs — many of whom have constituencies that backed Brexit. As Stephen Dorrell, the former Tory MP who chairs the European Movement, put it: "This election is about something much bigger than party politics — it is about our future relationship with the rest of Europe", while James McGrory, co-executive director of Open Britain, added that the best way to fight hard Brexit was to cut its proponents in parliament. "Open Britain has over half a million supporters and lots have asked what's the best thing they can do. One of the best ways they can help is by campaigning against those who favour Brexit at any cost."⁵⁵

Naturally, it is not only the internal elites which try to distort in every way possible the meaning of the Brexit referendum. The EU elites — apart from threatening the British government on the consequences that any deviation from what they proposed would imply — they proceeded to directly threaten the territorial integrity of the UK. First, by encouraging the bourgeois controlled Scottish National party (SNP) to demand a new referendum on Scottish independence. As I described it elsewhere,⁵⁶ the SNP is not a neo-nationalist party but, instead it is a remnant of the old 20th century kind of nationalism. As such, it had adopted the ridiculous stand that joining the EU, after they secede from Britain, could secure their national sovereignty, at the very moment when the European peoples fight to exit from the EU for the opposite reason! This is why this party adopted a very reactionary stand against Brexit and unfortunately the Scottish nationalists — unlike the Welsh nationalists who showed a much higher level of political sophistication than the Scots — voted against Brexit. The EU elites did not stop at this

⁵⁴ Tony Blair, "The way to fight the Tories is to turn Brexit against them", *The Guardian* (25/4/2017).

⁵⁵ Anushka Asthana Rowena Mason Jessica Elgot, "Remain group seeks to oust pro-Brexit MPs", *The Guardian* (25/4/2017).

⁵⁶ *The New World Order in Action*, Vol. 1, pp. 109-114.

and they are now trying to achieve a similar secession of Northern Ireland from Britain. As the well informed systemic organ of the Transnational Elite, the *Financial Times* just reported:

“European leaders are preparing to recognise the potential for a ‘united Ireland’ within the EU, confirming that Northern Ireland would seamlessly rejoin the bloc after Brexit in the event of a vote for Irish reunification. In a step that may stoke concerns in Britain that Brexit could hasten the fragmentation of the UK, diplomats are planning to ask leaders of the EU’s 27 post-Brexit member countries to endorse the idea in a summit on Saturday.”⁵⁷

If we add to this the fact the EU elites adopted Spain’s demands to make Gibraltar’s future status an issue in the Brexit negotiations,⁵⁸ the attempt of the Transnational Elites to blackmail the British people to accept whatever terms they impose on the Brexit negotiations, if they want to avoid the disintegration of Britain, becomes obvious.

In conclusion, although the UK elites have much more in common with the EU elites, than with the British people, nothing precludes that the punitive attitude of the EU elites, which, in turn, is necessary for them to keep the grip on their own peoples and their desires for national sovereignty, might well result in a breakdown of negotiations, leading the Brexit negotiations to a breakdown and the British people to a struggle for real national and economic sovereignty,⁵⁹ opening the way for similar struggles in other European countries.

The betrayal of the Brexit revolution in the USA

A few months after the Brexit referendum, which began the phenomenon of the Brexit revolution I mentioned above, a major and dramatic development took place in the USA: a new Brexit-style revolution, this time in the metropolis of globalization itself, the USA. The tremendous implications of this event, which was the result of the victory against all the odds of Donald Trump, a neo-nationalist (according to his electoral program) candidate who was explicitly attacking globalization, hardly need to be stressed. Of course, neither Trump, nor his likes in Europe (Farage, Le Pen, Grillo, and so on) can be credited for the creation of the mass popular anti-globalization movement itself, which

⁵⁷ Alex Barker and Arthur Beesley in Brussels and Vincent Boland in Dublin, “EU prepares for post-Brexit membership for united Ireland-Summit endorsement would raise fears over fragmentation of UK”, *Financial Times* (28/4/2017).

⁵⁸ Tim Shipman & Bojan Pancevski, “Spain ‘duped’ May on Gibraltar trade,” *The Times* (2/4/2017).

⁵⁹ See e.g. how Gideon Rachman, one of the main theoreticians of Global Governance, laments the possibility of a slide into nationalism, as a result of the inherent dynamic for such an ‘accident’ in the negotiations about to start, Gideon Rachman, “Brexit and the slide into nationalism”, *Financial Times* (2/5/2017).

is flourishing today all over Europe and beyond. All these politicians simply tried to exploit, for electoral reasons, the rising world-wide movement against globalization, given that the globalist 'Left', which is fully integrated into the NWO of neoliberal globalization, cannot even think of questioning globalization and its institutions — the EU, WTO, IMF, WB, NATO etc. — as well as the multinationals and the elites running it. Instead, it simply criticizes their 'excesses' and sides fully with the middle classes (i.e. that part of them which has not been pauperized during globalization) in expressing the interests of the beneficiaries of globalization against its victims, who in the past formed the Left's political clientele. It is therefore only to the extent that these politicians express the real demands of the new anti-globalization movement that the victims of globalization can support them, until they find their own natural leaders from within the Popular Fronts proposed here.

Therefore, the Trump victory in the USA simply confirmed the fact, recognized also even by systemic writers, that the movement for Brexit in Britain, as well as the movement for Trump in the United States and similar movements all over Europe, are in fact all parts of a rising new anti-globalization movement which began in Europe and has spread all over the world. This new movement has nothing to do with the old anti-globalization movement that began in Seattle and Genova in the beginning of the new millennium, and which was then systematically undermined and eventually destroyed at the hands of the globalist 'Left' and the Soroses of this world in Porto Alegre, etc.

It should be noted in advance that Trump is not the usual kind of a US protectionist President, as some in the globalist 'Left' had mistaken him. In fact, he presented himself as a neo-nationalist, which is very different from a protectionist. Thus, previous candidates in the post-war period were distinguished only by their (usually minor) differences as regards aspects of their economic policies, mostly referring to the extent of social controls over markets. However, none of these candidates ever questioned the very fundamentals of a system, which eventually — helped by post-war US hegemony — led to the emergence of Transnational Corporations and the present NWO of neoliberal globalization. In other words, the fundamental principle guiding all post-war US Presidents was the principle of maximizing market freedom — i.e. not just 'free trade' but, also free movement of capital, services and labor in general. On the other hand, the historical differences between protectionists (usually belonging to the Republican Party) and free traders referred mainly to commodity trade, which constitutes only one of the (in)famous "four freedoms" (free movement of goods and services, as well as of capital and labor), which no post-war US President would question. Therefore, to simply characterize Trump as a protectionist, as the globalist 'Left' does ("Trump followed the legacy of protectionism in US policies established by George Washington and Alexander Hamilton and carried into the administrations of Franklin

Roosevelt and others”)⁶⁰ betrays, at best, an ignorance of the fundamental differences between protectionism (which was a phenomenon of the nation-states era) and neo-nationalism (which is a phenomenon of the globalization era).

These “freedoms” constituted the post-war systemic fundamentals in the US, which were later institutionalized by the EU and NAFTA, and adopted by every country integrated into the NWO, including “communist” China. In fact, the entire world economic, political and military structure created by US hegemony in the ‘free’ World (i.e. the non-communist world) was based on three main institutions — the IMF, its sister organization, the WB, and the WTO — which, backed by the huge military power of NATO, functioned as the main pillars of ‘market freedom’ in general, which created the foundations of the present globalization era. It was the institutional economic framework created in the immediate post-war period which, in combination with the grow-or-die dynamic of the capitalist system, have led to the rise of multinationals that today, through the Transnational Elite, run the NWO. The victory of Brexit in the UK and the election of Trump in the USA drastically affected the NWO by explicitly questioning globalization. Both phenomena also constitute major social revolutions from below, against the concerted attack of the transnational elites (political, economic, cultural, academic and media) to complete the globalization process and lead to the creation of a system of global governance.

As I tried to show above, globalization is a class issue, reflecting the popular reaction to the class nature of globalization. Furthermore, it was exactly the abysmal failure of the ‘Left’ in the UK and US to grasp this fact (either for dogmatic reasons or because it has already been fully integrated in the NWO) which has led to its theoretical and consequently political bankruptcy. In fact, the entire US ‘Left’ (from Chomsky and Znet up to the Greens) had no qualms about siding with the criminal candidate of the elites (Hillary Clinton), with the latter even demanding a recount of the vote, aiming to reverse the election result! Thus, all those ‘Leftists’, instead of supporting the victims of globalization in their struggle against the elites, preferred to adopt the cause of those in the middle class or in the petty bourgeoisie, who benefit (or hope to benefit) from globalization! Their excuse was the liberal excuse (firmly based on the ideology of globalization) that human rights and identity politics should be the Left’s mission, in place of its traditional mission for social liberation and class politics! No wonder the neo-nationalist Right has replaced the Left in its role of representing the victims of the system in its present globalized form.

However, one note of caution has to be added here about the meaning of class, as liberal apologists of the system, such as Fukuyama, blatantly distort the term. Thus, as he writes, referring to both Brexit and Trumpism:

⁶⁰ Prof. James Petras, “Trump and the ‘Collapse of Capitalism’ (COC): Foibles, Fables and Failures, The Financial Press and its Keepers”, *Global Research* (23/11/2016). <<http://www.globalresearch.ca/trump-and-the-collapse-of-capitalism-coc-foibles-fables-and-failures-the-financial-press-and-its-keepers/5558610>>

“Social class, defined today by one’s level of education, appears to have become the single most important social fracture in countless industrialised and emerging-market countries. This, in turn, is driven directly by globalisation and the march of technology, which has been facilitated in turn by the liberal world order created largely by the US since 1945.”⁶¹

Of course, education does not define class, but only in the narrow liberal view that he adopts, pretending he is unaware of the fact that education is, particularly today, a commodity, which can be bought by those controlling economic power. Class is therefore defined by one’s economic power, as expressed by control of the means of production, income and wealth, as I defined it elsewhere.⁶²

Needless to add that systemic academics did everything they could to deny the real class nature of the Brexit revolution both in UK and USA. In this vein, a more sophisticated academic analysis in the flagship of globalist ‘Left’, compares Brexit with ‘Trumpism’ to draw essentially the same conclusions:

“Both majored on concerns about immigration. Both questioned whether the existing global financial order necessarily benefitted the ordinary man in the street. And both portrayed themselves as the underdogs campaigning against an allegedly complacent and out of touch political establishment. In the UK these stances have been shown to appeal in particular to the so-called “left behind”, that is, voters who feel they have lost out economically in recent years and who are uncomfortable with some of the social changes that have been going on around them.”⁶³

The obvious intention of this kind of analysis is to discard any idea that the Trump vote in the USA (or, similarly the Brexit vote in the UK) had anything to do with class and globalization, and everything to do with racism and anti-immigration! Yet, the academic analysis mentioned could not escape some indirect hints to the class nature of the vote, as when it mentioned the fact that “Donald Trump was remarkably successful in such mid-West Rust Belt states as Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin, where the decline of manufacturing industry has seemingly created a part of America that can also be said to have been ‘left behind’.”⁶⁴ It is not accidental of course that the main Brexit voters were

⁶¹ Francis Fukuyama, “US against the world? “Trump’s America and the new global order”, *Financial Times* (11/11/2016).

⁶² Takis Fotopoulos, “Class divisions today”, *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 2, No. 6 (July 2000), pp. 211-251. <http://www.democracynature.org/vol6/takis_class.htm>

⁶³ John Curtice, Professor of politics at Strathclyde University, “The Trump-Brexit voter revolt”, *BBC News* (11/9/2016). <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/election-us-2016-37943072>>

⁶⁴ *ibid.*

also concentrated in the areas which have been de-industrialized by globalization, or euphemistically as this academic described it, “those who are uncomfortable with some of the social changes that have been going on around them”!

There is no doubt — and all serious analysts accept the fact — that what happened in the US, as in Britain, was a revolution, but not of course in the ridiculous sense discussed by some ‘radical’ academics who should know that revolutions are not made anyway by individuals (the Farages and Trumps of this world). Surely, a real Marxist, or anarchist intellectual for that matter, would be the last one to suggest such a monstrosity. Revolutions are made by people and the very fact that the victims of globalization, in both Britain and the US, were mobilized ‘from below’ to rise against globalization is in itself a revolution, given that the essence of the entire NWO is globalization and the running of all economies integrated into this Order by multinationals. Clearly, therefore, this process has nothing to do with what the British government, or the new US Administration, for that matter, will do, or will not do, in the future. Neither Farage nor Trump nor Le Pen are leaders of this global movement. This is obviously a leaderless global movement expressing concrete demands for national and economic sovereignty, which is exactly the form that the struggle for self-determination takes in the globalization era. So, political parties, such as UKIP in Britain, the Republicans in the USA and FN in France simply attempt to exploit this movement for electoral reasons and do not in any sense lead it. This is why politicians such as Farage, Trump or Le Pen come in conflict with the elites when they support the demands of this movement. This is also why it is highly likely that the counter-revolution going on at present both in Europe and in the US against this popular movement for economic and national sovereignty and against globalization will manage, eventually (with all the power still held by the elites controlled by multinationals), to water down both Brexit and ‘Trumpism’. Yet, this will not stop this huge movement of global dimensions, which will simply abandon parties and ‘leaders’ that used to break their promises in power.

The conclusion is that to scorn the really revolutionary character of these phenomena (Brexit, election of Trump, possible election of Le Pen) on the grounds that their leaders when in power will simply ‘forget’ their promises, as Petras and the likes do, far from being a radical analysis of any sort in this crucial moment in History, is at least disorienting, unless it is aiming to defuse the entire movement, supposedly because it is not revolutionary enough! The obvious implication of such a distorted logic is the millenarian ‘strategy’ of waiting for the overthrow of capitalism, while in the meantime supporting the Hillarys of this world, as, supposedly, the ‘least evil’ — exactly as Chomsky, Sanders, the Greens and similar ‘radicals’ have done.

Of course, the elites understood much better than the ‘Left’ and champagne-socialists of all sorts the real revolutionary significance of the Brexit revolution in both UK and the USA. In exactly the same way as in UK, the post-election campaign in the USA aimed to ‘soften’ Trump’s policies, so that the NWO will remain essentially the same as

before, perhaps with some cosmetic modifications. Soros, who has played a leading role in the counter-revolution in the UK, did the same in the USA, always on behalf of the Transnational Elite. Thus, immediately the election result was announced, scores of anti-Trump demonstrations took place all over America. These demonstrations were as impromptu as the corresponding demonstrations during the Arab Spring, or the Ukraine coup!⁶⁵ As Paul Craig Roberts stressed at the time:

“I think I know who they are. They are thugs for hire and are paid by the Oligarchy to delegitimize Trump’s presidency in the way that Washington and the German Marshall Fund paid students in Kiev to protest the democratically elected Ukrainian government in order to prepare the way for a coup.”⁶⁶

In fact, it has been shown that some at least of the anti-Trump protests in the US have been organized by groups that were sponsored by Clinton sympathizer Soros through MoveOn.org. As is well known, “among Wikileaks’ Podesta emails was a strategy document involving the Soros-supported MoveOn.org and grassroots organizing and funding.”⁶⁷ Furthermore, neither Hillary, nor Obama, not even Bernie Sanders had uttered a single word to stop these demonstrations, and when the fully pro-systemic leader of the US Greens set in motion the recounting process, again, nobody attempted to stop her. In fact, the elites had not any qualms even about using the secret services to doubt Trump’s victory, on the basis perhaps of their familiar false flag operations concerning a supposed Russian hackers meddling in the elections, prompting even the BBC to point out that the present situation “set the incoming commander-in-chief against intelligence services that he will preside over”.⁶⁸ It is therefore clear that the real aim of the elites is to crush the underlying “revolution in thinking” that marked the Presidential election. As Prof. John McMurtry aptly put it:

“An underlying revolution in thinking has occurred. Trump has tapped the deep chords of worker rage at dispossession by forced corporate globalization, criminally disastrous Middle East wars, and trillions of dollars of bailouts to Wall

⁶⁵ See Takis Fotopoulos, *The New World Order in Action*, Vol. 2 on Ukraine demonstrations, and Vol. 3 on the Arab Spring events.

⁶⁶ Paul Craig Roberts, “The Anti-Trump Protesters Are Tools of the Oligarchy. Their Objective: Delegitimize Donald, Install ‘Madam President’”, *Global Research* (11/11/2016). <<http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-anti-trump-protesters-are-tools-of-the-oligarchy-their-objective-delegitimize-donald-install-madam-president/5556434>>

⁶⁷ See “Soros-fronted orgs among groups calling for anti-Trump protests (VIDEO)”, *RT* (12/11/2016). <<https://www.rt.com/usa/366579-soros-orgs-driving-trump-protests/>>; See, also, Wayne Madsen, “The Clintons and Soros Launch America’s Purple Revolution”, *Strategic Culture* (11/11/2016). <<http://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2016/11/11/clintons-and-soros-launch-america-purple-revolution.html>>

⁶⁸ “Trump mocks Russian hacking ‘conspiracy theory’”, *BBC News* (12/12/2016). <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-38292392>>

Street. He never connects the dots on stage. But by Clinton's advocacy of all of them, she has made them her own and will go down because of it (...) But this is not a Republican-Democrat division. It is as deep as all the lost jobs and lives since 2001, and it is ultimately grounded in the tens of millions of dispossessed people which the life-blind global market system and its wars have imposed on America too."⁶⁹

Yet, Trump managed even in the first 100 days of his presidency to betray almost all the promises he gave to the victims of globalization. The betrayal began almost immediately after his inauguration, perhaps fulfilling the commitments that he made to the Transnational Elite, in exchange for commitments by the elites that no impeachment vote would be initiated against him — as long of course as he continued obeying their orders. Thus, within the first three months or so in office: he managed:

- To renege on his promise to scrap the NAFTA trade deal, declaring that he only wants to renegotiate — not scrap — the North American Free Trade Agreement, with Canada and Mexico, although at the same time he kept his promise to sign an executive order to withdraw from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).⁷⁰
- Even worse, to renege on all his promises about non-intervention in foreign countries, following exactly the same criminal policies as his predecessors (Clinton, Bush, Obama) by launching cruise missile strikes against Syria's government (perhaps to please the Zionists in his government), followed by the dropping the largest non-nuclear bomb in a distant corner of Afghanistan, killing scores of people in the process, on both occasions. Trump was instantly rewarded for his criminal actions and was enthusiastically supported by the US political and media establishment for his display of military muscle.⁷¹
- To start a very dangerous campaign against North Korea, which might well end up in a major war in the area. This, despite the fact that there was no provocation at all by the communist regime there, which has never engaged in any external wars or occupations, unlike Trump's friends in Zionist Israel, which not only is well known to possess nuclear weapons but also to have engaged in real massacres of the Palestinian population in accordance with their policy of ethnic cleansing.⁷² Furthermore, even if we assume that Trump's strategy is simply to terrorize North Korea, with a combination of sanctions and the threat of a military strike, given

⁶⁹ Prof. John McMurtry, "President Trump: Big Liar Going to Washington or Tribune of the People?", *Global Research* (10/11/2016).

⁷⁰ "Trump executive order pulls out of TPP trade deal", *BBC News* (24/1/2017).
<<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-38721056>>

⁷¹ Nile Bowie, "Trump's foreign policy after 100 days: Tweeting with bombs?", *RT* (28/4/2017).
<<https://www.rt.com/op-edge/386441-trump-100-foreign-policy/>>

⁷² Takis Fotopoulos, "Two parallel massacres: Palestine and East Ukraine", *Pravda.Ru* (30/7/2014).
<http://www.pravdareport.com/opinion/columnists/30-07-2014/128159-massacres_palestine_east_ukraine-0/>

that sanctions are not expected to have any significant effect (as Pyongyang has very limited exposure to global markets), it cannot be expected to respond to economic sanctions in the same way as e.g. Iran, an energy exporter and key regional power. This would inevitably lead Trump to a self-inflicted dismal dilemma: either to engage in a major war, in which China (if not Russia as well) will have to be involved — otherwise the borders of a US protectorate, South Korea, will extend up to Chinese soil — or, instead, suffer a humiliating moral defeat, at the very start of his Presidential term. Particularly so, as “the chance of negotiating a peaceful end to North Korea’s weapons program is exceedingly unlikely, and for very logical reasons. Pyongyang has learned from the mistakes of Saddam Hussein and Muammar Gaddafi, and will not give up its strategic nuclear deterrent, which serves both a critical security function and a symbolic function, one of immense national pride.”⁷³

In conclusion, irrespective of the actual motives of Trump in this betrayal, which are irrelevant to our analysis, the crucial issue in his case, as also in the case of Brexit, is not whether Brexiteers or Trump ‘will deliver’ or not. This is an utterly disorienting question raised by a crooked globalist ‘Left’, which insults this popular movement as racist, nationalist, etc. The real issue is whether this revolution in thinking going on at the moment, from Britain and USA yesterday, to France today and Italy tomorrow, will mature into a global anti-globalization movement for economic and national sovereignty and self-reliance, as well as a new internationalism based on the principles of solidarity and mutual aid rather than competitiveness and profit.

The globalist ‘Left’ should be held responsible for Macron’s coronation and saving the EU

The rise to power of Le Pen’s neo-nationalist movement in France, which could have given a mortal blow to the EU and, possibly, even to the plan for global governance itself, does not look probable today. The main reason for this is the fact that the huge anti-globalization and anti-EU vote was split in the first round between Melenchon’s ‘Left’, Le Pen’s FN, and, other smaller anti-EU parties. Even worse, Melenchon’s ‘Left’ supporters are now set either to abstain or vote for Macron — supposedly their class enemy — in the second and crucial round! Thus, according to the results of a survey among Melanchon’s supporters (who attained almost 20 percent of the total vote in the first round) on their voting preferences concerning the second round, more than one third of them (35%) said that they would back their supposed ‘class enemy’ Macron, while the rest said they will abstain, or vote blanc. It is also typical of the kind of a crook “Left” (Tsipras-type), politician Melenchon is, that in the survey on voting intentions, which he

⁷³ Nile Bowie, “Trump’s foreign policy after 100 days”, op.cit.

organized among his supporters, voting for Le Pen was not even an option!⁷⁴ It should also be noted that the pseudo-argument that Melenchon, by supporting abstention, indirectly supported Le Pen, is completely invalid as it presupposes that Macron's bourgeois voters are more likely to abstain than LePen's voters — something which may be true in peaceful times, but not now, when all the establishment, including "Left" protesters in the streets, try hard to mobilize them to vote, if they wish to continue having peace of mind in the future!

Clearly, for Melenchon, exactly as for Tsipras, the most important consideration is to get and stay to power at all cost, irrespective of the catastrophic consequences for the workers and the other victims of globalization their actions could have. Having said this, the bourgeois nature of Melenchon's 'Left' supporters became clear in a BFMTV poll, following the single TV debate between Le Pen and Macron, according to which, "Macron was deemed the 'most convincing' for two-thirds of those who voted for left-wing candidate Jean-Luc Mélenchon in the first round."⁷⁵ On the other hand, a class analysis of the first round results clearly showed that "Among those in the lowest earning bracket Ms Le Pen was the most popular candidate, (while) Mr Macron enjoyed favourable polling figures among high-level professionals."⁷⁶ Furthermore, according to an Ifop poll carried out after the first round, 55 per cent of manual workers say they will vote for her.⁷⁷

In a very similar way, Tsipras and his 'Left' associates gave no damn about the catastrophe they were going to impose on the Greek people when they literally reversed the result of a referendum they called in June 2015, which by a two-thirds majority rejected a new memorandum with the lenders of the Transnational Elite.⁷⁸ He then proceeded to the selling out of Greek social wealth (e.g. Greek airports, ports, trains, etc.) while according to the new memorandum he just signed even parts (at least for now) of the Greek electricity company are for sale. All this, accompanied with 'structural reforms' to further 'liberalize' the markets (e.g. worsening working conditions).⁷⁹ Yet, any honest politician, let alone a Left politician, in view of such a crucial dilemma, he

⁷⁴ Charles Bremner, "Macron urges rival MPs to defect from 'dying' old parties", *The Times* (3/5/2017).

⁷⁵ Hugh Schofield, "Macron the clear favourite", *BBC News* (4/5/2017). <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-39801315>>

⁷⁶ FT Data, "Macron vs Le Pen: the voters they attract-Analysis of presidential election's first round gives clues for decisive run-off", *Financial Times* (27/4/2017).

⁷⁷ Michael Stothard and Harriet Agnew in Paris, "Macron and Le Pen fight for working-class vote", *Financial Times* (1/5/2017).

⁷⁸ Takis Fotopoulos, "The sell-out of Greece by SYRIZA and the bankruptcy of the globalist 'Left'", *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 11, Nos. 1/2 (Winter-Summer 2015).

<http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol11/vol11_no1_The_Sell-out_of_Greece_by_Syriza_and_the_bankruptcy_of_the_globalist_Left.html>

⁷⁹ Kerin Hope in Athens, Arthur Beesley in Brussels and Shawn Donnan in Washington, "Agreement cheers markets and potentially opens door to talks on debt relief", *Financial Times* (3/5/2017).

would simply had resigned, instead of surrendering to adopt policies completely alien to his pre-election promises. But, not Tsipras and his crook 'Left' associates who would stick at nothing to stay in power (all for the good of the people, of course!)

Likewise, had Melenchon really believed what he preached about the catastrophe that the EU means for the French people, he would have tried, long ago, to unite all anti-EU political forces in a huge anti-EU front, and by Sunday May 7th, the EU would have entered the road to oblivion. Instead, the 'class enemy' Macron will be the next French President among huge celebrations of the Transnational and French Elites, stock exchanges, money markets and the likes! This is exactly why the 'Left' is really dead and buried today, while workers and the victims of globalization in general, in the absence of a Popular Front for National and Social Liberation (FNSL) to really express them, have moved in droves to what they see as the (easier) second best solution: the neo-nationalist movements, which, as the Trump example has clearly shown, are far from reliable. Yet, when they have to choose between the well-known political crooks of the 'Left' (like Hilary Clinton) and the 'unknown quantities' that neo-nationalists (such as Trump) present, they clearly prefer the latter. Needless to add that Jeremy Corbyn's Labor Party will also have the same fate as Melenchon in the forthcoming general election in UK, as the British 'Left,' instead of fighting together with workers and the other victims of globalization for a real Brexit, tries everything it can to make Brexit as painless to the elites as possible. Of course, it is not only personal ambitions (although they are far from insignificant!) that determine the behaviour of the Tsiprases and Melenchons of this world. However, the main political difference between Le Pen and Melenchon was supposed to be their respective positions on immigration, on which the idiotic 'Left' position is almost identical with that of the Transnational Elite. At the same time, workers and the other victims of globalization (unlike the bourgeois supporters of the 'Left' who happen mostly to belong to the beneficiaries of globalization) agree with the positions of neo-nationalists on this issue, as I showed above.

Therefore, the blame for the five year disaster that the French victims of globalization will go through, and, even more important, for the loss of the historical opportunity for the French people to lead a pan-European struggle for the crushing of the EU — and potentially of the global governance project — should be placed squarely on Melenchon as the main representative of the globalist 'Left' in France at this historical moment. As I tried to show in this article, it is the globalist 'Left' in the political arena, as well as its supporters on the streets (some of them protected, funded and promoted by such benevolent people as George Soros and the controlled by him NGOs) who are mainly responsible for the reproduction and perpetuation of the NWO and the corresponding suffering of the millions of people all over the world who are its victims. Thus, the final blow to the EU, the main institution of globalization in Europe, in all probability will be averted under the combined blows of the entire Transnational Elite, the local elites, all political parties and the totally controlled by them media, which, by

preventing a victory for the neo-nationalist movement in France at this crucial historical moment, would (deliberately or not) help in the implementation of the plan for Global Governance, methodically being planned by the Transnational Elites for the past two decades or so.

In fact, the only really dangerous to the Transnational Elites movement in France is Le Pen's FN, given that there are several reasons why the supposedly anti-capitalist movement of the globalist 'Left' candidate Melançon is as dangerous to the elites, as Tsipras proved to be for them in Greece. Few would believe today that Melançon would ever break ties with the NWO and its institutions rather than just try to 'improve' the EU. On the other hand, Le Pen would lose almost all of its supporters if she tried something similar, since the EU elites will continue (and intensify) the war against her in case she wins, to destroy any possibility that other neo-nationalist parties could try to imitate her example. This is because Melançon's party is not a neo-nationalist party, like Le Pen's, but a traditional anti-capitalist party of the French Left, which could easily find excuses of the sort used by Tsipras and his associate Marxist crooks, who 'govern' the Greek protectorate at the moment, that the fall of capitalism is a long-term goal and, in the process, compromises are needed, etc. Yet, a communist revolution of the sort preached by Melançon could never be achieved through parliamentary elections, and has never happened in the past.

So, what, in all probability we shall see in the second round is the effective coronation of the Transnational Elite candidate Emmanuel Macron, an ex-investment banker at a highly paid position of Rothschild Bank (and Bilderberg conference attendee).⁸⁰ It should also be noted that Rothschild Bank, not accidentally, was the first to be nationalized by the socialist government of Francois Mitterand, as soon as he took over in 1981, before he was forced himself to 'join the club' of the NWO, a couple of years later! Furthermore, it was mainly Le Pen's National Front party, more than any other neo-nationalist party in the West, which realized that globalization and membership in the NWO's institutions are incompatible with national sovereignty. As Le Pen stressed, (in a way that the 'Left' has abandoned long ago!):

"Globalization is a barbarity, it is the country which should limit its abuses and regulate it [globalization] (...) Today the world is in the hands of multinational corporations and large international finance. (...) Immigration 'weighs down on wages,' while the minimum wage is now becoming the maximum wage."⁸¹

⁸⁰ See Neil Clark, "Believe it's a new French Revolution? Hold your horses", *RT*(26/4/2017).
<<https://www.rt.com/op-edge/386119-french-revolution-macron-election/>>

⁸¹ "Globalization is barbarous, multinationals rule world" – Marine Le Pen, *RT*(10/1/2015).
<<http://rt.com/news/212435-france-pen-globalization-barbarity/>>

In fact, the French National Front is the most important neo-nationalist party in Europe that could well have been in power following the Presidential elections in 2017, bar a united front of all globalist parties, supported by the entire Transnational Elite and particularly the Euro-elites and the mass media controlled by them — as is the case today. This is how Florian Philippot the FN's vice-president and chief strategist aptly put its case in a Financial Times interview:

“The people who always voted for the left, who believed in the left and who thought that it represented an improvement in salaries and pensions, social and economic progress, industrial policies (...) these people have realized that they were misled.”⁸²

As the same FT report pointed out, to some observers of French politics, the FN's economic policies, which include exiting the euro and throwing up trade barriers to protect industry, read like something copied from a 1930s political manifesto, while Christian Saint-Étienne, an economist for *Le Figaro* newspaper, recently described this vision as “Peronist Marxism”.⁸³ In fact, in a more recent FT interview, Marine Le Pen went a step further in the same direction and she called, apart from exiting from the Euro — a development she expects and hopes to lead to the collapse of the Euro, if not of the EU itself — for the nationalization of banks. At the same time she championed public services and presented herself as the protector of workers and farmers in the face of “wild and anarchic globalization (...) which has brought more pain than happiness.”⁸⁴ For comparison, it never even occurred to SYRIZA (and Varoufakis who now pretends to be a radical, while at the same time supports Macron's candidacy!⁸⁵) to use such slogans before the elections (let alone after them!). Needless to add that her foreign policy is also very different from that of the French establishment, as she wants a radical overhaul of French foreign policy in which relations with the regime of Syrian president Bashar al-Assad would be restored and those with the likes of Qatar and the Gulf states, which she alleges support terrorism, reviewed. At the same time, Le Pen sees the US as a purveyor of dangerous policies and Russia as a more suitable friend.

Macron's victory will be even more astonishing if one takes into account that he was literally parachuted into politics by the elites, as he neither belongs to any of the traditional French parties, nor ever had any political party of his own (apart from the ‘movement’ “En Marche” that he created — or perhaps was created for him by the elites

⁸² Adam Thomson, “France's far-right National Front seeks voters from the left”, *Financial Times* (4/1/2015).

⁸³ *ibid.*

⁸⁴ Anne-Sylvaine Chassany and Roula Khalaf, “Marine Le Pen lays out radical vision to govern France”, *Financial Times* (5/3/2015).

⁸⁵ See Yanis Varoufakis, “Macron came to Greece's aid during our crisis. The French left should back him”, *The Guardian* (4/5/2017).

— with the explicit aim to take part in the 2017 presidential elections). As Neil Clark accurately describes the ‘phenomenon’ Macron :

“So, step forward En Marche!, the shiny-new, very well-funded, ‘centrist’ vehicle through which elite interests — and the status quo — could be maintained. It seems absolutely ‘incroyable’ that a party only formed one year ago could propel someone who had never before stood for election to become President of France. Unless you understand that Macron, the man the media bill as the ‘outsider,’ is the ultimate ‘insider,’ who, like his British counterpart David Cameron, was fast-tracked to success (...) He’s an ‘enarque,’ a graduate of the elite Ecole National d’Administration. He then worked as an investment banker, dealing with corporate takeovers and mergers for Rothschild’s, where it is said: *“he quickly made a small fortune.”* He then became Deputy Secretary-General at the Elysee, and then was appointed Economy Minister where he aggressively promoted neoliberal reforms. He has among his well-heeled supporters those other capital-friendly ‘centrists,’ like Tony Blair protégé David Miliband and the UK’s extremely wealthy ex-Chancellor George Osborne, both of whom tweeted their congratulations following the election result. Macron is the poster boy not only of the French elites but what Takis Fotopoulos, author of *The New World Order in Action*, has called the ‘transnational elites’ too.”⁸⁶

It is therefore clear that the coronation of Macron — a typical representative of the NWO of neoliberal globalization, who is committed to cut corporation tax to 25 percent, reform wealth tax for the benefit of the rich and relax labor laws, thereby making it easier to hire and fire — was meant by the Transnational and French Elites to have a double meaning:

- That it is the elites which, in the last instance, determine the political process and, in exactly the same way as in the past kings could boast that they were able to appoint even their gardener as Prime Minister, if they so wished, the elites today, using all the paraphernalia of the pseudo-democratic process, could in the same way appoint whoever they like as President of a major country;
- That today’s ‘sans culottes’ (i.e. the victims of globalization) should learn their lesson, i.e. that the NWO and ultimately Global Governance is here to stay!

Furthermore, the message the Transnational elites sent had many recipients, i.e. the victims of globalization all over the world, whose hopes were revived by the success of the Brexit revolution all over the world and particularly in Britain and the USA. The attack against the Brexit revolution in UK is in full swing at the moment, with the

⁸⁶ Neil Clark, “Believe it’s a new French Revolution? Hold your horses”, op. cit.

Transnational Elites now openly threatening the British elites in case they do not toe the line in the forthcoming negotiations to fully derail Brexit according to their own wishes,⁸⁷ while Trump, as we saw above, has already betrayed the US victims of globalization, having converted himself into a 'normal' US President.

Conclusions: What to be done?

In conclusion, following the effective collapse of the phenomenon of Brexit revolution, which in all probability will be confirmed in the second round of the French Presidential elections and, also, in the aftermath of the inevitable failure of the various social (direct) action movements (Indignados, Occupy Wall Street, etc.), given that today's regimes have all the power in their hands to smash such movements, is there any way out for radical change today?

To my mind, the only way forward for the victims of globalization, if they do not wish to be the playthings of the Transnational and local elites but, instead, are determined to fight in order to break the elaborate chains that the present pseudo-democratic process had created for them, is to self-organize in each country, along Popular Fronts for National and Social Liberation aiming at a Democratic Community of Sovereign Nations.⁸⁸ This is the only way to transcend the bankrupt "Left" of today which, with a few exceptions, is dominated by the globalist 'Left'. Needless to add that this applies, also, to those who supposedly condemn Macron but for good measure condemn equally Le Pen.⁸⁹

Such a mass movement from below, which would unite victims of globalization around the world (the vast majority of the world population) with the basic aim of national and economic sovereignty — as a precondition for national and social liberation — is perhaps the only way to overcome the new, and worse ever, Middle Ages that the present NWO of neoliberal globalization has heralded.

⁸⁷ Francis Elliott & Oliver Wright, "Brussels is meddling in our election, warns May", front page title of *The Times* (4/5/2017).

⁸⁸ See Takis Fotopoulos, *The New World Order in Action: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the "Left"*, op. cit., ch. 12.

⁸⁹ See e.g. the radical philosopher Slavoj Zizek, whose support for Varoufakis' Diem 25 movement apparently has not exhausted his 'radical' reserves and he now turned his anger against liberal 'leftists' supporting Macron, as the least of two evils in the fight against Le Pen, "Don't believe the liberals – there is no real choice between Le Pen and Macron," *The Independent* (3/5/2017).

The New World Order (NWO) of neoliberal globalization in Australia

A brief intervention in the NWO debate by Arran Gare¹ and an exchange with Takis Fotopoulos

(17.06.2017)

INTRODUCTION

We are happy to reproduce below a brief intervention to the debate on the NWO of neoliberal globalization, with particular reference to Australia, by Arran Gare, the well-known environmental philosopher, accompanied by a brief reply by Takis Fotopoulos. Gare, who is also a reviewer of Takis Fotopoulos latest book (*The New World Order in Action: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the "Left"*) (San Diego: Progressive Press, 2017), having read the book, sent to the author the following meaningful message, which we hope will be expanded in the future.

In his intervention, Gare, whose ecological analysis and proposals —unlike most Green thinkers who have always been in the clouds concentrating in further embellishing their utopias (in the negative sense of the word) —had always rooted in the social and economic reality of neoliberal globalization, gives a brief but utterly meaningful description of how Australia was fully integrated into the NWO. In this sense, his text constitutes an original and meaningful intervention on the debate about the New World Order of neoliberal globalization.

Gare, refers first to the pivotal role of the Australian 'Left' in integrating the country into the NWO of neoliberal globalization. He then goes on to describe how this integration transformed a rich in resources country into an extractive economy, where speculative investment in housing, mostly by the Chinese elite and unsustainable farming, as well as cheap migrant labour are the main components of the Australian globalization 'miracle'. The inevitable consequences of the '4 freedoms' (free movement of goods, services, capital and labour) —which have been faithfully implemented by all countries integrated into the NWO, leading to the flourishing of neo-nationalist movements in Europe and the USA— are that few native born Australians are getting decent employment and that the conflict between environment and employment is particularly acute in Australia leading to much resistance to cutting greenhouse emissions or dealing with other environmental destruction — a phenomenon for which the beneficiaries of globalization, including many in the Green "left", blame on the low level of ecological consciousness of the people involved!

¹ Arran Gare is, Associate Professor in the Faculty of Life and Social Sciences at Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne

Finally, Gare highlights the ideological and cultural globalization in Australia, as expressed not only by the mass media controlled — as everywhere — by the transnational elites but also by universities “which are now treated as transnational business corporations” and economists at the service of the globalist elites, the mass propaganda for multiculturalism and against any kind of nationalism and national culture, marked by “an effort to destroy the very idea of being a nation”. Predictably, “young Australians are now totally ignorant of their own history and of Australian literature. “His conclusion is that what is needed is “a comprehensive vision for the whole of humanity for the future for communities, of communities in place of cosmopolitanism” which fits also with Kropotkin's idea of democratic federalism”. This is of course very close to the long-term vision of a confederation of communities based on inclusive democracies, which this journal has always advanced.

The Editorial Committee of the IJID
16.6.2017

Dear Takis,

I have been reading your book, and agreeing with almost all of it. Situated in Australia the weird nature of what is going on is difficult to fully comprehend. Australia was the first place where a supposedly left government, the Australian Labour Party, began implementing neoliberalism, getting rid of tariffs, controls on capital flows, selling off government owned banks and other key institutions. In Victoria, a state government sold off 250 schools, beautiful buildings constructed when Australians were into national building. Australia is claimed to be an economic success, but it has actually been transformed into an extractive economy selling off its minerals, farming in a way that is not sustainable (which does not worry the agribusiness companies who are taking over farming because they will make their big profits in the future when there are real shortages of food). We have a deteriorating net investment position (i.e. our real national debt, now around 65% of GDP), and the supposed improvements in income are due largely to how inflation is mismeasured. Now urban areas are being sold off, largely to wealthy Chinese. Young Australians find it very difficult to get jobs that have any future, and house prices and rents have skyrocketed, so fertility rates are falling dramatically because young people no longer have the means to raise families. So, young people are suffering from the country having been sold out from under their feet. It is because of all this that Australia is so environmentally destructive with so much resistance to cutting greenhouse emissions or dealing with other environmental destruction, and so attacks climate scientist for bringing bad news.

However, what I am grappling with is the success of the global corporatocracy being so successful at organizing consent. There are the broader global matters of the way in which mainstream economics has been promoted to legitimate their triumph. There are very few economists critical of free trade. These include Herman Daly and Erik

Reinert. Daly refers to a book attacking free trade published by Culbertson in 1984 which was only published because it was self-published, despite the eminence of its author. What is particularly disturbing about the Australian case is that at federation in 1900 free trade had been rejected. Australians did not want to be just suppliers of raw materials to the British, the consequences of which were evident in the depression of the 1890s. They were influenced by ideas of the national economy argued by Friedrich List. However, this was just part of a range of ideas that our politicians and media moguls, along with complicit academics, have sought to erase from the public memory.

However, what is going on goes far beyond this. There is an effort to destroy the very idea of being a nation. Young Australians are now totally ignorant of their own history and of Australian literature, something that became evident when a student from Germany studying English to teach this in schools in Germany was astonished that in literature subjects there was no knowledge of Australian literature.

However, one of the most difficult areas is immigration. Australia is famous for its brutal treatment of refugees. But refugees are being used as a scapegoat to hide what is really happening. There are huge numbers of immigrants, so when companies want skilled employees, including engineers, computer scientists or whatever, they barely take young inexperienced Australians seriously and import them from India or elsewhere. Multiculturalism is promoted and any form of nationalism is held to be politically incorrect. This despite the left embracing nationalism in the 1960s and 70s and for the most part seeing the Vietnam war as really a war of national liberation from neo-colonialism. So, the collapse in fertility of young Australians does not worry the government because they are happy to replace the Australian population in a way that will destroy any basis for unified opposition to economic globalization. Really, the politicians and the managers in corporations, including universities which are now treated as transnational business corporations, are a comprador class who have been co-opted by the global corporatocracy.

The odd thing is that this strategy has worked with most of those who are suffering the consequences. Recently an article was published on employment in Australia showing how few native-born Australians were getting decent employment. While there was a 474,000 increase in employment between 2008 and 2016, only 74,000 of these went to native born Australians. I read the figures out to my environmental philosophy class and got stunned silence from most of the students and a vigorous defence of current policies by an English migrant who had a good job after coming to Australia on a 457 visa. I think this migration problem is something that the left, and environmentalists have to consider. It is clearly not simple since some migration, and some acceptance of refugees, is a good thing.

In my view, all this can only be addressed by envisaging a comprehensive vision for the whole of humanity for the future. Daly and Cobb argue for communities of communities in place of cosmopolitanism. I think this is a good notion, and fits with Kropotkin's idea of democratic federalism, with as much decentralization as possible. This is what is required to oppose both economic globalization and chauvinistic

nationalism, but it is unbelievably difficult to get even young people to take this seriously.

I will attach the piece from an Australian newspaper showing what is going on with employment, because I think this highlights a problem that has to be addressed that reflects a deeper problem, that people have so little loyalty to any community that they are atomized and rendered utterly powerless. It is difficult to make the point that without this loyalty, environmentalism is hollow.

It is a pity I had not read your book before finishing mine, since I could have used it to bolster my arguments, and I would have emphasised more the notion of self-reliance.

Cheers,
Arran, 15.6.2017

Dear Arran,

I particularly appreciated your comments because, exactly as you did with your review of *Towards an Inclusive Democracy*, not only you grasped the very essence of the book, but on this occasion, you managed also to implement the *New World Order's* analysis on the Brexit Revolution and the role of the globalist 'Left', in an explanation of Australian development. This is particularly useful because Australia (as well as Canada and USA) are used by the globalists and the Transnational Elites as the perfect examples of multicultural societies, with no sense of national unity, which is the prototype that all peoples in the world should emulate. In fact, as I showed in the book, the Transnational Elites have even managed to pass a UN resolution to this effect a few years ago.

Given the importance of your contribution in highlighting the mostly unknown Australian case of globalisation (which, of course, is not only economic but also cultural and ideological), I wonder whether you would be able to write an article in the journal on this topic. Alternatively, if you are not able at this particular moment to do, so would you give us a permission to publish your letter in the journal, accompanied by a brief introduction of mine?

Cheers,
Takis, 15.6.2017

P.S. I agree of course that the long-term ideal should be a confederation of communities (to my mind, based on inclusive democracies) and, in fact, the last chapter of my book deals exactly with this very issue: i.e. how we can move from the present catastrophic NWO towards a democratic community of sovereign nations. I am talking about 'nations' rather than 'communities' because I think this is a necessary stage in the strategy of building a confederation of sovereign communities.

Brexit, Trump, the AfD and the 'New World Order in Action'¹

NEIL CLARK

(30.09.2017)

Surprised by the Brexit vote in the UK, the victory of Donald Trump and the strong showing of the far-right AfD party in the German elections?

Well, you won't be, if you read the extremely thought-provoking new book, *The New World Order in Action, Globalisation, the Brexit Revolution and the Left* by Takis Fotopoulos.

The Greek left-wing political philosopher and economist argues that such phenomena are manifestations of a public backlash against what he describes as the "New World Order of neoliberal globalization" — a project driven by what he calls the "Transnational Elites" (an interconnected network of elites based mainly in the G7 countries), which seeks to destroy all economic and national sovereignty and impose a new form of low-wage servitude on mankind.

The Three Phases

In chapter one, Fotopoulos gives us a short history lesson and distinguishes between the three main phases in the development of today's capitalist global economy.

There was a liberal phase in the 19th century that led to a failed attempt at globalization in the early 20th century.

Then there was a "statist" phase which was universalized in the west after World War Two, in the form of social democracy and the welfare state.

Then, beginning in the 1980s, came the present neoliberal phase, associated with a massive expansion of Transnational Corporations (TNCs) and deregulation of the financial services industry. The start of this period coincided, not by accident, Fotopoulos adds, with the collapse of "actually existing socialism" in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe. What happened was that the power of TNCs and monopoly finance capital became so great, that alternative economic models, based on national markets, were dismantled.

This era of neoliberal globalization — ushered in by Mrs. Thatcher and Ronald Reagan — and pushed by the TNCs and banking/financial elites who funded them, has led to "an unprecedented concentration of income and wealth," so much so that by 2016 an Oxfam report showed that the net worth of the richest 62 people was equal to the combined wealth of half the world.

¹ First published: 14:43 29.09.2017(updated 14:55 29.09.2017).

<<https://sputniknews.com/columnists/201709291057805864-brexit-trump-afd/>>

In 2017, Oxfam revealed² that just eight people owned the same wealth as half the world — 3.6 billion people.

This is shocking, but no accident, as it's how the system was designed. The present era also been marked by endless wars, as the Transnational Elites target for destruction independent, resource-rich, strategically important nations which try and resist colonization, such as Yugoslavia, Iraq, Libya and Syria. These wars — routinely sold to the public as "humanitarian interventions" — in turn, have led to a huge refugee crisis, which then confuses and splits domestic opposition to neoliberal globalization.

Fotopoulos is quite scathing about how the "left" in the west has either gone along with the elite, globalist project or failed to understand the "nature of the beast" that it is up against.

The Issue of 'Austerity'

Fotopoulos notes how many self-styled progressives regard "austerity" as being merely being a "bad" choice made by "bad" politicians, instead of it being a key feature of neoliberal globalization. He cites a 6,000 word article³ by Paul Krugman published in the Guardian, in 2015, in which the Nobel prize-winning American economist fails to mention the words "neoliberal" and "globalization" even once, and ignores the fact that "austerity" is also the policy of the EU and all US administrations since Reagan.

It's the failure to understand that austerity policies are the inevitable consequence of "race to the bottom" neoliberal globalization — and not just the policies of a few misguided politicians, which led to fiascos such as the sell-out of the Greek people by the "anti-austerity" Syriza party.

To end austerity, Syriza needed to make a clean break with the status quo — and that would have meant saying "antio sas" not only to the euro and the EU, but what Fotopolous calls "the other transnational institutions of the NWO (WTO, IMF, NATO and so on)." But as a party of the globalist, "reformist" left, Syriza did no such thing, and consequently the Greek people's agony only intensified.

Rise of the Neo-Nationalist Right

It's been the failure — or reluctance — of the main parties of the left to properly understand modern globalization, Fotopolous argues, that has led to the rise of the neo-nationalist right. The many victims of the current system have largely been ignored by pro-globalist parties of the left and center-left, and so populist parties of the radical right — focusing obsessively on large scale immigration-which itself is merely a symptom

² "Eight people own same wealth as half the world", Posted by Melanie Kramers Senior Press Officer (16th Jan 2017). <<https://www.oxfam.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases/2017/01/eight-people-own-same-wealth-as-half-the-world>>

³ Paul Krugman, "The case for cuts was a lie. Why does Britain still believe it? The austerity delusion", The Guardian (29 April 2015). <<https://www.theguardian.com/business/ng-interactive/2015/apr/29/the-austerity-delusion>>

of neoliberal globalization and the free movement of capital — (and the Transnational Elites' wars), have moved in to fill the gap.

The surge in support for UKIP⁴ in 2014-15 in Britain, which led to the Brexit⁵ referendum and the vote to leave the EU, the rise of the maverick Donald Trump, the strong showing for the AfD party⁶ in Germany- and the National Front in France, can be seen as manifestations of this.

The progressive response — Fotopoulos notes — has too often been to lazily brand people voting for such parties and individuals as "racists," instead of focusing on the root cause of the growing popular discontent, which is neoliberal globalization and the economic destruction and dislocation which it has caused.

In his work, Fotopoulos is effectively building on research done by Professor Steve Hall et al, who argue that "The Rise of the Right" has been caused directly by the main parties of the left embracing neoliberalism and taking elite-friendly positions on globalization. (You can read my review of "The Rise of the Right" here⁷.)

Fotopoulos, like Hall et al, argues that only by opposing neoliberalism in toto and reconnecting with their traditional working-class base can the left succeed. Any attempt to improve the plight of the victims of globalization within the current TNC-friendly framework is doomed to failure.

The stark conclusion from reading his book is that genuinely progressive parties in the west who want real change, need to campaign not only for their countries to leave the EU, but all the other transnational institutions of the NWO as well, as these institutions are unreformable. There are important lessons in its pages for the British Labour Party — and its leader Jeremy Corbyn, who could be on the brink of power — and who at the party's annual conference this week called for⁸ "a new model of economic management to replace the failed dogmas of neo-liberalism."

Anyone who knows Corbyn, and who wishes him well, needs to send him a copy by first-class post (or by very large carrier pigeon).

Social Liberation and National Sovereignty

Evoking the anti-fascist/anti-Nazi resistance movements of World War Two, Fotopoulos' radical solution to the current crisis is for "national and social liberation fronts" to set up in countries across the world to defeat the neoliberal globalists. In the same way antiglobalists of the neonationalist right need to understand there can be no national

⁴ "Nigel Farage, the Pied Piper: Beer, Brussels, Bombast and Brexit", Sputnik (13:43 04.07.2016(updated 19:54 30.11.2016)). <<https://sputniknews.com/europe/201607041042394595-ukip-farage-brexite/>>

⁵ https://sputniknews.com/trend/brexit_uk_eu_membership/>

⁶ "Merkel's Position Shaky, While AfD Rise 'Is Return to European Norms'", Sputnik (20:32 25.09.201. updated 21:49 25.09.2017). <<https://sputniknews.com/europe/201709251057682000-angela-merkel-election-over/>>

⁷ Neil Clark "How the Liberalization of the Left Led to the Rise of the Far-Right," Sputnik (02.02.2017). <<https://sputniknews.com/columnists/201702021050271445-far-right-liberalization-lessons/>>

⁸ Neil Clark "Jeremy Corbyn - Britain's Prime Minister in All But Name," Sputnik (13:58 28.09.201. updated 19:37 28.09.2017). <<https://sputniknews.com/columnists/20170928105774111-jeremy-corbyn-labour-conference/>>

independence without social liberation, the antiglobalists of the left need to understand too that there can be no social liberation without a restoration of full national sovereignty.

The long term goal put forward by Fotopoulos in his book's closing chapter would be to move from today's grossly in-egalitarian NWO — to a democratic community of sovereign nations. This would lead to a world of genuine international solidarity, and not one where a few rich countries seek to dominate others, as is the case today.

If that sounds a tall order, then it undoubtedly is. The ideology of the neoliberal globalists has become culturally hegemonic. In fact, it's hard — if not impossible — to achieve any exalted position in the arts, economics, publishing, broadcasting, or academia in the west today without subscribing to the dominant ideology. Even the previously apolitical Eurovision Song Contest has been used as a forum for pushing it — as Fotopoulos — quoting an article of mine, notes on page 63.

Obsessive political correctness and the promotion of identity politics are just two of the methods used by those who benefit from neoliberal globalization, to divide and distract us. The "Russiagate" hoax — the 2017 version of the "Iraq has WMDs" scare, is another.

The neoliberal globalists like to accuse others of racism, but when it comes to smearing Russia, and Russians, anything goes. The "internationalism" they promote is of course a sham as it only applies to countries which submit to the Transnational Elites' authority. Countries which don't, and try to maintain their independence, are sanctioned and threatened with war.

You don't have to agree with everything Takis Fotopoulos says, and every judgement he makes in his 122,000 word book to agree with him that something urgently needs to be done to end the iniquity — and violence — of the present system.

Volume Two of his *New World Order in Action* series is eagerly anticipated

2017 Barry Seidman's interview with Takis Fotopoulos¹²⁷

for "Equal Time for Freethought" radio show on "The New World Order in Action. Vol. 1: Globalization, the Brexit Revolution and the 'Left'" (Progressive Press, December 2016).

(23.12.2017)

SUMMARY

The following interview with Takis Fotopoulos by Barry Seidman, together with his first interview for Equal Time for Freethought more than nine years ago,¹²⁸ mark the two most important stages in his writing work: the first one with reference to the project of Inclusive Democracy he developed in the 1990's and this one with reference to the fundamental shift of strategy that the rise of the New World Order (NWO) of neoliberal globalization requires. It is shown that the institutional foundations he took for granted in the ID project (nation-state and social democracy) although, even at the time, were crumbling, they were still in existence and, therefore, the struggle for social liberation was still possible within the existing institutional framework. He now stresses that the definite phasing out of both in the NWO makes social liberation definitely dependent on national liberation. In other words, the precondition for any struggle for social liberation in the present era of neoliberal globalization is national and economic sovereignty. In this sense, the present interview is particularly significant as it is the first full-fledged interview on the basis of his latest book.¹²⁹

B.S.: It's been almost nine years since we've had you on the program; a lot has happened since then. But before we get into all that, or some of that, and examine the ideas in your book perhaps a few definitions of terms would be a good idea. Firstly, the term New World Order is an often-used conspiracy theory term, as you know, which could describe anything from a clandestine totalitarian

¹²⁷ This is a slightly edited (for purposes of publication) version of the interview with subtitles and explanatory words added, missing words replaced, and repetitions deleted. The interview was aired on 23 December 2017 and can be heard here. "Equal Time for Freethought; show 590: The New World Order in Action and Takis Fotopoulos, Dec 23d 2017". <<http://www.equaltimeforfreethought.org/2017/12/23/show-590-takis-fotopoulos/>

¹²⁸ http://inclusivedemocracy.org/fotopoulos/english/brinterviews/seidman_interview.htm>

¹²⁹

<[http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/fotopoulos/english/brbooks/The New World Order In Action 2015/The New World Order In Action.htm](http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/fotopoulos/english/brbooks/The%20New%20World%20Order%20In%20Action%202015/The%20New%20World%20Order%20In%20Action.htm)>

world government and Freemasonry to alien invasion, believe it or not. So why did you choose to use this term and what do you mean by it?

The meaning of the New World Order and the Transnational Elite

Takis: The term New World Order (NWO) is being used in a different way by both the Left and the Right. I mean the Right, as you said, usually what it means by this is a conspiracy theory of some sort, whereas for the Left it means a kind of ideology. In fact, what I am going to do today, and of course I did in the book, is to describe a new definition of the New World Order, according to which the New World Order is a structural change in the capitalist market system.

B.S.: Another term you use is Transnational Elite. Are we talking about the 1 percent here or political ruling classes? Which one are we speaking about or is there something else?

Takis: The Transnational Elite is defined in relation to the New World Order which, as I said, is a structural change in the market capitalist system that is related to the NWO and it simply means the network of the elites, which are not just local elites, they are transnational elites in the era of globalization. We do think we have local elites but these are not the elites which control the world. The world is controlled today by Transnational Elites. And these are economic elites — that is those that control the transnational or multinational corporations — political elites, cultural elites and so on.

Neoliberal globalization defines the New World Order

B.S.: The term globalization also has several meanings, one of them being the idea that we are creating a united world where everybody is free and the West will help the Third World nations become successful like Europe and United States blah blah blah. How are you using this term? And do you think any of the West's actions in countries like India for instance have benefited people there?

Takis: Of course what you just described is what I call the ideology of globalization. In fact, globalization is simply an economic phenomenon. It's simply today's evolution of the capitalist market system. The capitalist market system today can only be globalized and this implies certain important consequences. For example, if you have a globalized capitalist system, that means that markets have to be open and liberalized. And this is the basic condition, actually — what in the European Union call the “four freedoms”. It simply means that all markets (the markets for commodities, i.e. for goods & services, the markets for labor, the markets for capital), should be free and liberalized. In other words, markets should not only be open but also there should be no controls on them. So, this is the defining characteristic of globalization today. And this has nothing to do with the ideology you mentioned. How you can say globalization helps people in India or in the United States and so on when in fact (and this is verified by much evidence, some

of which actually I described in the book) there is a continued concentration of income and wealth all over the world in the last 20 years or so since globalization emerged. So, you may have an increase in the national income of China or India or whatever. But this does not mean that this wealth is distributed in any way fair or equal. And this is something that even serious systemic analysts recognize and they say this is the major problem of globalization, that its benefits are not distributed in any way fairly. That's why, actually we have much reaction, mainly, the present reaction in the form of what we may call neo-nationalist, or as I call them, sovereignty movements.

B.S.: I've spoken with some people who believe that globalization has helped India because people are working there in the national economy, you know, wealth has gone up a little bit, that kind of stuff. And when I say that it's not distributed properly, they blame that on the people, the elites in India, rather than on the system itself, rather than on globalization. So that's why I was asking that question as well.

Takis: What we have now in countries like India, China and of course in the western world is a few billionaires, and on the other hand we have also some sort of middle class developing in both India and China, but the rest of people there, the vast majority of people, are victims of globalization. And, in fact, the same is going on not only in India and China but in various capitalist countries too. Why people voted for Brexit in Britain, why people voted for Trump in the United States? That is, if you analyze, as I did, their voting preferences and so on, you will see that, in fact, it's the victims of globalization, in both cases, that voted for Brexit or Trump, and the same happened in France when they voted for Le Pen, or in Austria and so on. So, in other words, we have an international, or world-wide, movement now, from below, which of course is being exploited by political elites. And Trump is a kind of political elite exploiting this movement, and the same in Britain and so on. But we have to distinguish between the movements from below and what are the party movements, or political movements, that tried to express this movement.

The phasing out of the nation-state in the New World Order

B.S.: One final term, which confuses people in this country, too depending on what your political ideology is. So, I want to know how you're using the word, the term, the political philosophy "neo-liberalism". This term really gets a beating here. Hillary Clinton supporters, who still actually think of her and themselves as traditional liberals, believe it's a fake term created by the right wing to demonize liberals and progressives. I've actually heard people tell me that. Progressives, which are I guess Social Democrats, think of the term as sort of a special version of capitalism, which has somehow ruined the nation and weakened the United States and that we have to get back to a more social democratic sort of capitalism like FDR's New Deal. And the Left, whatever that may be anymore in this country,

sees it as just the latest version of capitalism born from Reagan and Thatcher and the transnational elites' efforts to save capitalism from itself. So, all that said, how were you're using the term neoliberalism in your work?

Takis: Actually, I don't accept this explanation. That is, neoliberalism is not just an ideology, as many people in the Left or the so-called Left suggest today. And it is not just, also, a version of capitalism, unless you mean by this that this is a structural phenomenon in the evolution of the capitalist system. In this sense, I would accept it, but today's capitalism has very little to do with the capitalism of 30 years ago, even more so a hundred years ago. The basic qualitative difference between today's capitalism and previous capitalisms is that the capitalist system used to be linked, from the beginning, with the nation state. In fact, the nation state helped a lot the evolution of capitalist market internally, domestically, in each country. However, today, the capitalism that has prevailed today, has been trying, in any way possible, to eliminate the nation state. In other words, we have now the phasing out of the nation state. This can be seen clearly in the European Union for example, where member states do not have, any more, any say in the domestic economic affairs but, instead, domestic economy (especially if they are members of the Eurozone as well), domestic economic policies are determined from outside, from a bureaucracy in Brussels. And the same happens all over the world, where we have the phasing out of the nation state and, instead, we have supranational or Transnational Elites developing, what I called the Transnational Elite before, which actually controls today's world economic system. So, this is what I mean by neoliberal elites. As I said at the beginning, the NWO of neoliberal globalization is a structural phenomenon that signifies the new form that capitalist market economy has taken in the last 20 years or so, which has very little to do with previous models of capitalism. Even the globalization of the early 20th century, as some call it, has nothing to do with today's globalization, because that globalization, which was attempted by countries like Britain and Germany and so on, was in fact globalization based on nation-states or on empires, the British Empire, the Russian Empire and so on. So, to the extent that these empires were in constant conflict between them, obviously, no globalization could be possible, that's why they ended up with the First World War and then with the Second World War. It was a conflict of imperialisms, exactly because capitalism at that time was based on nation states. Today this is inconceivable, you cannot have a war between European states. Why? Because they have common interests, they express the same economic interests, sometimes of the same multinational corporations. Their common interests are expressed politically and militarily by NATO and so on. So, there's no reason for Germany to start a war against Britain and vice versa. This is the qualitative difference of today from any previous globalization and from previous nation states.

The globalization's myth of peace

B.S.: Right, right. So, I mean, I think a lot, although I'm not sure about the United States but I think if people pay attention to Brexit and the EU issues, even here

people get the idea that there is a strong difference between the nationalist kind of capitalism versus this internationalist kind of it and globalization. But, still, there is a debate about which is more dangerous to humankind: this transnational neoliberal capitalism which is obviously dangerous, or the old school nationalism and negativism? This is of course a debate which came about here, partly, due to Brexit in the United Kingdom, as well as the rise of Donald Trump and Trumpism in the United States. So, here, I guess we can talk in a little more detail what your view is on these two political modalities.

Takis: Yes, but before we reach Brexit I think I have to say a few words about what you mentioned. In fact, there are wars today. Simply, there are no wars between the countries which are fully integrated into the New World Order, as I said, between European states, or between U.S.A. and Europe and so on. Of course, we had a series of wars in the last 20 years or so. First, in Yugoslavia when NATO bombed Serbia, then in Iraq where there was an invasion of the country, then in Libya and then in Syria where the same pattern was repeated and so on. So, I mean there are wars, but these are different wars from the wars between advanced capitalist states, as it was the case both in the First and Second World Wars — more in the Second. Now, we have wars by what I call the Transnational Elite against any state which resists being integrated into the New World Order.

B.S.: Right.

Takis: That's why there was a war against Iraq: because it was a sovereign nation. That's why there was a war against Libya and Yugoslavia: because all of these were sovereign nations which were not integrated into the New World Order and accordingly they had to be subordinated. Yet, there is a propaganda of the Transnational Elite that the European Union secures peace in Europe! This is funny because, it's not the European Union that secures peace, but the fact that the capitalist states in Europe (the elites of course of these countries), were united in creating the European Union, exactly in order to express better the interests of the multinationals. In fact, the basic treaties which established the European Union had been drafted by a mysterious organization called the European Round Table of Industrialists, which has (effectively) created all the institutions of the European Union. So, we have to distinguish between nationalism and the old nation-state wars (on the one hand) and what is today the start of a kind of internationalism (on the other). That is, what I call the New World Order of neoliberal globalization — which still creates wars, but not between the advanced capitalist countries which are integrated into the New World Order. There are still of course conflicts that we all know. For example, why there is all this tension with Russia? Because Russia is not integrated yet fully. Although it is a member of the World Trade Organization and so on, it's not fully integrated, in the sense that the Russian elite under Putin wants to participate in the Transnational Elite as an equal member, something they do not accept. I mean the elites in the West do not accept it and that's why we have all this tension between the Transnational Elite and Russia.

The significance of the Brexit revolution

B.S.: So, Brexit then. There are some different views here, even from people in England. I mean some say it was a bad thing because of security reasons, some say it was a bad thing because of (its effects on) international travel between the countries, that it's good to have, you know, one world government kind of liberal beliefs. Others think it was a good thing that it happened, because even though it might bring back a sort of nationalism, maybe, maybe not, it also breaks the pattern that the EU has set and maybe it will lead to some changes within the neoliberal agenda. So, what do you think Brexit meant and do you think it's going to last? What do you think about those opinions?

Takis: Of course, to understand what Brexit means and how people see Brexit you have to distinguish between which people you are talking about.

B.S.: Right, of course.

Takis: The elites basically are against Brexit and we saw it during the campaign for Brexit when all the major transnational corporations which are based in the U.K. launched a huge campaign to terrify the people (what was called the 'Project Fear') — to terrify people not to vote for Brexit. And in fact the Transnational Elites took part, an effective part, in this campaign, even Obama came here in London to say that you have to vote against Brexit, and the American elites were of course against Brexit, the European elites, the European Union elites were also against it and so on. In fact, it was basically a movement which started from below. In other words, once the Conservative Party launched this referendum in the firm belief (it was Cameron at the time leading the Party), that they will win it, they did not know (what will follow). They did so because there were some elements of the Conservative Party who were in favor of Brexit, but by no means the majority. There was however a strong part, or a significant part, of the Tory party which forced Cameron to have a Brexit (referendum). Again, as I said in the beginning (they believed) that the no vote would win but, in fact, what's happened — and this can be proven by the results of the election — was that many people in Britain from lower income groups, that is the working class, poor farmers, people with small shops and so on, all these people who were the victims of globalization all these years (voted for Brexit). People, for example, in the north of England, who became unemployed when Thatcher started opening markets — because, why an industrialist in Britain would use British steel when he can buy steel from Korea or whatever at half the price or less? So, the basic industries in Britain closed down at the time. There used to be a huge car industry in Britain and a huge basic industry to support it, the steel and rubber industries and so on. But all these industries closed down. And Britain, in the last 20 years or so, was transformed from an industrial economy to a service economy, that is (an economy) that was relying mainly on the financial sector, the City of London and so on, while everything else was imported. Of course, all these poorer people, who were

employed by these sectors which were phased out, were very angry they lost their jobs and they lost sometimes even their home and so on. All these people became immediately supporters of the “Leave” vote because they thought that it was the European Union, which was the means through which these globalization policies were passed and were implemented. In Britain it had been calculated that something like 60 percent of the legislation passed through the Houses of Parliament in fact is generated in the European Union, in Brussels. So, when people belonging to all these groups found out all this they said “come on, who is ruling Britain now, it's not us anymore, It's somebody else in Brussels, so let's get out of it”. And that's why there was this huge movement of people who were completely apathetic up to then to the electoral contest, that is people who had ceased voting for the Labor Party because the Labor Party, since Blair, has become a pure neoliberal party, as was also the case with most Social Democratic Parties. So, the traditional clientele of the Labor Party either moved to other parties, or mostly abstained and what happened with Brexit was that all these people, particularly those who used to abstain, came back and voted for Brexit and that's why you see that the poorer income groups voted for Brexit. In fact, it was only in London where Brexit was voted down. Why in London? Because London concentrates all the financial sector (which is of course the beneficiary from globalization), and those who work for it, but there are also people coming from all over the world who try to find their future there, as it happened for example with immigrants to the United States and so on. But the rest of Britain, the rest of England in particular, voted in favor of Brexit. And the same would have happened also with Scotland, but the Nationalist Party of Scotland voted in favor of the European Union (!) it went against Brexit. On the other hand, the Nationalist Party in Wales voted in favor of Brexit.

B.S.: But what about Ireland?

Takis: Ireland, Northern Ireland, voted in favor (of Remain in the EU) but in fact the Nationalist Party, which is now actually cooperating with the Conservative Party in governing the country, voted against (Remain). So, they were divided in Northern Ireland.

How we could explain the rise of Trump in the USA?

B.S.: Moving now to the United States, I know you're from Greece and you live in England so you're looking from outside in at the United States, which is an anomaly sometimes, but a lot of things have happened that are similar. You know we're a service based culture now and we don't produce the imports etc., etc., etc. Donald Trump is a new kind of thing for us — and I've seen some crazy stuff happening here including George W. Bush. But this is something a little different, for better or worse. You know United States now has probably the least qualified — and we can discuss what qualified means (“to be qualified” just means carrying out the wishes of the transnational elite) — but the least qualified in (terms of)

our history, i.e. a sleazy narcissistic game show host, you know, who has now not only split the Republican Party but holds a mirror up I think to the United States, to us, showing us what we really look like to the world because of our policies over the last five decades. What do you think about the rise of Trump himself and the empowerment of the most divisive elements in American culture with him, like the neo-Nazis and the xenophobes and the nationalists and stuff like this?

Takis: So, the first question is therefore whether there is, qualitatively, any difference now in the United States, whether things are worse, from what point of view are worse and why people voted for Trump — which is also the second question that is how we explain the rise of Trump. I think here that we have to distinguish as I've said before between the elites — both in the United States and in the other advanced capitalist countries — and the victims of globalization, which belong to the lower social classes, the working classes etc. The United States have not of course suffered because of globalization, if we talk about the national statistics, about how the national income has grown and so on. Why is this? Because, in fact, what we really had was U.S.-based transnational corporations which expanded all over the world. So, from their point of view, of course, things were rosy because they could exploit cheap labor in China or India or whatever. But, at the same time, they had of course to move many parts of their productive activity from the U.S. abroad.

The classic example is Apple of course. As you know, when you're buying an Apple computer, it says "made in China". Of course, it's not made in China because all the electronic base of the computer is made in California. not in China. In China, they simply assemble the computer and they state it's all made in China! Now this means that many people who could work in the United States in the steel industry and the car industry and so on found themselves, in the last 20 years or so, being unemployed because cheap European cars, or Chinese, or Korean cars could come to the United States and the result was that people in the United States — workers especially in what is called the Rust Belt states and so on — became unemployed and therefore very angry with what's going on. So, these are the reasons why things are not going well for some, who actually happened to be the majority, both in Britain and the United States and so on, while, for others, of course things are going very well. That is, in the United States people in the coastal parts of the United States both in the east and the west (California, New York and so on) have no problem but the people in the middle, where actually all main industries used to be based are not happy at all with what's going on. So, there was a popular movement both in the United States and in Britain against globalization and its affects. And it was then Trump who exploited, if you like, this movement and promised that he will bring back jobs from abroad, that he would punish the multinational corporations who move their activities abroad, that he would reduce the immigration from Mexico, etc. So, these were popular demands, which therefore gave him the victory because of the work that he could bring in all these areas in the center of United States, as against the liberal parts of the United States in the east and the west. That's how you can explain the rise of

Trump. And that could, also, explain the huge war that was launched against Trump, even after he was elected. I had not seen in my life the entire establishment to attack the president who was elected — at least, this was I think an unprecedented phenomenon — and this can only be explained because, as I said, it is the Transnational Elite that controls not only multinational corporations, but controls also the world media like *The New York Times*, or *The Times* and *The Guardian* here, and so on, it controls also the cultural industry etc. In fact, that's why we may talk about the Transnational Elite because we have a network of elites which actually takes decisions and promotes its own decisions and its own ideology all over the world.

The smear campaign by the “Left” on the rise of sovereignty movements

Now, to come to the last part of the question about the rise of neo-Nazis and so on, I would say that this is part of the propaganda that is being developed by the Transnational Elites and the media they control, because neo-Nazis have been in existence in both Europe and the States for many years. But usually they did not control more than two or three, or five percent at most, of the electorate. So, what happened and you saw in Britain that 51 percent of the population voted for Brexit or what happened in the States and you saw many millions of people voting for Trump? Obviously, they did not become neo-Nazis from one day to the next! This is just a smear campaign launched by the Left. And this is a major other item we can discuss, i.e. that the Left attacked very much these movements that started from below and only wanted sovereignty and they've attacked them because they thought — rightly of course — that they'd lose electoral clientele because in Britain, for example, it can be proven that the vast majority who voted for Brexit were working class people who used to vote in the past Labor. So obviously all these workers did not become neo-Nazi's. Simply, they found out that the (mainly Blairite) Labor Party, which clearly functions as if it is in the payroll of the European Union, does not express them anymore.

B.S.: OK. So, this is rather complex. England maybe a little bit simpler. I can't say for sure I don't live there. There are similarities of course but here in the United States there's a variety of things going on, obviously. I'm not sure how many people in the electorate understood even what Hillary Clinton represented. A lot of people didn't like her. They might have had an idea that she and Obama and the Bushes represent the Transnational Elite and they were tired of establishment politics — that's been happening here for a while. They might also understand the problems, the individual problems, with Donald Trump and the types of people that are happy that he's the president. I don't mean the people who have been hurt by the Transnational Elite but those elements in society (associated with racism) because this society has a type of racism that obviously is different than in England, with slavery and with a lot of other things. Also, it gets even more confusing when you add the other so-called revolution around Bernie Sanders because some people saw that as something from below. Even

though he's part of the system and he's part of a social democratic ideology, Sanders's supporters figured they were going to bring back some kind of social democracy that we never really quite had anyway. They were going to bring us back to the time before neoliberalism, before Reagan took over and Bush and every one since Bill Clinton. Hillary Clinton supporters — I'm not even sure you know it was a lot of stuff going on there — they wanted the first female president amongst other things. So, it may be that it's not so much that people voted for Trump or for a third party, as opposed to voting against the establishment, against Hillary Clinton. But here we have the Christian fundamentalists, who have always been a big voting group for the Republican Party supporting Donald Trump, which is really odd because, based on their own expressed values as so-called Christians, you know, Donald Trump is nowhere near an exemplary figure of that. So, I think there's a lot of things going on, he's really exploiting through all those characteristics of this country through religion and racism and white working class Americans and all this other stuff. Who knows what Donald Trump really believes. But now, you know, when you wrote the book he was just becoming elected, with the election just happened. Now he's been there for a while. What do you think has happened? Do you think it's the same kind and he still represents people who, whether they understand what's going on or not, still think that he represents, or his administration somehow underneath all the craziness represents nationalism or isolationism versus the Transnational Elite's neo liberalism? Or do you think Trump has become part of the system and now is being used by the same Transnational Elites, no matter what comes out of his mouth?

Social Democracy is dead and buried in the New World Order

Takis: First, as regards the division between Clinton and Trump, or even that between Sanders and Trump, I think that it is generally accepted that the entire liberal establishment was against Trump and that it was divided, however, as regards the support for Hillary or for Sanders. Of course, the majority of the liberal establishment and liberal voters were in favor of Hillary Clinton, who controlled also the party mechanism and so on and against Sanders. And Sanders, of course, became unreliable from the moment he called his supporters to vote for Hillary, disappointing many people who may have believed in his program. Now, the problem with people like Sanders is that it's not just a matter of personalities. It's that social democracy is not feasible anymore, it's not possible anymore in a globalized society and economy, as the one we live now. It's not a matter that Sanders wants to betray his voters, or that the same happened in France with Mitterrand or Hollande, or the same in Britain. It's not that all these wanted to betray their voters. It's simply that they had to accept the structural characteristics of the system, otherwise they cannot actually implement any of their policies — unless they break with the institutions of the New World Order. If they decide not to break, then they cannot do anything else, from inside. You cannot, in other words, improve the

European Union so that it would become a good Social Democratic Union. In fact, this was attempted in the late 1980s with the Delors Plan, which was a Social Democratic program (Delors was also a Social Democrat). But all this was thrown out and was rejected by the successors of Delors and the new generation of European Union leaders, who adopted the neoliberal program not because they wanted to abandon the social democracy but because they found out that with open and liberalized markets — which they took for granted — they did not have a choice. That's why you see the collapse of the social democracy not just in the United States in the form of Sanders, but all over the world. In Europe, now, all Social Democratic Parties collapsed. Look at the electoral results in Germany, in France, in Italy and in Britain and so on (Britain is presently an exception as it got Corbyn, [a kind of Tsipras], we can discuss it later if you like). But, otherwise, the Social Democratic Parties all over Europe and in the United States collapsed. The reason is that they could not any more offer what the old Social Democratic Parties offered in the past. So, that's the reason why people voted for Trump in the United States or for Brexit in Britain.

B.S.: Before we leave this, I just have one question about that. There was a line that was a quip, if you paid attention I'm sure you did to the primary debate between Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders, where he was talking about health care you know universal socialized healthcare like most of Europe still has in other places, and he was describing Denmark as an example. And she said, well, we're not Denmark. Do you think Scandinavia, Denmark, Sweden those countries are still holding on to a Social Democracy of some sort and, if they are, are they an exception? So maybe when Hillary Clinton said we're not Denmark she really meant we're not going to do that here because we can't do it, not because we won't.

Takis: In fact, this is not true. Actually, I have written an article about the Scandinavian social democracy a few months ago where I had a lot of evidence and research by Scandinavian people who showed that it is a myth that the old Social Democratic state still exists in any Scandinavian country. In fact, what they did, both in Sweden and in Denmark and so on, they introduced open and liberalized markets which, as regards for example labor means that you cannot have anymore full employment, as we used to know it in the past. That is, now they have flexible labor, and flexible labor means that you should be available at any time whenever your employer asks you to work and so on. In fact, part-time work, and what they are calling in Britain and the U.S. 'zero contract hours' are prevalent. But zero contract hours means something like, if you remember the old Hollywood films where every morning somebody from the factory was coming out of the gates and was choosing between people who were going to work. Now this is the situation today in Britain and I suspect also in the United States. That is, people who do not have any contract, do not have any insurance, or any effective insurance rights and so on, have to work (this way) in order to avoid unemployment and if they don't want to work this way then they (the employers) can simply use immigrant workers. That's why

they have so many immigrants allowed to get into Europe and to some extent also in the United States. So, what happens is that, as regards the health care for example you mentioned, no social democratic health care system is any more viable. In Britain, for example, you know they had the best health care system and I have personal knowledge of it because when I came here (50 years ago or so) it was working marvelously, as when it was established, immediately after the war by a very different of course Labor Party than the present one. And it was free at all levels, that is people could use the health system, from the general practitioner up to the more specialized operations, and so on. Now what happened however later on, following Thatcher, Blair and the rest, was that (Governments) had to reduce taxes, as lower taxes is one of the basic elements of the neoliberal globalization. That is, a country has to be competitive in order to compete within the open market, and to be competitive it has to have low taxes, particularly corporation taxes and so on. So, they lower taxes, and this means what? This means they have to lower also state spending. And the first candidates were health, where most spending was going and education. So that's why the health system in Britain started deteriorating rapidly since Thatcher and Blair and continues to deteriorate now. Clearly, the idea of the Transnational Elite is that the quality of services will become so bad over time, so that people will prefer (those who can afford it of course) private service. Something similar is going on in the United States. As regards the Scandinavian countries, as I said, once they adopted the flexibility of prices and wages, then, they cannot talk any more about social democracy. In fact, they just try to keep some sort of (comprehensive) health system by taxing people (who can afford) more. On this, they differ perhaps from continental Europeans, but still the system has no comparison with what the health system or the education system in Scandinavia was 20-30 years ago, with what is going on now.

On the side effects of the individualization of society in the New World Order

B.S.: Ok. Early in your book you talk about the social and psychological effects on peoples when their countries enter the New World Order. I can't speak directly on nations outside the United States, never visited them, but it's evident here that America has become what sociologist Charles Derber describes as a sociopathic society, with shooting, mass shooting, almost every day, or every week. It feels like these days there's lots of things going on in this society that's crumbling. Charles Derber lists many reasons for his belief that we're a sociopathic society. You mentioned this too. What are some examples you see wherever you see them? Like for instance in the United States we have an increase of the use of anti-depressants and other drugs. There is a lot more depression and anxiety than there used to be. There's more eating disorders than there used to be.

Takis: These kinds of trends, that is people who are antisocial, who are individualized people who try to explain everything around them and act accordingly on the basis of how they and perhaps their family will do better but not giving a damn about the

collective — either it is the community or society in general — these trends are of course cultivated by the cultural globalization and the ideological globalization. The sort of society they promote is a society where human rights have to be protected at any cost, even if they refer to relations between minorities in the population like between transgender people and so on. That is, human rights is the ideology of globalization, which is used not only domestically but also as regards their foreign relations. Don't forget that all the main wars of the Transnational Elite in the last 20 years were in order to protect human rights in Iraq in Libya and so on. So, this means that there is a deliberate trend to individualize society because this is the whole idea of neoliberal globalization. People try to accommodate themselves with the existing social and economic framework and try to find individual solutions for everything affecting them. They don't any more think in social terms, as they used to think in the past. In this connection, I would say that self-determination today, or rather the sovereignty movements I mentioned before are an expression of self-determination. In the past, self-determination was expressed either in the form of classical democracy or in the form of confederations of communities and this was the main form up to the French Revolution. After the establishment of national states, self-determination was expressed through the nation state. That was the only way in which, collectively, people would express their desires about what to do with society, how they are going to move, how they're going to spend their income and so on. But whilst nation-states are being phased out, as its happening today, then, in fact, people do not have any means of collective self-determination anymore and the only thing they are left with is individual self-determination. That is, they try to sort out their problems at the individual level. This has all sort of side effects like the ones you mentioned. People become depressed, people do become anxious because they feel they are failed people if they don't succeed in the market and can't get a good job, or good house, or whatever. That is, assign any fault to themselves, any fault in other words related to why they don't get a good job, or why they don't get a good house etc. Everything becomes individualized. If everybody thinks in individual terms that means that all these psychological problems that you mentioned are simply necessary side effects of this kind of society we live in.

B.S.: Right. Right. And loneliness as well.

National liberation as a precondition for social liberation in the NWO

B.S.: Is there a way in your mind to defeat neoliberalism, capitalism in general perhaps, and take power from the elites and give it back to the people without a violent revolution or waiting for some apocalyptic event to occur first?

Takis: In fact, I happen to suggest a shift in strategy because, if you remember, when we were talking about inclusive democracy this strategy was very different from what I'm talking today and the reason is not that I changed my ideas. I still believe that an ideal society should be an inclusive democracy, but the problem is how you get there. And to

my mind this is not possible any more, as it used to be perhaps 30 or 40 years ago. That is, then, there were (still) people in local communities and so on, who were creating eco-communes or whatever and tried to implement their ideas at the local level, in the hope that, this way, they could expand at the social level, what they were doing at the local level.

B.S.: It seemed even more positive 10 years ago than it does now. More possible I mean.

Takis: Yeah, today this is not possible anymore, that is, in order to be able, even to experiment on this kind of basis, you have to be able to control the economy around you and you can't control in any efficient way the economy around you if it is globalized and it is huge corporations that control what people buy at the supermarkets or whatever they use their money generally. So, what I mean is that today we live under occupation, that is we have a kind of occupation by the Transnational Elites, which actually take all important decisions about ourselves. So, if you have an occupation, the only way to proceed, as it happened during the German occupation in Europe during the Second World War, is, first, to get your national liberation. Then, once you have national liberation, in other words once you can control your nation, you can control your country or your community — I mean economic control and political control and of course cultural control — once you control your community, then you can talk about how you can change the community how you can have an ideal society and so on. That's why I call this movement today a movement for self-determination, as it is the expression of self-determination today, which used to be in the past in the form of confederations etc. Today, the form of self-expression, or self-determination, that is available is only through the creation, first, of forms of society which secure national liberation. And once you get your national liberation then you can talk about social liberation. That is, the social liberation presupposes if you like, national liberation. Unless you control your own environment, your country, or your community, you cannot talk about an ideal society. Even the Russian Communists in 1917 they did what? They stormed the Winter Palace. Why? Because that was the center of power and they knew that they had a nation, the Russian nation, and all that was needed was to invade the Winter Palace and get all power needed in order to convert society according to what they believed was the ideal form of society. But, today, there's no Winter Palace anymore in any country. Which is the Winter Palace in the United States? Is it the White House? And who controls the White House? At least, not Trump! It is obvious now that nobody can control the White House unless he is approved by those elites that control the media, control the Senate and so on. The same happened in France. Who controls the Elysee Palace? It's not of course Macron. Macron was in fact *selected* by the Transnational Elite, exactly, in order to implement the program of the Transnational Elite towards creating a full federation of European states. In other words, a program towards the formal abolition of national

sovereignty. And the same in Britain with Theresa May and so on. In other words, it's not anymore who is Prime Minister and who is President that control today's society. It's all these elites, which actually control the people who are elected in such places. Don't tell me that if Hillary Clinton were elected she would not accept all the demands of the Transnational Elite, or of the multinationals, or the mass media.

B.S.: Of course not. She was part of that, she helped create it.

So, what do we do then? Go back to some form of nationalism before we could then go to some form of community and inclusive democracy, which is I guess what Brexit was about? But I don't even know, if that can happen in Europe — forget about the United States. A lot of people think it might be a lost cause here. But is there anything besides violence like the Russian Revolution, that we saw how it turned out? Is there any way to have a real liberatory project now and how to take any steps towards it? Superficially speaking, is there hope left?

Takis: As regards first the term that you use, nationalism, I don't agree that we should call all these movements nationalist movements. That's what I explained in detail, why they are not nationalists in the old form, because they are not aggressive nationalists, we are talking about defensive nationalists, that is we are not talking about Nazis who want to expand the economic area of activity of their own countries and so on. So, what you call nationalism in Britain today, or in France and so on, has nothing to do with expanding in other countries in any aggressive form. They just fight in defense of the right to determine their own affairs in their own country. That's why I call these movements sovereignty movements rather than nationalist or even neo-nationalist because they still can be smeared by the Left as if this is some kind of aggressive Nationalism, which they are not. So, what was the last part of your question?

B.S.: Well I just wanted to ask while we talk about these topics and we get to the end of the conversation about what could be done and if there's anything that could be done. Most of my guests tend to be very pessimistic. I'm pessimistic in some ways too. But is there any reason to be optimistic at all or idealistic that things could change in a positive way, or is it too late?

Takis: No, it's not too late I think, and I made concrete proposals in my book that the way forward is for all those movements which I characterized self-determination movements to start being organized from below because at the moment it's people like Trump, or Farage in Britain, or LePen in France and so on who, for their own reasons, political reasons, or ambitions, or whatever, try to 'exploit', as I said, these movements. The point is that these movements have to organize from below, in other words, they have to self-organize in the form of Popular Fronts like, as I mentioned before, during the German occupation. There were popular fronts fighting the Nazi conqueror both in Greece and in France and elsewhere in Europe. So, what we need today is people to self-organize in

the form of Popular Fronts in order to get their national liberation. And once they get national liberation, they have to organize a self-reliant economy, in other words, people will have to break with the institutions of the New World Order and create self-reliance. I don't mean autarky of course, I mean self-reliance in the sense that people in the country, say in the United States or Britain, will be able to cover most of their basic needs, and even more, by the domestic production, and then, and only then once they have covered their basic needs, they could start trading on the surpluses of their production and exchange surpluses with other countries — and all this could be done within a new community of nations. In other words, I think that only if a new community of sovereign nations is created, only then we can have a ray of hope that we can get out of the present neoliberal globalization. If people organize, first, in the form of Popular Fronts and get their national liberation, and then they fight with other nations which are also sovereign (or fight for their sovereignty), they can unite with all these nations to create, at the end, a community of sovereign nations, which will really change the form of the world. As regards to what would be the form of such a society, that should be left to the people themselves to decide. In other words, after people have got their national liberation they may want to have a kind of socialism, or of soviet communism, or inclusive democracy, or an anarcho-syndicalist society or whatever.

B.S.: Like the Spanish anarchists during the 1930s.

Takis: Yeah, yeah. All these should be decided afterwards, that is, after they got national liberation, because we should not forget that the Spanish anarchists that you correctly mentioned and, as I mentioned before the Bolsheviks and so on, they all already had their own national liberation, and the problem for them was how they move from national liberation to social liberation. And this is something that the assemblies of the future should decide.

B.S.: Right. That is what you've been talking about since you wrote *Towards an Inclusive Democracy* and things are a little bit more complex now. But I do personally think that that's possible, although it seems like a really tall order. But, who knows, things happen quickly sometimes, if enough people in enough places get more upset and have their lives more turned upside down, then things like that might be possible.

Thank you Takis Fotopoulos for being on Equal Time or Freethought again.

Takis: Thank you too Barry.

