

## 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 Elite<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Elite<sup>2</sup> — 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 book<sup>3</sup>, 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 Nations<sup>4</sup> 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,

---

<sup>2</sup> 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#](http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol11/vol11_no1_The_Sell-out_of_Greece_by_Syriza_and_the_bankruptcy_of_the_globalist_Left.html#)>

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

<sup>4</sup> *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).<sup>5</sup>

### **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.<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> there were no qualms about allying with various local butchers, which specialize in the use of purely fascist methods to overthrow national liberation regimes:

---

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

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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 areas<sup>8</sup> and the corresponding conversion of Greece into a huge concentration camp for refugees with its borders blocked by its 'partners' in the EU.<sup>9</sup> 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."<sup>10</sup>

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

---

<sup>8</sup> 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>>

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

<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.

---

<sup>11</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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.'<sup>12</sup>

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 20<sup>th</sup> 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

---

<sup>12</sup> 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."<sup>13</sup> 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."<sup>14</sup>

---

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

<sup>14</sup> 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.”<sup>15</sup> Similar trends are noticed in other European countries like Finland, where the anti-NATO and pro-independence parties effectively won the last elections,<sup>16</sup> as well as in Hungary, where neo-nationalist forces are continuously rising.<sup>17</sup> 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!<sup>18</sup> 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.”<sup>19</sup> 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!<sup>20</sup> 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,<sup>21</sup> 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

---

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

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

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

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

<sup>19</sup> 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/>>

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

<sup>21</sup> 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* case<sup>22</sup> 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,<sup>23</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>23</sup> 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,<sup>24</sup> 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,<sup>25</sup> 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,<sup>26</sup> 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,<sup>27</sup> 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

---

<sup>24</sup> "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/>>

<sup>25</sup> 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/>>

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

<sup>27</sup> *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'<sup>28</sup> 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 Sachs<sup>29</sup> people and the likes, recently joined by Emmanuel Barroso the ex-President of the European Commission!) or, alternatively, some central planners.

---

<sup>28</sup> 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.

<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup> 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.<sup>31</sup>

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

---

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

<sup>31</sup> "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,<sup>32</sup> argued in his Diem25 Manifesto.<sup>33</sup> 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.”<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> 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>>

<sup>33</sup> 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](http://inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol12/vol12_no1_Diem25_manifesto_democratizing_europe_or_for_eu_elites_domination.html)>

<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> 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."<sup>36</sup> 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."<sup>37</sup>

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.

---

<sup>35</sup> 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](http://www.democracynature.org/vol6/takis_class.htm)>

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

<sup>37</sup> *ibid.*



the EU), according to another EU acolyte<sup>38</sup>) 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!<sup>39</sup>

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

---

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

<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> 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).<sup>41</sup> 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**

---

<sup>40</sup> 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>>

<sup>41</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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,<sup>42</sup> 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,<sup>43</sup> 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,<sup>44</sup> France and Austria, abandoning the old Left parties, which now survive mainly

---

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

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

<sup>44</sup> 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!<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup> 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

---

<sup>45</sup> 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>>

<sup>46</sup> 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.<sup>47</sup> 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,<sup>48</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>48</sup> 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!<sup>49</sup> 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."<sup>50</sup>

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'."<sup>51</sup>

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!"<sup>52</sup>

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

---

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

<sup>50</sup> 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>>

<sup>51</sup> 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>>

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

<sup>53</sup> 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.<sup>54</sup> 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."<sup>55</sup>

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,<sup>56</sup> the SNP is not a neo-nationalist party but, instead it is a remnant of the old 20<sup>th</sup> 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

---

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

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

<sup>56</sup> *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.”<sup>57</sup>

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,<sup>58</sup> 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,<sup>59</sup> 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

---

<sup>57</sup> 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).

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

<sup>59</sup> 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 Sorosés 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”)<sup>60</sup> 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:

---

<sup>60</sup> 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.”<sup>61</sup>

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.<sup>62</sup>

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.”<sup>63</sup>

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’.”<sup>64</sup> It is not accidental of course that the main Brexit voters were

---

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

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

<sup>63</sup> 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>>

<sup>64</sup> *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!<sup>65</sup> 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.”<sup>66</sup>

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.”<sup>67</sup> 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”.<sup>68</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>66</sup> 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>>

<sup>67</sup> 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>>

<sup>68</sup> “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."<sup>69</sup>

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).<sup>70</sup>
- 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.<sup>71</sup>
- 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.<sup>72</sup> 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

---

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

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

<sup>71</sup> 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/>>

<sup>72</sup> 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.”<sup>73</sup>

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 Melançon’s ‘Left’, Le Pen’s FN, and, other smaller anti-EU parties. Even worse, Melançon’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 Melançon’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 Melançon is, that in the survey on voting intentions, which he

---

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

organized among his supporters, voting for Le Pen was not even an option!<sup>74</sup> 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."<sup>75</sup> 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."<sup>76</sup> Furthermore, according to an Ifop poll carried out after the first round, 55 per cent of manual workers say they will vote for her.<sup>77</sup>

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.<sup>78</sup> 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).<sup>79</sup> Yet, any honest politician, let alone a Left politician, in view of such a crucial dilemma, he

---

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

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

<sup>76</sup> 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).

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

<sup>78</sup> 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](http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol11/vol11_no1_The_Sell-out_of_Greece_by_Syriza_and_the_bankruptcy_of_the_globalist_Left.html)>

<sup>79</sup> 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).<sup>80</sup> 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."<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> 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/>>

<sup>81</sup> "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.”<sup>82</sup>

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”.<sup>83</sup> 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.”<sup>84</sup> 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!<sup>85</sup>) 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

---

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

<sup>83</sup> *ibid.*

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

<sup>85</sup> 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.”<sup>86</sup>

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

---

<sup>86</sup> 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,<sup>87</sup> 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.<sup>88</sup> 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.<sup>89</sup>

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.

---

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

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

<sup>89</sup> 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).