

# The New World Order in Action: From Kosovo to Tibet\*

**TAKIS FOTOPOULOS**

The recently granted “independence” to Kosovo by the transnational elite, in flagrant violation of international law and the UN, has completed the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia. As I pointed out elsewhere<sup>[1]</sup> the dismembering of Yugoslavia was an attempt by the transnational elite to fully integrate the area into the New Economic Order of the internationalised market economy. Thus, given the resurgence of nationalism in the Balkans after the collapse of socialism and the fact that the old Yugoslavia was the strongest Balkan state, with a long history of independence from both the Western and Soviet blocks, it is obvious that the transnational elite at some stage drew the conclusion that the normal methods of economic integration, which were successfully used in the rest of the Balkans (Albania, Bulgaria, Romania) would not be sufficient to fully integrate the old Yugoslavia into the internationalised market economy and its economic and military institutions (EU/NATO). Therefore, the policy adopted by the transnational elite was one of encouraging Yugoslavia’s dismemberment through the creation of a series of protectorates. Either, on a ‘voluntary’ basis, (as in the cases of Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia), or by force (as in the cases of Bosnia and then Kosovo). In pursuing this policy, the transnational elite, throughout the last decade, exploited in every way possible the nationalist and ethnic divisions, which emerged after the collapse of Yugoslavian ‘socialism’.

The Serbian elite was divided in this process between a nationalist part (supposedly) expressing the aspirations of lower social groups for some form of a nationally based social economy, and a “modernising” part mainly expressing the middle classes’ aspirations to join the EU and the consequent full integration to the internationalised market economy. The barbarous bombing by the transnational elite-controlled NATO (with the full support of the European reformist Left and the European mainstream Greens) of Serbian infrastructure had the desired effect in achieving the ousting of the nationalist leadership (part of which is still being tried in the Hague by the kangaroo court established by the transnational elite) and the dominance, since then, of the modernising part of the elite. The inevitable outcome of the dismembering of Yugoslavia was the return of the Yugoslav peoples to the pre-World War II condition of dependence, which had been interrupted by their partial separation from the world market and the corresponding political independence they achieved under the Tito regime. It is therefore expected that in the short to medium term the Serbian elite, with the full support of Serbia’s strong middle class, would be fully integrated into the New International Order, through its accession to NATO and the EU.

At the same time, the transnational elite (which does not consist only of the “bad” American elite, as the reformist Left simplifies the issue for obvious reasons, but also of the main European elites) has already fulfilled all its geopolitical and economic goals it had planned

on launching its criminal wars over the past ten years (bombing of Yugoslavia, invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq), and the corresponding goals it aims today with respect to rising powers like China, namely:

- The military surrounding of Russia —which, for the transnational elite, represents an unstable link in the New World Order— through the integration of Eastern Europe into NATO and the installation of military bases, possibly including missile systems, up to its very border. This is of course an old strategic aim of the transnational elite and its American leadership since, as early as 1984, the US National Security Council had taken the decision to re-integrate the countries of East Europe, including Yugoslavia, in the internationalised market economy<sup>[2]</sup>. Despite the fact that the transitional elite does not feel threatened anymore by the new Russian elite —which is already integrated into the world capitalist market economy and at the moment is anxious to further enhance this integration through its accession to the World Trade Organization— still, it is very much concerned about the rise of nationalism in the country, which at the moment and in the wake of the oil revenue boom, is controlled by the political elite around Putin.
- Ensuring the full integration of Iraq into the New World Order in the form of a semi-protectorate<sup>[3]</sup> and securing the oil stocks there, in view of the worsening situation with respect to world oil stocks, which is also expressed in the growing oil crisis. Thanks to the irreversible division of the Iraqi people which the transnational elite, under the US leadership, has already achieved, (similar to the division of Yugoslavia's peoples it encouraged in the 1990s that led to the dismembering of the country) oil control by the transnational elite in the Middle East has been secured for the next 20-30 years, while stocks are expected to last in the region. This is particularly so if the “Yugoslavian solution” is attempted by the transnational elite against Iran as well, on the pretext of its supposed nuclear plans, and this attempt is met by similar success as in Yugoslavia to integrate Iran and possibly the entire Middle East into the New World Order of the internationalised market economy and representative “democracy”.
- The corresponding undermining of Chinese ambitions for world power status, amounting to a new “pole” in world affairs equivalent to that of USA —a conceited ambition given that the Chinese “miracle” is very much a mirage created by the transfer of significant production activities by Western transnational corporations in this country with the aim to exploit the vast, well trained and very cheap (compared to Western standards) local resources. Thus, at the very moment the Chinese elite was attempting through the Olympic games to promote its status as a new pole in world power relations, the transnational elite used the “Tibet incident”, i.e. the mass demonstrations of the Tibetans in favour of their right to religious irrationalism and the feudal theocracy, in order to give a lesson to the Chinese elite. In other words, the transnational elite is not in reality concerned about the rising economic power of China, when it is well aware of the fact that China's economy is, in fact, the assembly line of the transnational elite, with 60% of its exports and nearly 100% of its high technology exports accounted for by Western transnational corporations<sup>[4]</sup> exploiting the local miserable wages and working conditions—a fact that was reflected also in the recent financial crisis when it became obvious that the Chinese (and Indian) “growth” rests on wooden legs. In other words, the objectives of the ideological attack orchestrated by the transnational elite were clearly geopolitical and aimed to teach the Chinese elite a lesson about its true position as a servant and not as an equal member

of the transnational elite, as it imagines.

However, the interesting element in the attainment of the above objectives by the transnational elite is not its well known military superiority, which of course was the main instrument it used in achieving most of these objectives, but also the ideology it used so effectively to stimulate the euphemistically called “world civil society” (or “world community”) of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and the “movements” of the reformist Left and Ecology, as the Tibet incident has shown.

As I pointed out elsewhere<sup>[5]</sup>, economic and political globalisation were inevitably accompanied by a kind of ‘ideological globalisation’, i.e. a transnational ideology used to justify the decrease of national sovereignty, which complements the corresponding decrease of economic sovereignty following economic globalisation. The core of this new ideology is the doctrine of ‘limited’ sovereignty, according to which, there are certain universal values that should take priority over other values, like that of national sovereignty. This doctrine is used to ‘justify’ military interventions/attacks against any ‘rogue’ regimes or political organisations and movements. Tony Blair's foreign policy guru Robert Cooper expressed clearly the new ideological globalisation when he argued that ‘what is needed is a new kind of imperialism, one compatible with human rights and cosmopolitan values: an imperialism which aims to bring order and organisation but which rests today on the voluntary principle.’<sup>[6]</sup>

Thus, NGOs (such as Human Rights Watch, etc.) and “movements”, in perfect harmony with the transnational elite, were mobilised en masse yesterday to defend the rights of Kosovars, of women in Afghanistan or of the Iraqis (before the invasions!), and of the Tibetans today, with the Green assistant mayor of Paris stating shamelessly “we stopped China pretending that it is a country like any other, a respectable country”! Obviously, for him as well as for the disgraceful Con Bedit, Joschka Fischer and similar “Euro Greens”, countries like France, Britain, the USA, etc. belong to “respectable countries”, despite their massive crimes in the past and today! By “coincidence”, however, we never have seen the same world community (NGOs and the rest) massively mobilising (apart from some feeble complaints) and demand, for instance, the sentencing of Bush, Blair, Sharon, Olmert, et.al. as criminals against humanity —as they did for Saddam or Milosevic— or against the blatant violation of individual rights by Zionists in Gaza, and by the tyrannical regimes in Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Presumably, for all these “movements” and NGOs of the reformist Left and Ecology, the human rights of some people are “more equal” than those of others...

---

\* – This text is partly based on an article published in the mass circulation Athens daily *Eleftherotytia* on 12/4/2008.

---

[1] Takis Fotopoulos, “[The First War of the Internationalised Market Economy](#)”, *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (July 1999).

[2] M. Chossudovsky, “Dismantling Former Yugoslavia, *Znet* (April 1999).

[3] Seumas Milne, “Bush is trying to impose a classic colonial status on Iraq”, *The Guardian* (26/6/2008); see also Takis Fotopoulos, “[Iraq: the new criminal "war" of the transnational elite](#)”,

*Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (July 2003).

[4] Will Hutton, *The Writing on the Wall: China and the West in the 21st Century* (2007).

[5] Takis Fotopoulos, "[The global 'war' of the transnational elite](#)", *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (July 2002).

[6] Robert Cooper, "Why we still need empires", *The Observer* (7 April 2002).