

# The Neo-Imperialist Corporatist Order and the “Men Behind the Curtain”

By [Sam Muhho](#)

Global Research, November 18, 2013

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

*Vincent Harlow once wisely observed, “Men’s minds indeed conceive new thoughts and plan new projects, but out of ancient thinking and under potent influence of long-established characteristics.” This has been reflected in reality for both the positive but also for the negative.*

A critical modern-day “negative” that is threatening humanity as we know it is the emergence of an [increasingly transparent “neo-imperialist” order](#) that is currently subverting the world and seeking to control the destiny of humanity in manners not unlike to what imperialism has done throughout the ages. This “empire”, unlike previous ones, is not serving the interest of a specific country or nationality but an [international cabal of corporate-financier, self-proclaimed “globalist” elite](#) operating from the Wall Street-London axis of power along with international bankers, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and related financial and political institutions.

A false political theater has been crafted by the corporate media serving as the public relations arm of this agenda. It is about time people escaped the media “matrix” marketing a singular agenda under different political labels and it is time to understand the international gambles this empire is playing with our collective destiny.

## The Nature of the Empire

Contrary to misconceptions by many well-intentioned and aware people, this empire is not strictly an “American empire” in the sense that it is being done for the mere glory of America as a nation although the historical Anglo-American political and financial center of power is the driving factor. Rather, it is an empire that seeks the subversion of both the American people and the world by the creation of an international corporatist order where power is centralized in hands of a collective, privileged few expanding their control through the means of co-opted governments and force. The mechanisms of this modern empire are parallel to the mechanism of the British Empire historically and can be demonstrated in various sources of both scholarly and general analysis.

The parallel is found in manners such as the function of empires in general (albeit under different historical contexts), the role of “system administrators”, and also the manner in which the modern-day “empire” can be dismantled similar to the British Empire’s dismantling from the American colonies, all of which will be noted.

What cannot be understated is the role of this empire as an international corporatist order. [Michael Snyder defines a corporatist order](#) as one where:

Most wealth and power is concentrated in the hands of giant corporations and big government is used as a tool by these corporations to consolidate wealth and power even further. In a corporatist system, the wealth and power of individuals and small businesses is dwarfed by the overwhelming dominance of the corporations.

Snyder's excellent article "[Corporatism Is Not Capitalism: 7 Things About The Monolithic Predator Corporations That Dominate Our Economy That Every American Should Know](#)" discusses everything that is wrong with the system including an increasing wealth disparity perpetuated by the disingenuous means in which corporations conduct themselves in the global economy and the concentration of undue wealth and power into the corporation's collective system through dubious means of manipulation. Also mentioned is a University of Zurich study demonstrating that a handful of 147 corporations which interlock with various other corporate fronts own 40% of the world's wealth among which were the American megabanks Barclay, Morgan Stanley, JP Morgan Chase and Co., Bank of America, Wells Fargo, and Goldman Sachs.

Those who have followed the workings of this collective group would note how these individuals at the highest level of the pyramid are the chief architects of human misery with their [financing of various think-tanks and fronts](#) to articulate their agenda and enforce it globally. In my recent article, "[High Finance, Geopolitical Leverage, and the Rise of the New World Order](#)", I detailed the specifics in how high finance exploits ideologies from across the political spectrum to hammer together a structure of control wherever it convenient to do so. I also examined the historical manner in which this was done in the creation of the Federal Reserve as well as the historical role of international communism in serving high finance's geopolitical ambitions of creating "captive economies" as [Dr. Anthony Sutton explains](#). Regardless of whatever political tool is manipulated and spun in the modern political theater, [a single agenda marches forward](#).

### The Function of the Empire

The function of an empire is often reduced in the minds of the general population to simply the military force which serves as the muscle of the empire but this is often done at the expense of neglecting the underlying "skeleton", namely the role of financial administrators, networks, and interests. In the case of the British Empire, these networks worked in London to ensure the flow of money and resources into the hands of the financial elite. This was done by various methods such as the tightly-controlled [mercantilist economic system](#) that existed during the American colonial era which was specifically set up to ensure British dominance over American resources and prevent competition at the expense of individuals.

British imperial economic networks on the global stage, especially in Asia, would often work in tandem with military power such as in the strategy of "[gunboat diplomacy](#)" where the empire would place gunboats off the coast of a capital and threaten bombardment if certain economic concessions were not made as was the case of the Bowring Treaty of 1855 with Thailand. The [Bowring Treaty](#) is presently credited by historians as spurring the industrialization and modernization of Thailand's economy, including greater economic liberties.

However, it was a geopolitically unfair treaty in the sense that it was coerced by the neighboring British military might stationed in India and for the benefit of the expansion of British financial hegemony. The treaty stipulated, among other points both positive and

negative that, “The import duty was fixed at 3 percent for all articles, with two exceptions: opium was to be free of duty, but it had to be sold to the opium farmer; and bullion was to be free of duty.” One can see how this would have bolstered Britain’s financial ambitions of competition in the region and one of the most disingenuous provisions was the opium stipulation, considering the previous “[First Opium War](#)” in China and the British means to capitalize on opium addiction for maximizing their profits.

Industrialization and modernization is not always the byproduct of western ambitions in the third world. In the case of Thailand, industrialization occurred because of capital investment by the west which built up Thailand but for the benefit of western hegemony and Thailand was able to be kept “under control” by western military might to prevent it becoming a rival. However, the new “modus operandi” has become to PREVENT the industrialization of the third world so as to not provide an alternative center for economic power and geopolitical competition, something China and Russia are currently being noted as doing, [hence slated for western subversion](#).

The primary center of focus in this has become Africa and with Chinese and Russian interests seeking bilateral economic agreements with various nations in Africa, by implication leading into development and productivity outside the orbits of the Wall Street/London casino economy establishment, [Africa has become a prime target of western destabilization](#) to leverage development into their hands and prevent it all together. Libya’s Gaddafi was leading [various initiatives to build up and strengthen Africa](#) though investment, trade, and constructing national institutions which were seen as rivals to western interests, hence his removal through the premeditated, so-called “humanitarian”-war in 2011 (see “[The Top Ten Myths in the War Against Libya](#)”).

Gaddafi was working to modernize Africa and make it self-sufficient and his “economic crimes” in the eyes of the west, including the [African Satellite Project, African Monetary Fund, and the African Investment Bank](#), is what led to him being slated for western-assisted overthrow. Amidst the violence and civil war the ravaged the country, [peaceful negotiations were purposely](#) thwarted in violation of the “Responsibility to Protect” in order to further western geopolitical designs. The Libyan war was a western psy-op [30 years in the making](#).

Former Science advisor to the White House Dr. John P. Holdren and current advisor Dr. Paul Ehrlich not only openly call for a “planetary regime” and global government in their book “[Ecoscience](#)” but openly express their contempt of the industrialization of the third world, justifying it through pseudo-science premised on false environmentalist concern. They openly state their pro-sterilization, pro-eugenics “Malthusian” outlook on society and slander those who view science and technology as the key to solving humanity’s problems (see [Dr. Webster Tarpley’s expose here](#)). Industrialization is not their goal but rather industrialization within their interests where only they can control development and the third world becoming an impoverished heap to be exploited as feudal lands for high finance and western hegemony.

This function of empire, fomenting geopolitical conflicts to expand regional hegemony, had a precedent in diamond-rich “Zululand” in southern Africa whose subversion in the “[Anglo-Zulu War](#)” of 1879 was a landmark victory for imperialism in Africa. The British had been following a “forward policy” in what is now South Africa to bring various regions, including Dutch Boer settlements, under their consolidate control. The independent, self-sufficient and powerful Zulu kingdom was seen as a threat, leading to an invasion in Zululand which would end up being deliberately carved into 14 proxy states and its resources exploited. The

British would take care to maintain rivalries in Zululand in order to prevent a unified Zulu opposition to British control which was the primary reason for the division.

“Divide and conquer” politics as seen in [Zululand](#) is not unlike the manner in which British colonists in North America during the 17th and 18th centuries would also cultivate and exploit rivalries between Native American tribes in order to capitalize on the slave and deerskin trade and maintain their domination politically and economically ([Tindall](#) 88-89). Nor is it unlike the current “foreign policy blunders” and civil wars purposely orchestrated and capitalized on by NATO in order to justify continued military occupation and geopolitical leveraging for specific hegemonic goals from Libya to Central Asia.

#### Central Asia, Pipeline Politics, and the “Grand Chessboard”

Similar “gunboat diplomacy” and “divide and conquer” politics would reemerge with the current actions of the modern-day imperialists of [militarized corporatism](#) targeting nations that have resisted their plans for global integration such as Iraq and Libya. [False pre-texts were invented to invade Iraq](#) by the same interests in order to commence its plundering. Iraq’s economy would end up being “reformed” according to a blueprint drawn up by a Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) fellow Paul Bremer that amounted the absorption of its economy into the global corporatist system along with stipulations architected by the IMF. The [Economist noted this](#) with their intentions transparent in the title, “[Let’s all go to the yard sale: If it all works out, Iraq will be a capitalist’s dream](#),” where it is noted that Iraq’s economy was opened up to multinational exploitation including the provisions of “100% ownership of Iraqi assets, full repatriation of profits, equal legal standing with local firms, and foreign banks being allowed to operate or buy into local banks”. Under the guise of this being a “capitalist” venture (as opposed to the more proper term “corporatist”), the Economist attempted to justify the foreign usurpation of Iraqi sovereignty and the plundering and dictation of their resources according to western interests.

Iraq’s purpose is not to be underestimated as it is a significant lynchpin in the geopolitical endeavors of western hegemony in central Asia and in geopolitically strangling Iran’s opposition to western designs across the Middle East with US allies Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Israel as the primary beneficiaries. Renowned analysts and journalists like [Pepe Escobar have noted the vital role natural gas has in regional geopolitics](#), especially with regards to the emerging “Shiite crescent” and the proposed Syria-Iraq-Iran pipeline. This pipeline’s construction would offset western/NATO aligned Saudi-Qatari-Israeli-Turkish gas initiatives in the region. The U.S. invasion of Iraq was initially intended to install a viable western proxy but regional designs for western interests have been increasingly faltering as the current Iraqi PM Nouri Al-Maliki moves closer into the Iranian economic orbit. The term “Shiite crescent” itself is a sectarian-motivated term coined in the west and aimed at bolstering in the mind of the population a premeditated divide between Sunni and Shiite Muslims to further western geopolitical objectives in Syria and beyond.

This drive for hegemony is not merely conjecture or “conspiracy theory” as this geopolitical point is admitted by Zbigniew Brezinszski, the former National Security Advisor under President James Carter [who organized the Afghanistan mujahidin in the 1980s](#). He clearly enumerates in his book, [The Grand Chessboard](#), the American geostrategic doctrine of perpetuating global supremacy and pre-eminence by dominating central Asia and its vital resource and logistical center. Central Asia is seen as the grand chessboard upon which U.S. global domination would be established. Especially noted in the disingenuous book is central Asia’s global value in terms of natural resources, economic activity and population.

According to Brzezinski, the person who could dominate central Asia can claim global hegemony. While he has supposedly “sharply criticized Bush’s foreign policy”, he nonetheless architected the very policy points that Bush’s policy would serve with the invasion and occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan. The [war on terror was a bloody and exploitative fraud](#) for all involved.

Brzezinski’s vision beholds a unipolar world order dictated by one center of economic, political, and military power as opposed to the vision of a multipolar world order of global collaboration as envisioned by Russia’s [Vladimir Putin at the 43<sup>rd</sup> Muich Security Conference in 2007](#). Recently emerging supranational economic blocs operating outside the Wall Street/London consensus such as BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization has begun to offer a viable counterbalance to the west/NATO’s global preeminence and empowering regional players to become economic competitors instead of pawns for western corporate interests.

### The Men Behind the Curtain

It must be noted that “global American pre-eminence” is not a strictly “American” venture or ideal. Rather it is the collective manifestation of the special-interests and agendas of the corporate-overlords who have hijacked and dominated America’s economy, political system, and media. While this is not a popular concept in the establishment’s halls of academia and politics, this did not stop [MSNBC’s Dylan Ratigan from making the following statement in 2008](#):

The biggest contributor to Barack Obama’s presidential campaign is Goldman Sachs [also a heavy contributor to Republican candidates]. The primary activities of this president relative to banking have been to protect the most lucrative aspect of that business, which is the dark market for credit default swaps and the like. That has been the explicit agenda of his Treasury Secretary. This president is advocating trade agreements that allow enhanced bank secrecy in Panama, enhanced murdering of union members in Colombia, and the refunding of North Korean slaves... But I guess where I take issue is, this president is working for the bad guys. The Democrats are working for the bad guys. So are the Republicans. The Democrats get away with it by saying, ‘Look at how crazy the Republicans are; and the Democrats pretend to care about people.’ BUT THE FACT IS THE 2-PARTY POLITICAL SYSTEM IS UTTERLY BOGUS. (emphasis added).

The two-party system [is indeed UTTERLY BOGUS](#). America’s foreign and economic policies, while fed to the public under the cover of presidential administrations, are actually the byproducts of [US foreign policy think-tanks funded by corporate-financier interests](#) in order to perpetuate their collective agenda which politicians merely rubber-stamp into law. Prominent think-tanks include the Council on Foreign Relations, which frequently calls for a unipolar world order, the International Crisis Group, which includes Brzezinski as an advisor, the “Neo-Con” ‘Project for the New American Century” (PNAC), and London’s “Chatham House” which represents corresponding British corporate-financier interests. Other groups include the RAND Corporation and the not-to be-neglected Brookings Institute within whose halls, [according to Tony Cartalucci](#), can be found the blueprints for most prominent international conflicts for the last 30 years.

Many prominent U.S. politicians from across the artificial political lines are affiliated with these groups. [Dick Cheney \(a former director\)](#), [Hillary Clinton](#), and Defense Secretary Chuck

Hagel (who also served on numerous boards of directors [including Chevron](#)) among other politicians are Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) members along with most self-serving US politicians. A list of the CFR's [corporate-financiers can be found here](#). Former CIA analyst and National Security Council member Kenneth Pollack is a Brookings Institute member. A simple visit to these think-tank's websites can be very insightful with regards to who's funding who and who is doing what. None of this is cryptic, "top secret knowledge" but is simply the prevailing reality that can be easily verified with a search engine by those who know what to look for. Follow the money.

## The Iranian and Syrian Dilemmas

The Brookings Institute is of particular concern among these think-tanks as it has been the primary facilitator in the drive for war against Iran founded on distortion and geopolitically-motivated propaganda. Much commotion has been recently circulating in the media about the Iranian nuclear negotiations and the leader of Hezbollah, [Hassan Nasrallah, best captured the reality](#) by emphasizing the significance of these negotiations and pointing out that the only other alternative would be war. He alleged that Israel's Netanyahu was acting as a representative for dubious Arab regimes, implying [western puppet-states Saudi Arabia and Qatar](#), and stated that there was a deliberate attempt to see no solution reached for reasons that will become apparent.

Contrary to media reports portraying Iran as an immediate, existential threat to US and Israeli security, the [Brookings Institute released a policy report](#) in 2009 that was basically a blueprint for overthrowing nations, in this case specifically for Iran, titled [Which Path to Persia? \(.PDF\)](#). It was written by six prominent analysts within establishment circles, including [Kenneth Pollack](#), admitting that Iran poses not a threat to the survival of the United States and Israel's security but their collective regional and geopolitical hegemony and interests across the region. It was noted that Iran was playing a strategy of firmness and even aggressiveness but not recklessness in combating western hegemony and imperialism as can be seen in its recent economic endeavors in the [pipeline and gas politics of the region](#). It was also noted that Iran was deliberately avoiding a conflagration with the west and that any possible nuclear weapons capability for Iran (which is noted as unconfirmed and nonexistent in other reports) would be used as a deterrence for attack and protecting regional ambitions Iran has for the region as opposed to the propaganda of using such weapons to attack the U.S. and to "wipe Israel off the map" (pg. 24-25).

This is reconfirmed by the recent 2013 [RAND Corporation report Iran After the Bomb](#) which, while noting that no evidence exists that Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons according to the US intelligence community, envisions a post-nuclear scenario of Iran. RAND is another "globalist" think-tank that hosts compromised interests but manages to give an honest synopsis of the Iranian reality. It is also noted that Iran's "supreme leader" Ayatollah Khamenei has issued religious decrees labeling nuclear weapons as "against Islamic principles." Contrary to recent reports circulation by MEMRI TV and mainstream media, [these fatwas are not fake and actually do exist](#). And contrary to some critics, they are [not an example of taqiyya \(deception\)](#). One thing that is very revealing is the following statement by RAND which sums up their insightful report:

The Islamic Republic [of Iran] is a revisionist state that seeks to undermine what it perceives to be the American-dominated order in the Middle East. However, it does not have territorial ambitions and does not seek to invade, conquer, or occupy other nations. Its chief military aim is to deter a U.S. and/or

Israeli military attack while it undermines American allies in the Middle East [which includes the economic interests of the totalitarian kingdoms of Saudi Arabia and Qatar whose atrocities in human rights dwarfs anything Iran is guilty of]... Iran's possession of nuclear weapons will lead to greater tension between the Shi'a theocracy and the conservative Sunni monarchies [Saudi Arabia, Qatar, etc.] However, Iran is unlikely to use nuclear weapons against other Muslim countries...The Islamic Republic views Israel in ideological terms. However, it is very unlikely that Iran would use nuclear weapons against Israel, given the latter's overwhelming conventional and nuclear military superiority. (pg. vii)

The Brookings Institution not only enumerates transparently the similar points that Iran is not an existential threat but goes further to enumerate a list of strategies for US provocations against Iran to initiate a war that, according to the report, Iran does not want. It is even noted that an Iranian retaliation in the case of American airstrikes would not be inevitable and that Iran may deliberately refrain from retaliation in order to strategically "play the victim" (pg. 84-85, 95) Let it not be forgotten how the US and Britain staged the [CIA "Operation Ajax"](#) in 1953 to oust the democratically-elected Iranian president Mohammad Mosaddegh, who nationalized the country's oil, in favor of the pro-American Shah who ruled as a brutal dictator. Similar plans for regime change are enumerated in the Brookings Institute report where it is admitted that the opposition "Green Movement" in 2009 was orchestrated by the US government through "civil society and NGOs" in order to provoke Iranian belligerence through regime change operations, capitalizing on internal dissent. This is not to deny any legitimate aspirations and calls for reform in Iran which are prevalent among student groups but merely to point out how such ambitions are co-opted and used by western interests for their own agenda (103-105, 109-110). See this excellent [summary](#) of all these critical points.

Other means proposed included playing upon sectarian and ethnic divisions inside Iran to destabilize the country and even funding radical Sunni militant groups, specifically the MEK, which has killed Americans in the past and is labeled by the U.S. state department as a "foreign terrorist organization". Its ideology is described by analysts as radical "left-wing" Islamic-Marxism which makes it interesting to consider the US plans to fully employ this group as political assets. MEK has also collaborated with Saddam Hussein's forces in guerilla warfare against Iran in the Iran-Iraq War of the 1980s (113, 117-118). The group is against the dominant Iranian establishment and it is noted that the US has worked covertly with them in the past and that in order to work overtly with them, the group had to be removed from the terrorist list (118).

The compounded criminality of western and Israeli collaboration with MEK is emphasized [here](#). It should be noted that the MEK has recently been removed from the US list of terrorist organizations as part of the next phase of using them as a proxy. MEK claims to have killed 40,000 Iranians in the past and has been trained on U.S. soil in a secret base in Nevada, published on the Huffington Post and [cited here by Kurt Nimmo](#) in an excellent and well-sourced article emphasizing the coordinated western agenda against Iran.

In culminating these abhorrent proposals, Brookings further notes the option of a military invasion and conventional war against Iran if the above proposals failed to accomplish western interests. This is the most alarming option especially in context to the following admission:

If the United States were to decide that to garner greater international support, galvanize U.S. domestic support, and/or provide a legal justification for an invasion, it would be best to wait for an Iranian provocation, then the time frame for an invasion might stretch out indefinitely. ..However, since it would be up to Iran to make the provocative move, which Iran has been wary of doing most times in the past, the United States would never know for sure when it would get the requisite Iranian provocation. In fact, it might never come at all (65)... it would be far more preferable if the United States could cite an Iranian provocation as justification for the airstrikes [as a catalyst for an invasion] before launching them. Clearly, the more outrageous, the more deadly, and the more unprovoked the Iranian action, the better off the United States would be. Of course, it would be very difficult for the United States to goad Iran into such a provocation without the rest of the world recognizing this game, which would then undermine it (85).

In all this certified criminality, which has obviously been at play even as the report was being published in 2009, it must not be forgotten that the [Brookings Institution is of, for, and by big business](#) and their collective agenda of integrating Iran into their international consensus and exploiting its 76 million population for their unipolar order. This is opposed to Iran's attempts to foster national self-sufficiency and develop ties with nations strategic to western interests including [India, Thailand](#), China, and Russia. Brookings Institution is funded by the likes of the Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, The Carnegie Foundation, Goldman Sachs, and the Carlyle Group among others; their report even includes a special acknowledgement of financial support from the Smith Richardson Foundation upon which Zbigniew Brzezinski sits as an active governor.

Such international criminality is magnified when Pulitzer-Prize winning journalist [Seymour Hersh revealed](#) in his article "Preparing the Battlefield" that the U.S. is cooperating with their anti-Iranian terrorist asset, Saudi Arabia, in order to fund radical, [Al Qaeda-linked, Sunni-groups like the Jundallah](#) to destabilize and destroy Iran as a viable geopolitical opponent. Al Qaeda, directed by the Saudis in cooperation with western geopolitical objectives, has been leveraged as a "Swiss army knife of destabilization" across the Middle East in the fake "war on terror" as Seymour Hersh exposed in another report titled "[The Redirection](#)" published in 2007.

In that report, Hersh reveals that the U.S. and Saudi Arabia have been working since 2007 to destabilize Syria and Lebanon with a [proxy-war wave of sectarian-extremists](#) currently being marketed in the media as a "political uprising" and a "revolution". This is different from the legitimate internal political opposition in Syria that maintains distinctiveness from the extremist and terrorist elements that clearly constitute the bulk of the "Syrian rebels" supported by the west. In "[The Redirection](#)", Seymour Hersh states:

To undermine Iran, which is predominantly Shiite, the Bush Administration has decided, in effect, to reconfigure its priorities in the Middle East. In Lebanon, the Administration has coöperated with Saudi Arabia's government, which is Sunni, in clandestine operations that are intended to weaken Hezbollah, the Shiite organization that is backed by Iran. The U.S. has also taken part in clandestine operations aimed at Iran and its ally Syria. A by-product of these activities has been the bolstering of Sunni extremist groups that espouse a militant vision of Islam and are hostile to America and sympathetic to Al Qaeda...[Saudi Arabia's Prince] Bandar and other Saudis have assured the White House that "they will keep a very close eye on the religious fundamentalists. Their message to us was 'We've created this movement, and we can control it.' It's not that we don't want the Salafis [Al Qaeda] to throw

bombs; it's who they throw them at—Hezbollah, Moqtada al-Sadr, Iran, and at the Syrians, if they continue to work with Hezbollah and Iran.

### NGOs and “System Administrators”: Trojan Horses for International Subversion

The role of “system administrators” was a crucial element in both the British Empire and the current globalist system when coming from the “humanitarian” angle. During the days of the British Empire, system administrators were networks created by the financial ruling class of the empire that served to further the empire, sometimes under the guise of altruistic or religious covers. A case study of this can be found in the invaluable work of Trevor Reese’s book [Colonial Georgia: A Study in British Imperial Policy in the Eighteenth Century](#) which documents the foundation of what is now the U.S. State of Georgia in 1733 in context to British imperial policy and mercantilism. The “Georgia Trustees” group was pivotal in the founding of Georgia by mobilizing insolvent debtors from London prisons to Georgia on behalf of the empire. In the study by Trevor Reese, it is demonstrated that those behind groups such as the Georgia Trustees were always the financial elite in London using such fronts to dictate people’s destinies on their behalf, regardless of the outcomes. Reese notes that, “The dependence of Georgia on the continual assistance of the United Kingdom was some justification for regarding it more as British property than as an individual entity within itself.

There was never any idea of the colony’s being other than subordinate and contributory to the welfare of its mother-country.” ([Reese](#) 38). Modern-day empire treats its global “civil society” networks throughout various countries in a similar manner. Georgia also lacked manufacturing which made it foundationally dependent on the mother country as was to be expected in the mercantilist system, thus curtailing their freedom through the absence of [self-sufficiency and imperial dependency](#) (121).

The modern reincarnation of the “Georgia Trustees” is seen in the role of corporate-financier funded, western-tied international “non-governmental organizations” (NGOs). NGOs serve as networks of intrusion into sovereign nations’ institutions with the intent of absorbing those nations into the agenda of the international consensus of Wall Street and London. This is not merely a cynical analysis born of speculation but [openly admitted by Pentagon strategist Thomas Barnett at 2008 TED talk](#). He talks of reforming the U.S. military force into the “U.S.-enabled Leviathan force” which includes military assets to tear down targeted institutions and also creating an army of “system administrators” like NGOs, international organizations, and contractors to “build in the swath of destruction” a network favorable to western interests. NGOs have been prominent in triggering the [U.S. engineered Arab Spring](#) as an admitted geopolitical stunt designed to contain Russian and Chinese economic interests and establish a front of proxy governments as geopolitical analysts like William Engdahl have noted; this modus operandi has been documented and dubbed the [“The Revolution Business” by Journeyman Pictures](#). It utilizes subversive NGOs like [CANVAS](#), run by Srdja Popovic, to train hordes of activists to target and dismantle governments of various natures that do not comply with the prevailing corporatist geopolitical interests, in conjunction [with a treasonous US State Department](#). The “Arab Spring” is an overtly documented case of such machinations under the pretext of nonviolent resistance and in Syria and Libya’s case, armed terrorist insurrection.

That is not to say that there were not legitimate grievances throughout the Arab world that led well-intentioned people to protest but the collective energies of these people were siphoned off and directed as a “Swiss army knife” of destabilization not in pursuit of their

own interests but in the interests of the disingenuous leaders who lorded over them. In Egypt, that leader was [Mohammad ElBaradei](#) who feigned anti-American and anti-Israeli sentiments while being part of the International Crisis Group (ICG), the previously-mentioned US foreign policy think-tank funded by the Fortune-500 and notorious for international subversion of many shapes and for the same policies of America and Israel he criticized for political leverage. [It is funded by](#) people from the Carnegie Corporation, Morgan Stanley, Open Society Institute, Deutsche Bank Group, and McKinsey & Company to Chevron and Shell. The ICG also hosts the likes of the previously mentioned Zbigniew Brzezinski and [General Wesley Clark](#)

ICG has been involved in fomenting street violence in Thailand ([full history here](#)) in an attempt to reinstall renegade criminal Thaksin Shinawatra into office on behalf of his Fortune-500 backers, [exploiting “socialist” ideology to build a support base](#) among Thai peasants through populist handouts. This is not to mention his attempt to push through the Thai parliament without approval a “[US-Thailand Free Trade Agreement](#)” written in a manner that would open up Thailand’s indigenous markets to corporate plundering. Thaksin was also the imperialist proxy-of-choice to remake Thailand as a bulwark against Chinese interests in Southeast Asia and create an environment favorable to western interests.

In the wake of the Arab Spring, a similar maneuver would be conducted against Tunisia and Egypt. Tunisia’s “activist” leader and later president, [Moncef Marzouki](#), would be directly tied to the Soros funded “International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH)” and also the US state department through the [National Endowment for Democracy \(NED\)](#) which is the closest modern equivalent to the “Georgia Trustees” and would toe the line of western policy against Syria as well as providing a doorway into his nation for western interests. This is only scratching the surface of the crisscrossing and interlocking lines of compromised interests who, from [Tunisia to Thailand](#), sought full spectrum dominance in Eurasia.

While such groups like NED, FIDH, and their many outlets thrive on the basis of humanitarian concerns and altruism, they always end up being funded by disingenuous corporate-interests and individuals like George Soros, [who was found to be behind the NGOs writing Egypt’s post-“revolution” constitution](#). Not everyone involved at the lower level of western-tied activist groups is disingenuous in intention but the efforts of well-intentioned people are exploited to push forward an agenda in the makings of its financial masters and leaders and not the people. As in the case of Amnesty International, blatant factual manipulation is used to demonize, for example, [Russia’s stance on Syria](#); Amnesty International has been used as [a tool to bolster western geopolitical objectives, irrespective of the facts](#) on the ground and with glaring and deliberate omissions on who truly is commandeering the bulk of atrocities around the world. Such groups end up interlocking with other corporate-funded foundations and think tanks from the Council on Foreign Relations to the Brookings Institute just like the Georgia Trustees and colonial networks interlocked with the Board of Trade in London during the height of the British Empire.

### Self-Sufficiency and Technology: The Keys to Lasting and Active Liberty

A final point of comparison revolves around the manner in which the British Empire was dismantled and the promise that it holds to dismantling the current imperialist system. The key lies in boycotting the corrupt system and its corporate backbone and building self-sufficient communities outside of it. The [American Revolution](#) was more than simply the war that made it possible. Rather, the colonists realized the oppressiveness of the British imperialist system and refused to play into both its economic and political game. The

colonialists boycotted the exploitative imperialist racket of mercantilism during what was called the “nonimportation movement.” Communities collaborated locally to produce “homespun” clothing and build up their own economic dependence, causing much ire for the Crown and British merchants (Tindall 186). The First Continental Congress adopted the Continental Association of 1774 which sought to galvanize communities into forming committees dedicated to the absolute boycott of British goods, enraging King George III. It was these drives of the colonists to free themselves from the imperialist system that truly granted the Americans victory. As George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi eloquently note in their book *America: A Narrative History*:

Such efforts to gain economic self-sufficiency helped bind the diverse colonies by ropes of shared resistance. Thousands of ordinary men and women participated in the boycott of British goods, and their sacrifices on behalf of colonial liberties provided the momentum leading to revolution. For all the attention given to colonial leaders such as Sam Adams and Thomas Jefferson, it was common people who enforced the boycott, volunteered in “Rebel” militia units, attended town meetings, and increasingly exerted pressure on royal officials in the colonies. The “Founding Fathers” (a phrase coined in 1916) could not have led the Revolutionary movement without such widespread popular support. As the people of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, Declared in a petition, “We have always believed that the people are the fountains of power.” (193)

Tony Cartalucci [capitalizes on this point in his ideologies](#) against the current system of globalization and corporatist-driven economic interdependency and relates these principles to the modern era and the [destructive nature of centralized big retail](#). He notes that the “[founding fathers did not drink British tea](#)” and that by declaring their independence, the colonialists were already free and independent men and that the coming war was the means by which they would defend their independence, not achieve it. The colonists invested in their own infrastructure and sought to assert their independence through will and effort.

Likewise, [we must individually recognize the corporations perpetuating global subversion and imperialism](#) as well as exploiting low-wage labor overseas and actively work to [boycott and replace them](#) with viable, local, decentralized options. Technology now exists to make any nation self-sufficient and independent as opposed to the corporate-financier alternative of existential interdependency and unipolar control. We need [an alternative economic model](#) with emphasis on individual enterprise and technological investment being used locally and in politically-conscious, self-sufficient communities leveraging such technology to break their dependence on destructive monopolies and [tip the balance in their favor](#).

That is not to say that we must start making our own cloths and revert back to pre-industrial habits. On the contrary, this vision involves the active leveraging of the latest cutting-edge of technology by both communities and nations as a whole to build educated people and use that technology to solve local problems and national problems pragmatically instead of relying on the illusions of parasitic corporations and endless, co-opted political “theaters”. There is the growing “personal fabrication” movement [as envisioned by MIT’s Dr. Neil Gershenfeld](#) that could revolutionize production and enterprise. Gershenfeld states that, “the other 5 billion people on the planet aren’t just technical ‘sinks,’ they are ‘sources.’ The real opportunity is to harness the inventive power of the world to locally design and produce solutions to local problems”. He notes how this has been legally impeded by corporate-interests seeking to preserve their influence.

The “[Do-It-Yourself](#)” movement is spurring individual and community-centered enterprise

and development and is prodding humanity along into a new industrial revolution, one where power will be decentralized by the means of technology and wealth redistributed, not through government subsidies, but through “individual enterprise” and “entrepreneurship and collaboration” (see “[Decentralize Big Retail](#)”). We must cut off the “globalists” from their support base among the misguided masses, stop playing into their media propaganda game, and build up our own infrastructure and communities to answer to our own demands and not that of the Fortune 500.

Reality demonstrates the truth of Vincent Harlow’s observation, especially with regards to the subversive role empire has played and continues to play in the world today. Whether it is through the function of empire, the role of system administrators or even the keys to its dismantling, reality echoes the same theme.

Enslavement is the end game of imperialism but truth is present among the constant lies fed to humanity by a compromised mass media. Truth offers the key to freedom and that freedom is what comes when one is able to recognize the lies and workings [of a rebranded form of empire](#). People must unite in knowledge and concern for the affairs of their nation and actively work to expose establishment lies, invest in their communities, and build the backbones of a self-sufficient nation in the image of the people.

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Sam Muhho](#), Global Research, 2013

---

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

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Sam Muhho](#)

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

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

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)