



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

## Will Globalists Keep Their Promises?

Global warming, pandemics, and poverty, oh my! Citizens of the West are constantly prompted to fear *something*, to worry about the world's fate, and to raise their voices in support of eliminating the world's dangers. And, we're told, socialism — especially global socialism — is the answer to bringing about utopia on Earth.

But how do we know if what we are being told is true or not? Answer: We look to see if past globalist promises came to pass. Let us see.



AP Images

AP Images

As for what we should worry about and how to remedy things, an online UN News article from June 11, 2020 entitled “What does ‘build back better’ really mean? One of the world’s top CEOs give us his take” tells the claims of “Suphachai Chearavanont, ... head of Thailand-based CP Group — one of the world’s largest conglomerates — and chairperson of UN Global Compact Thailand.” He says, “Despite the terrible toll of this [COVID] pandemic, the impact of climate change poses a much greater threat to the continued existence of mankind.” He added: “We’re aware that as a company, as an industry, and as consumers, we are consuming natural resources, and that we need to manage the waste that we produce, including food waste, plastic waste that ends up in the oceans, and our carbon footprint. We’re also aware of inequality, that opportunities for a good education, and a good job, are not distributed evenly.” His solution: the global socialist “build back better” campaign. (More on that later.)

Fabrizio Hochschild, the under-secretary-general of the UN and special advisor on preparations for the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the United Nations (which was celebrated last year), had said already in April of 2020, the beginning of the COVID pandemic, that we need to “build back better” from COVID.

Pandemics, climate change and cybercrime do not respect borders. They cannot be solved by any one country alone, no matter how big or powerful. We need international cooperation to galvanize action and to harness the opportunities the future holds, whether that’s leveraging the benefits of new technologies or building a zero-carbon world.

COVID-19 has shown how crucial it is for us to cooperate across borders, sectors and generations.

Pope Francis echoed the need for change after COVID, as documented by Breitbart:

“We will be able to regenerate society and not return to so-called ‘normality,’ which is an ailing normality, indeed which was ailing before the pandemic: the pandemic highlighted it!” he said, adding that the old normality “was sick with injustice, inequality and environmental degradation.”



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

In his op-ed for the *New York Times*, the pope wrote that this “is a moment to dream big, to rethink our priorities — what we value, what we want, what we seek — and to commit to act in our daily life on what we have dreamed of.”

“God asks us to dare to create something new,” he declared. “We cannot return to the false securities of the *political and economic systems we had before the crisis*. We need economies that give to all access to the fruits of creation, to the basic needs of life: to land, lodging and labor.” [Emphasis added.]

“We need to slow down, take stock and design better ways of living together on this earth,” he proposed.

Prime Minister Boris Johnson and the royals in England have also called for “building back better,” and, as Americans are probably only too aware, Joe Biden campaigned on the theme of “building back better” after COVID.

So what does “building back better” actually mean? The key to understanding the globalists’ plan can be gleaned from the above quotes — as well as numerous others online. It means:

- A push for income equality (a low, equal income for the common man, not necessarily for the elites, who have shown no inclination to strip away their own wealth);
- Complete government control over energy production *and use*, in the name of achieving environmentally friendly and sustainable power;
- Equal access to land (which the World Economic Forum (WEF) said in a video entitled “Eight Predictions for the World in 2030” means no private land ownership at all), housing, jobs, and goods, including healthcare for all (note that equal healthcare does not necessarily mean abundant healthcare);
- And except for the above comments by Suphachai Chearavanont, who seemingly believes these goals could be achieved by companies that lead by example, it is clear “building back better” means governments, globalist entities, and elites working together to implement all of the above in the near future through mandates and coercion, such as cutting off Internet services and banking access, if people or companies fail to get on board.

As the title of a World Economic Forum article states, “To build back better, we must reinvent capitalism.” Make no mistake, *reinventing capitalism* doesn’t mean loosening binds on barter, trade, and individualism, and increasing consumer and business choices. It means just the opposite.

## Achieving Past Promises

But what are the chances that globalists’ efforts would actually benefit the world’s “common man,” rather than harm him? Skeptics point to in-your-face facts as evidence that global elites really do not care about people or the environment, claiming globalists simply want to micromanage the world as they see fit, despite the inevitable harms they would shower on the world’s commoners.

For instance, skeptics point out that these same global elites who are pushing “build back better” still operate manufacturing plants in China and continue to build and operate research-and-development facilities in China despite the fact that that country currently has millions of people in reeducation



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

camps and on slave-labor crews (ironically even making the victims pick cotton, as American slaves commonly did), and despite the fact that the country “disappears” social critics, kills them, and harvests their organs, and despite the fact that China has a horrific record of environmental devastation, with air and water pollution likely second to none.

Also used as a case in point, Google, which is a strong backer of the globalist “build back better” campaign, even built a censored version of its search engine for China, called Dragonfly, so the Chinese people cannot easily fight for human rights, seemingly mocking Google’s own slogan, “Don’t be evil.”

Fortunately, there are several methods whereby we can predict the results of globalist tinkering. One of those methods is to investigate how successful past globalist efforts have been at empowering and enriching the little guy, such as by examining how well the UN — which, like the League of Nations before it, is meant to be an embryonic world government — has fulfilled its claimed goals.

One-hundred-ninety-three of the world’s 195 nations belong to the UN (the Vatican and Palestine are not members). It was founded in 1945, and all member governments pledge to accept and abide by the UN Charter, which sets the rules and regulations for the stated purpose of smoothing international relations, empowering the downtrodden, and promoting world peace, so it ought to have achieved notable successes by now.

To determine the world body’s level of success, we can examine the UN’s self-professed goals to see if it reached them.

The UN itself says it was founded “to promote international peace and stability, human rights, and economic development” through its various entities, which are as follows:

- NATO — It was formed, says the UN, “to safeguard its members’ freedom and security by both political and military means,” and that decree has morphed into it becoming the world’s de facto policeman. Yet over just the past five years, there have been numerous wars across the globe: between Yemen and Saudi Arabia (tens of thousands killed), the Afghanistan Civil War (which has been raging since the 1980s when the Soviets invaded that country, and is kept going by NATO intervention and supplies); the Tigray War in Africa, which spills across the borders of Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Sudan; and the Syrian Civil War, which has numerous participants, including Russia, Iran, and the United States, and has led to more than a half-million deaths and five million refugees. (And if we go back earlier than that, we find NATO failing to prevent genocides in Cambodia, Rwanda, Congo, Sudan, and elsewhere, which took millions of lives.)

Then there are the NATO-instigated conflicts: the invasion of Afghanistan after 9/11, which included U.S. drone strikes in Pakistan and other countries around that region of the world (killing thousands of innocent civilians); the invasion of Iraq to evict its leader, Saddam Hussein; the support for the Arab Spring movement; and the seven-month bombing campaign to evict Libyan leader Moammar Gadhafi, though he had been an active ally in the U.S.-led “War on Terror.”

None of the NATO-backed conflicts has led to peace for the countries involved or their civilians: Afghanistan is still in the midst of civil war, its populace largely relies on heroin and other drug sales to live, and Taliban radicals still kill the unfaithful with impunity in most of the countryside. The total cost of the Iraq War alone is estimated at somewhere between \$1.9 trillion and \$3 trillion, if one includes Pentagon war spending, spending on Iraq by the State Department, the healthcare of veterans, refurbishing and replacing equipment, and the interest expense on debt incurred to fund the war. It has



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

also cost Iraq, according to the Iraq Body Count Project, about 200,000 civilian deaths. Moreover, Iraqi Christians and Muslim minorities have been slaughtered by the tens of thousands by Muslim radicals since the war began (despite the presence of NATO troops), and by 2013, somewhere between 50 and 90 percent of Christians had already fled the previously safe country.

In 2014, *USA Today* reported on the repression: “The few Christians and Muslim minorities who remain live secretly, in fear of being discovered. ‘I am still in Mosul, and I know for sure I will be dead if they know I am here,’ said Hassan Ali, 55, a Turkmen Shiite and father of three daughters. ‘But what can I do? I can’t afford to move somewhere else. I prefer to die here rather than dying in refugee camps with no services and no food.’” As well, Iraq is now an ally of Iran, America’s mortal enemy.

As far as NATO’s bombing of Libya is concerned, it led to destabilization and internal strife in that previously secure country, which resulted in the widespread killing of blacks and the installing of various radical Muslim theocracies and strongmen, turning it into a country where one can be killed for any perceived transgression of religious edicts or commands of area leaders. Now, apparently, Turkey and Russia are vying for control there.

Ironically, the mere fact that NATO exists could spur the next world war. Under NATO’s charter, every nation in the union, including the United States, commits to treating an attack on any member as an attack on itself, which means that we could be drawn into war by a minor military squabble somewhere.

So, no hope is yet apparent for globalism’s chances of being a benefit to the common man.

- EU — It was formed “to help member countries cooperate on economic, political and security matters,” and it has been deemed a major success, mainly because it is credited with ending wars on the European continent. In 2017, the World Economic Forum celebrated six main successes of the EU: 1. It allowed 500 million people to “live, study, or work” in any of the EU’s 28 member states, something that 14 million citizens take advantage of; 2. It created one of the biggest trading markets in the world, with a GDP of \$16.5 trillion; 3. It received the Nobel Peace Prize for enticing former Soviet dictatorships to become market economies (so they could join the EU); 4. It banished the death penalty; 5. It created price supports for agricultural products and export subsidies (ironically, the WEF admitted that those actions created mountain-sized gluts of butter and lakes of milk and wine, etc., and harmed Third World countries that couldn’t then compete in the marketplace); 6. It set cleanliness standards for swimming water, passed the Paris Agreement on Climate (which even the UN admits will not stave off climate change) to limit carbon-dioxide emissions, and tried to protect biodiversity.

Since the EU’s biggest claimed feat is the peace it brought to Europe, an assertion that is largely untrue, the achievements are, at best, lackluster, especially considering that the repercussions of its formation seem to greatly outweigh the benefits derived.

As to the attainment of European peace, Cambridge Professor Olivier Tonneau noted on the online site *The Conversation*: “It is a myth that the unprecedented period of peace between European nations is due to the EU.... The European Union took its current form with the 1991 Maastricht Treaty (or, at the earliest, with the 1986 Rome Treaty) and can hardly be credited with the years of peace that preceded them.” He also noted that in 1909 it was stated that intercountry trade in Europe was then so great that no nation would dare risk war and risk its own wealth, yet the Great War began in 1914, refuting the trade-brings-peace argument. In reality, it’s more likely that a combination of the high costs of arming for modern warfare and a fear of being overrun by the Soviet Union ensured continental calm.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

As to the negative consequences of EU membership, even a partial list is shocking:

As the website “funds europe” reported in 2017, “The average European citizen is worth about US\$86,000 (€75,400) and has seen his/her wealth decline by 5% over the past ten years. Over the same period (2005-2015), the average wealth of a person in Australia has increased by over 100% and in Canada by over 50%.”

[Statista.com](#) relates that the EU’s youth unemployment rate exceeded 15.7 percent from 2009 to 2019 (this high rate is largely owing to the benefits and taxes companies are forced to pay when they hire someone). Greece’s *overall* unemployment rate was 17.2 percent in 2019 (which was still a great improvement over the previous seven years’ rates), Spain’s was at 14.1 percent, and Italy’s 10 percent. In contrast, Germany had 1.3 percent unemployment, meaning wealth and opportunity aren’t spread evenly in the eurozone. (In 2019, the worst state unemployment rate in America was Alaska’s at 6.1 percent.)

The EU is massively undemocratic, with *unelected* EU appointees dictating up to 80 percent of all rules and laws to member countries, with the people of the EU having no say in matters. And the power of the unelected bureaucrats was not ceded to them by the people of the EU through popular vote: When voting on an EU Constitution was done in 2005, the French and Dutch voted against it, so EU elitists simply renamed the EU Constitution the Lisbon Treaty and mandated its adoption anyway.

It’s true that people of the EU do elect EU representatives, but those representatives don’t have much actual power; they mainly serve as a rubber-stamp to edicts from the unelected personages above them. (So much for democracy and power of the people.)

The poverty rate across the EU is high, with a 14.1-percent rate in socialist-paradise France in 2017. Moreover, countries wherein *50 percent or more of middle-income households* had difficulty making ends meet each month included Italy, Ireland, Poland, France, and nine other countries. In Greece, 94.7 percent of middle-income earners had difficulty paying their bills. (In 2017, 12.3 percent of Americans were considered to be in poverty — all stats from [statista.com](#).)

According to the study entitled “National Poverty Watch Reports 2018, Germany,” in Germany, 17.7 percent of citizens 65 and older are at risk of poverty or social exclusion (excluded from socializing by being poor), as are 42.9 percent of single parents with dependent children. Much of the problem is caused by high housing costs, with nearly half of those at risk of poverty being “overburdened” by rental payments. Homelessness skyrocketed in four years from 860,000 to 1.2 million.

A typical German poverty case is an elderly woman named Ingrid, featured in a Deutsche Welle video entitled “living on the breadline”: Her social security checks go primarily toward her rent, utilities, and medicine. After she pays for those, she has 5.6 euros per day (or \$6.72) to spend on food, soaps, repairs, and other essentials. She says she dearly misses having enough money to buy herself an ice cream cone, and she hasn’t bought new clothes or indulgences for decades, though she paid into the state pension system for over 22 years.

Taxes, too, are high. In Germany, Germans who make over 9,408 euros per year (or approximately \$11,384) pay taxes at a 14-percent rate. Those making over 57,051 euros pay 42 percent to federal taxes. Plus, they all pay a 5.5-percent solidarity tax on income. There are few local taxes. (In the United States, approximately 44 percent of households pay no federal income tax, though they do pay 12.4 percent toward Social Security and 2.9 percent to Medicare — half paid by them and half paid by their





Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

employer — according to the Tax Policy Center.)

Similarly, in France, according to the website Complete France, as of 2018, “All employees pay social welfare contributions, accounting for approximately 22% of the monthly wage, which are deducted at source.” Added to that, “Employers also pay contributions for each member of staff, calculated at between 25% and 42% of an employee’s monthly wage,” meaning employers have that much less money to pay to their employees. Pensions are also taxed at a 9.2-percent rate. These taxes are supposed to be repatriated back to the people to take care of their needs, but they are not, hence French citizens’ “yellow vest” protests that have been going on since 2018 against high taxes and the high cost of living.

The euro, sold by globalists as giving Europeans the convenience of a single currency, is causing economic havoc. According to an article in the *Harvard Business Review* entitled “The European Union: A Failed Experiment,” the EU demanded spending cuts and large tax increases from profligate nations to safeguard the euro, but instead of this helping circumstances, poor EU countries suffered, experiencing deep downturns in their economies and increased unemployment — and the citizens of those nations had no voice in improving their own conditions.

Ironically, some poor-yet-extravagant-spending countries have been fighting the EU’s austerity measures and have been trying to spend their way out of their fiscal problems, which means that one or two small nations could bring down the economies of all countries in the EU via their reckless spending.

A comprehensive list would go on and on, but here are a few other problems: Internal strife is increasing because of high immigration rates and non-assimilation of migrants; the U.K. government’s Acheson Report found that inequality of healthcare between the rich and poor was worse 50 years after the inception of the National Health Service than when NHS began, with, for example, people living in the U.K.’s poor neighborhoods receiving far less access to cancer treatments than wealthy people; fish stocks in the seas plummeted because of EU rules; etc.

So much for Europeans’ wealth and safety by working together.

- World Trade Organization — It was formed “to manage the rule of International Trade and ensure the fair and equitable treatment of all members through negotiations and trade dispute settlements.” It, too, has been dubbed a huge success by globalists. Phil Levy, the senior economist for President George W. Bush’s Council of Economic Advisors, wrote a series of articles on the WTO in *Forbes* magazine in 2018, which begin by telling of the necessity for the WTO. In the first article, “Who Cares About the World Trade Organization?” he says that it provides worldwide benefits, foremost among them “the *efficiency* argument for a rules-based global trading system — by letting countries specialize in the goods they can produce most cheaply, by allowing businesses to operate at an efficient scale, and by letting people buy affordable goods, there are large economic benefits that accrue to all participants.”

According to him, the WTO brings multiple other benefits: It brings a common set of rules for exporters, making life easier for smaller competitors; it’s the easiest method to get rid of non-tariff trade barriers, such as “inspection regimes, or regulations, or biased government purchasing programs”; and it ends the difficulty of getting bilateral trade agreements (trade agreements between two countries) through Congress.

Yet he also says in the first line of the second article on the topic, “One of the rare points in agreement in global trade policy is that the World Trade Organization is in trouble” — meaning it is failing. And he tells why: Probably the most important aspect of the WTO, a “dispute settlement mechanism ... where



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

political agreements over trade might regularly be hammered out ... proved a critical failure,” mainly because China, the country that globalists have been grooming for world dominance, can’t be controlled by the WTO. Not only does China steal or copy copyrighted goods as a matter of course — a GolfWRX commentator said that in talking with a Chinese supplier, he was told, “The world of knock-offs and counterfeiting, while not something to be proud of, was ingrained in the culture” — but it sends spies the world over to steal technology and it uses slave labor to put competitors out of business. And there is nothing that the WTO can do about it. Levy also said that the rules at the WTO need to be rewritten to take care of problems, but that those countries that are gaming the system aren’t interested in changing the rules (and, in truth, even if the rules were changed, China and other countries wouldn’t follow the new rules anyway).

So workers the world over have been getting tossed out of jobs because the companies that employ them can’t compete with China’s slave labor and intellectual theft, and the WTO will never do anything about it, yet the WTO is supposed to represent grand gains — yeah!

- Group of 20 (G20) — It was formed “to convene officials from the world’s largest economies, both advanced and developing, to address global economic concerns and coordinate economic policies.” According to the G20, it “is an informal group of 19 countries and the European Union, with representatives of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank,” that coordinate together “to achieve global economic stability, sustainable growth to promote financial regulations that reduce risks and prevent future financial crises; and to create a new international financial architecture.” So let’s see how that is working.

A notable stain on the organization is the 2008 economic crash — brought on by worldwide coordinated financial dysfunction. The G20 was formed in 1999, yet despite the presence of international bankers and statesmen from the major Western powers in its ranks, it didn’t head off the 2008 economic crash. Moreover, the consequences of bad debt caused by foolish U.S. monetary legislation — namely foolish lending practices caused by the Community Reinvestment Act that led banks the world over to bundle America’s bad housing debt and sell the debt to other financial institutions — had been forecast for many years.

Also, nowadays, under the auspices of the COVID-19 pandemic, nearly a quarter of American businesses that make less than \$100 million per year have reportedly gone out of business, yet the stock market is still booming, thanks to the U.S. government printing money. And there is every chance that this manufactured stock boom will lead to an economic crash from which America’s middle class will, at best, stagger through, while the super-rich will protect themselves from the market’s downsides via paid investment experts and insider knowledge. David Rosenberg, the 36-year Wall Street veteran and founder of Rosenberg Analysis, said, “From my lens we ... have a market ... that appears egregiously overpriced, overbought and overextended.” As investment expert Bob Adelman at The New American noted February 12: “Rosenberg said that Wall Street and its investors are in ‘dangerous times’ and that [stock prices] proves there is a ‘speculative bubble’ that is nearly certain to end badly.” Adelman also observed that Jeremy Grantham, an investment strategist for a large investment firm, wrote back on January 5: “The long, long bull market [in stocks] has finally matured into a full-fledged epic bubble.... I believe [when it pops it] will be recorded as one of the great bubbles of financial history.”

Yet rather than push policies to prevent an implosion, the elites’ answer to COVID across the developed world has been to continue interfering with businesses’ ability to succeed (or even open their doors at



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

all) and to print more money faster.

The logical deduction to be made from this behavior is that the elites are setting up the Western middle class for a fleecing of epic proportions (because they want them to be poorer and more apt to follow globalist mandates), in a similar manner to how globalists have kept Africans poor for decades, not only interfering in their gains but reducing their wealth. In the case of Africa, as was noted earlier, because Western countries such as France offer a network of subsidies to farmers, they stimulate overproduction of agricultural goods, causing prices to crash, making it difficult for Africa's poor countries, which are mainly agrarian-based, to compete in world markets. Moreover, if African countries begin to succeed, they stand to get hit with high tariffs on their agricultural items. (Poor African countries are generally exempt from EU tariffs, but wealthier ones aren't.) In point of fact, though much of Africa relies on agricultural exports, the highest tariffs that many Western countries have, including those in the EU, are on agricultural items. According to the WTO, in 2018, average EU tariffs on dairy products were nearly 40 percent, sugars and confectionary 25 percent, and animal products over 15 percent. Meanwhile, the taxes on petroleum, machinery, and minerals were less than five percent.

So, if the G20's goal is to make the middle class poor, only then could you call its strategizing successful.

- The International Criminal Court (ICC) — It was formed “to investigate and try those charged with genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes of aggression.” In reality, the court barely makes even a pretense of catching and punishing international bad guys. It actually only charges those who are politically expedient victims. For example, China's government has been credibly accused of “disappearing” citizens whom it deems dissidents and then killing them to harvest their organs for transplants, yet no charges have been brought. Likewise, China has committed other mass atrocities with disdain, such as the Tiananmen Square massacre. And the Chinese have literally incarcerated millions of minorities in reeducation camps, yet nothing is done by the ICC. As an opinion piece in the very pro-China *Washington Post* acknowledged, “While Beijing has long operated gulags for political prisoners and dissidents in Tibet, ... new facilities represent a huge expansion of China's years-long program to involuntarily mass relocate rural Tibetans, which Human Rights Watch in 2013 called ‘unprecedented in the post-Mao era.’”

Not even the murderous leaders of small, weak countries, such as Fidel Castro in Cuba or Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela, have seen the inside of the ICC. In fact, some of the world's worst human-rights abusers, including China and Cuba, have been chosen to lead the UN Commission on Human Rights.

Let's face it, the only guilt the ICC judges would be able to find is that on their own faces when they look in the mirror. No protection for the peons there.

The main globalist entities have all failed to look out for the welfare of the world's citizens, and now they want us to give them even more power to manage our lives. Entities to achieve global health, wealth, and harmony have existed for decades, yet problems still exist and have, in many cases, even worsened. Globalists now promise that if we follow their lead, we'll see world order and utopia on Earth, but history provides no evidence we should trust them. So don't trust them!





Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,  
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



**Subscribe**

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.