Putin: Key Player in the “New World Order”

written by Alex Newman

Shortly before getting on the plane, 10-year-old Miguel Calehr, as countless children do before flying, asked his mother what would happen when it crashed. “Come on, don’t be silly, you’ve been traveling already so many times,” Miguel’s mom, Samira Calehr, remembers telling her nervous son. “Everything’s going to be OK.” The boy was still frightened despite his mother’s soothing words. But with his older brother, Shaka, 19, by his side, Miguel shuffled through the security checkpoint anyway.

“Mama, I love you,” Miguel said nervously before waving goodbye and boarding the flight from Amsterdam to Kuala Lumpur. It would be the last time Samira would hug her two boys. The two siblings, leaving their middle brother (who was also their best friend) behind because the Malaysian Airlines flight was fully booked, were on their way to visit Grandma in Indonesia. They never made it. Instead, along with 296 others on Flight MH17, Miguel and Shaka were blown out of the sky over Ukrainian airspace on July 17.

Samira and the whole family are devastated and will never fully recover. “If I could just turn back time. I didn’t listen to him. I don’t know, I have no words to say,” the heartbroken mother told CNN. “Why didn’t they take my life? They are still young, they still have a future. Why? Why the children? Why not me?” The boys’ grandmother, Yasmine Calehr, could not hold back her tears either. “Everybody is crying, everybody is losing something that belonged to them, but we feel like we have lost ourselves as well,” she said.

All across Ukraine, thousands of other families are mourning the loss of loved ones as well. According to the United Nations, by early September, more than 3,000 people had been killed in the ongoing Ukranian conflict. The real numbers are probably even higher as the civil war — fueled by the Russian government on one side and Western powers on the other — continues to claim more victims. The shoot-down of MH17 served to further inflame those geopolitical tensions.
In Moscow, strongman Vladimir Putin blames the West for the carnage, while many in the West blame Putin, seeing him as a communist thug. Other Westerners, horrified by the actions of their own out-of-control political leadership, have started to view Putin and his regime as an obstacle to the machinations of the U.S. and European Union governments — perhaps not a force for good, but at least no worse than establishment insiders in the West. Even in the American “Liberty Movement,” Putin has been winning friends among those who view him as a roadblock to globalism.

In Brussels and Washington, D.C., meanwhile, President Obama and various European leaders point to the Kremlin as the real culprit behind the bloodshed in Ukraine. Indeed, many neoconservatives and establishment Democrats imagine that Putin threatens freedom in the West. The saber rattling over Ukraine, coming not long after similar barb trading between Putin and Obama surrounding the war in Syria, has only added fuel to the fire.

But what if everything is not quite as it seems? What if — despite the “East vs. West” and “New Cold War” hysteria whipped up by politicians and the mainstream media — both sides are actually working toward the same goals using largely the same means? Sounds impossible, right? The evidence, however, suggests it is not only possible — it is exactly what is happening.

“Regional” Approach to World Order

Despite the saber rattling, globalists on both sides of the East-West divide refer to their goal as the creation of a “New World Order.” This “order” they speak of, as we shall show, represents, essentially, a global system of political and economic control over humanity. And Putin, a former KGB boss, is following precisely the strategies toward world order outlined openly by the same Western establishment he purportedly stands as a bulwark against. He often refers to his vision as the imposition of a new, “multi-polar” world order. But a growing amount of evidence shows that it is exactly the same order sought by globalist Western powerbrokers.

One of the keys to understanding Putin’s crucial role in imposing the “New World Order” on humanity is a grasp of how its proponents plan to build it. Rather than aiming to foist a full-blown totalitarian global government on the world all at once, top globalists around the world have outlined a different strategy. In essence, the plot aims to divide the planet’s people and nations into massive “regions” ruled by supranational institutions — such as the European Union, which is now responsible for the bulk of European laws — virtually free of public control or oversight. The outline of that plan is now in full public view.

Indeed, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger — one of the most visible and outspoken globalist “New World Order” schemers — has explained the strategy openly on numerous occasions. Most recently, writing in the Wall Street Journal on August 29, Kissinger, using opaque and rather unexciting writing, explained how the process should work. “The contemporary quest for world order will require a coherent strategy to establish a concept of order within the various regions and to relate these regional orders to one another,” he explained in the op-ed, headlined “Henry Kissinger on the Assembly of a New World Order.”

But the strategy is nothing new. In 1995, fellow globalist and ex-National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, architect of David Rockefeller’s infamous Trilateral Commission, outlined essentially the same plan. “We do not have a New World Order…. We cannot leap into world government in one quick step,” he
said in 1995 at the “State of the World Forum,” convened by former Soviet dictator Mikhail Gorbachev and backed by the Rockefellers and other establishment forces in the West. “In brief, the precondition for eventual globalization — genuine globalization — is progressive regionalization, because thereby we move toward larger, more stable, more cooperative units.”

Among the most obvious examples highlighting the trend is the European Union, which is further along than any other regional regime in crushing national sovereignty and ruling over diverse nations by bureaucratic decree. Former Soviet dictator Gorbachev, an outspoken proponent of the “New World Order,” approvingly referred to the Brussels-based super-state as “the new European Soviet” — under communism, of course, a “Soviet” was a governmental council used to control the people and prevent counterrevolution. Gorbachev was correct in more ways than one.

While the Sovietesque EU serves as a model for other areas of the world, it is hardly alone. Closer to home in North America, top globalists such as former general and CIA chief David Petraeus, a member of the globalist-minded Council on Foreign Relations and the shadowy Bilderberg group, openly acknowledged what comes next earlier this year. “After America comes North America,” Petraeus said confidently in answering the question about what comes after the United States, the theme of a panel discussion he participated in. “Are we on the threshold of the North American decade, question mark? I threw that away — threw away the question mark — and boldly proclaimed the coming North American decade, says the title now.” As in Europe, the foundation of it all was a misnamed “free trade” agreement.

### Putin’s Eurasian Union

Putin’s saber rattling over Ukraine is providing a rationale for continued Western integration — via the EU, NATO, and the “transatlantic partnership” — to counter the Russian bear. But in addition, Putin is also pursuing a “New World Order” via the regionalization approach. Chief among the schemes, for now at least, is the “Eurasian Union,” which brings together the regimes ruling Russia, Belarus, and Kazakhstan. Eventually, Putin and his counterparts hope to expand the union to include other former Soviet regimes in the region, particularly members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). In late May, the three strongmen signed what Putin described as a “historic” treaty ushering in the “Eurasian Economic Union.”

Many analysts see the developments as the ongoing re-emergence of the Soviet Union. In a 2011 piece by Putin about the scheming published by Izvestia, headlined “A new integration project for Eurasia: The future in the making,” the former KGB boss denied that his emerging regional union represented a rebirth of the USSR. However, his words revealed an almost total adherence to the publicly announced Western globalist strategy for building the New World Order — using progressive regionalization of power on the road to true global government while manufacturing and exploiting crises along the way.

“It took Europe 40 years to move from the European Coal and Steel Community to the full European Union,” Putin observed in the Izvestia op-ed, now published on the website of the Kremlin’s diplomatic mission to the EU. “The establishment of the Customs Union and the Common Economic Space is proceeding at a much faster pace because we could draw on the experience of the EU and other regional associations.” Indeed, even the harmonized Eurasian regulatory regime being imposed via the regional scheme is “in most cases consistent with European standards,” he added. Soon, it may be compatible with regulations in “North America,” too, as the EU-North America “Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership” moves along.
As for Putin and company’s broader vision, again, it may as well have been spelled out by Kissinger in one of his “New World Order” op-eds. Putin wrote: “We suggest a powerful supranational association capable of becoming one of the poles in the modern world and serving as an efficient bridge between Europe and the dynamic Asia-Pacific region. Alongside other key players and regional structures, such as the European Union, the United States, China and APEC, the Eurasian Union will help ensure global sustainable development.” Sustainable development, of course, as regular readers of this magazine know well, represents the pinnacle of the Western globalist vision for its new order — centralized, global control over every facet of human life.

Putin also explained that his regional regime would be “based on WTO principles,” referring to the globalist World Trade Organization. Like the other regional building “blocs” of the New World Order, it will pursue the same goals. “The Eurasian Union will be based on universal integration principles as an essential part of Greater Europe united by shared values of freedom, democracy, and market laws,” he explained.

Eventually, as part of the globalist strategy, the quest for world order will have to “relate these regional orders to one another,” as Kissinger recently put it. Again, Putin follows the line. “Russia and the EU agreed to form a common economic space and coordinate economic regulations without the establishment of supranational structures back in 2003,” he wrote. “In line with this idea, we proposed setting up a harmonized community of economies stretching from Lisbon to Vladivostok, a free trade zone and even employing more sophisticated integration patterns. We also proposed pursuing coordinated policies in industry, technology, the energy sector, education, science, and also to eventually scrap visas. These proposals have not been left hanging in midair; our European colleagues are discussing them in detail.”

Integration with the EU is on the agenda, too, though it may have to wait for Ukraine to settle down. “Soon the Customs Union, and later the Eurasian Union, will join the dialogue with the EU,” Putin said. “As a result, apart from bringing direct economic benefits, accession to the Eurasian Union will also help countries integrate into Europe sooner and from a stronger position.... In addition, a partnership between the Eurasian Union and EU that is economically consistent and balanced will prompt changes in the geopolitical and geo-economic setup of the continent as a whole with a guaranteed global effect.”

Ultimately, as Putin makes clear, the whole world will be involved. “We believe that a solution might be found in devising common approaches from the bottom up, first within the existing regional institutions, such as the EU, NAFTA, APEC, ASEAN inter alia, before reaching an agreement in a dialogue between them,” he wrote. “These are the integration bricks that can be used to build a more sustainable global economy.”

As an example of how it could work, Putin pointed to the two largest regional regimes on the continent, the EU and his “currently under construction” Eurasian Union. “In building cooperation on the principles of free trade rules and compatible regulation systems they are in a position to disseminate these principles, including through third parties and regional institutions, all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans,” he said. “They will thus create an area that will be economically harmonized.... At that point, it will make sense to engage in a constructive dialogue on the fundamentals of cooperation with the countries of the Asia-Pacific region, North America and other regions.”

Of course, Putin is hardly the only globalist pursuing that vision. Senior members of the Western establishment have been openly promoting the exact same strategy. In late 2012, for example, top EU and Russian leaders, including Putin, met in Brussels for the 30th EU-Russia Summit. “By working together,
the EU and Russia can make a decisive contribution to global governance and regional conflict resolution, to global economic governance in the G8 and G20, and to a broad range of international and regional issues,” explained European Council President Herman Van Rompuy, who met with Kissinger and other top globalists at the Bilderberg summit shortly before being appointed to his post as “president” of Europe. “I would like to congratulate President Putin for taking over the presidency of G20.”

**Putin Visits Latin American Despots to Push New World Order**

Putin has been pursuing the “regionalization” approach to the new world order not only in Eurasia but on the other side of the Atlantic, where he is rekindling old Soviet-era alliances with the most virulent anti-American regimes in America’s so-called backyard.

In July, for example, both Putin and Communist Chinese dictator Xi Jinping, an extremely close ally of the Kremlin, visited Latin America to push what they described as a new “international order.” In addition to boosting relations between their regimes and the region’s totalitarian-minded rulers, Putin and Xi signed huge deals with their counterparts in the Western Hemisphere on everything from trade and economic cooperation to military issues and espionage. More than a few analysts pointed out that the official Sino-Russo trips illustrated the fast-shifting geopolitical scene, with the world being shepherded in controlled fashion toward the new, “multi-polar” world order — featuring a neutered United States, strong regional groupings, and more unaccountable regional and global “governance.”

From the start, Putin emphasized that regionalization was among the major purposes of his trip. “We are interested in [a] strong, economically stable and politically independent, united Latin America that is becoming an important part of the emerging polycentric world order,” he said. The ex-KGB boss also touted multiple integration schemes as partners in his efforts — especially the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC), which includes all governments in the Americas except the United States and Canada.

It is not just CELAC, founded in recent years by Latin American socialists with strong Sino-Russo support as a “counterweight” to U.S. “imperialism,” that Putin is interested in. In fact, the Russian strongman said Moscow is “open to substantive interaction with all integration formations in the Latin American region.” That would include the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), the Common Market of the South (Mercosur), the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), the Pacific Alliance, the Central American Integration System (SICA), and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), Putin said in Havana.

“It is vital that all these associations, as they develop their external relations, should work towards the unity of Latin American countries ... both politically and ideologically,” Putin said. “We hope that consolidation of multilateral cooperation will be an additional factor in the successful development of our bilateral relations with Latin American partners.” Similar trends are taking place around the world, the Russian ruler observed, saying, “Integration processes in Latin America reflect to a large extent the worldwide regional integration tendencies and indicate the pursuit of political consolidation in the region and reinforcement of its influence on global affairs.”

Chinese Communist ruler Xi, whose regime now regularly calls for a “New World Order,” and Putin unveiled a new-world “development bank” run by the socialist- and communist-minded BRICS regimes — Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa — when the two autocratic rulers met in Brazil in mid-July.
Discussions on the international banking outfit, supposedly designed to serve as a “counterweight” to Western-dominated institutions, have been ongoing for years. At this year’s annual BRICS meeting, the five regimes finally signed the deal to put it all together.

More than a few analysts have wildly misdiagnosed what the latest developments mean, claiming that the new BRICS bank somehow represents a “challenge” to the Western establishment’s vision for what it calls a “New World Order.” In reality, though, most of the BRICS regimes and their allies have strong backing from the U.S. and European political class. And they are all pushing virtually the same nightmarish plot for a “New World Order” — at least if their own public declarations and statements are to be believed.

In June, Beijing and over 130 other national governments at the G77 signed a declaration calling for a “New World Order to Live Well.” It is, of course, the same order pushed by Obama, Kissinger, Brzezinski, and others. Billionaire globalist and Rothschild dynasty protégé George Soros, another key player in the emerging global order, has previously called for Beijing, one of Putin’s closest allies, to “own” the “New World Order.”

UN boss Ban Ki-moon was even at the Bolivia summit to celebrate the “New World Order” being pushed by the Third World regimes. He praised the ruthless governments assembled there, calling on them to keep agitating for autocratic “sustainable development” and “solutions” to “climate change,” a key pillar of the “global governance” schemes aimed at shackling humanity. “All countries need to act on these priorities — individually and collectively,” Ban told attendees, claiming the “fate of billions” depended on the success of their efforts. “That is how I understand the theme of this summit — a New World Order for Living Well.” As the largest bloc of governments in the UN, he added, they have a “key role” to play in advancing the global outfit’s goals.

**Putin and the “Globalization” Strategy on World Order**

The other key element of globalist strategy, also outlined in the recent *Wall Street Journal* piece written by Kissinger in late August, involves the imposition of what he described as a “structure of international rules and norms” that “must be fostered as a matter of common conviction.” In other words, alongside the “regionalization” approach to global governance, truly global structures must be built in tandem to eventually run the emerging “New World Order” as the regional blocs become integrated.

A crucial component of the globalist New World Order is the eventual creation of truly global monetary and financial governance. On both fronts, Putin has helped lead the charge. In 2009, the Kremlin even published a statement outlining its priorities ahead of the G20 summit, demanding the creation of a “supranational reserve currency to be issued by international institutions as part of a reform of the global financial system.” The IMF, the Kremlin statement said, should consider using its proto-global currency known as “Special Drawing Rights,” or SDRs, as a “super-reserve currency accepted by the whole of the international community.” The basket of national currencies undergirding the SDR would be expanded, too.

The same year, Putin protégé Dmitry Medvedev, then serving as Russia’s “president,” pulled what he called a “united future world currency” coin out of his pocket at a G8 summit. The coin featured the words “unity in diversity.” Then, he explained to the audience that it “means they’re getting ready. I think it’s a good sign that we understand how interdependent we are.” In June of 2010, Medvedev was at it again. “We are making plans for the future,” he gushed at an international economic forum in St. Petersburg,
Russia. “We are talking about creating other reserve currencies, and we are counting on other countries to understand this.”

Unsurprisingly, other “countries” — Western governments and politicians, really — did understand that. Then-French President Nicolas Sarkozy, for instance, said at the same forum that world powers “should think together about a new international currency system” at the upcoming G20 summit. He also said the world’s financial system was “outdated” and should be replaced. “We all need to think about the foundations for a new international financial system,” Sarkozy urged. “We’ve been based on the Bretton Woods institutions of 1945, when our American friends were the only superpower. My question is: Are we still in 1945? The answer here is, ‘no.’”

What about American globalists? They are fully on board, too. Former Fed boss and then-chairman of Obama’s “Economic Recovery Advisory Board” Paul Volcker, for example, has long been a strong proponent of a global fiat currency and a global central bank. He is widely reported to have said, “A global economy needs a global currency.” And he has repeatedly called for such a system, hoping to see it emerge during his lifetime.

In China, George Soros’ proposed leader of the world order, the “people’s” central-bank boss Zhou Xiaochuan has also frequently called for a new reserve currency — in addition to frequent calls by the communist regime in Beijing for a “de-Americanized” New World Order. In a 2009 report published on the central bank’s website entitled “Reform the International Monetary System,” Xiaochuan explained that “the desirable goal of reforming the international monetary system, therefore, is to create an international reserve currency that is disconnected from individual nations and is able to remain stable in the long run, thus removing the inherent deficiencies caused by using credit-based national currencies.”

When asked about the Communist Chinese regime’s idea at a Council on Foreign Relations event, Obama’s tax-dodging U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy “TurboTax” Geithner, a regular proponent of global regulation and an important globalist, after acknowledging that he had not read it yet, said, “We’re actually quite open to that.”

What would a global currency mean for Americans? For starters, it would necessarily require the loss of the U.S. dollar’s status as the world reserve currency. That means a dramatic devaluation of Americans’ currency, with all that implies — surging prices for imports on which America is now totally dependent, for example. Right now, America’s central bank, the privately owned Federal Reserve, helps the U.S. government finance its wars, armies of bureaucrats, loyalty-purchasing welfare, and other schemes by printing debt-based currency.

If a global central bank were able to do something similar, which is exactly what globalists such as Putin and his Western counterparts are pushing, the emerging global government would likewise be able to finance its own armies, police, courts, bureaucrats, and more. All it would require is simply printing “liquidity,” secretly confiscating humanity’s wealth via inflation of the currency supply. Besides funding government bureaucracy, the new financial leaders would literally be able to determine which businesses and countries would flourish and which would fail — as did the Federal Reserve in the United States when it bailed out some too-big-to-fail entities while ensuring others went bankrupt in 2008.

Putin is also helping to globalize the financial regulatory regime. In early 2013, when Putin assumed the presidency of the G20, he had nothing but praise for the suspiciously named “Financial Stability Board” (FSB) — not to be confused with the other FSB, the successor to the Soviet KGB that Putin came from.
originally. The new FSB, supposedly hatched by G20 governments and dictatorships, is meant to serve as the global financial police. It will be housed, of course, at the shadowy Bank for International Settlements (BIS), another key globalist institution.

Outlining the globalist machinations in his 1966 book *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*, the late Georgetown University professor and Bill Clinton mentor Carroll Quigley, a devoted globalist, wrote: “The powers of financial capitalism had a far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. This system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert by secret agreements arrived at in frequent private meetings and conferences. The apex of the system was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the world’s central banks which were themselves private corporations.”

**Putin Loves Global “Governance,” Too**

More broadly, on the UN, which is set to serve as the nucleus of “global governance,” Putin, again, is fully on board with the globalist agenda. Consider, as just one example among many, the former KGB chief’s posturing amid the recent brouhaha over Syria. “The United Nations’ founders understood that decisions affecting war and peace should happen only by consensus,” Putin wrote in the *New York Times* as Obama and the United States were being made to look like rogue warmongers and imbeciles, as contrasted with the “responsible” Russian statesman (who never mentioned the massive Soviet role in creating the UN to begin with). “The profound wisdom of this has underpinned the stability of international relations for decades.”

“We are not protecting the Syrian government, but international law,” Putin continued. “The law is still the law, and we must follow it whether we like it or not. Under current international law, force is permitted only in self-defense or by the decision of the Security Council. Anything else is unacceptable under the United Nations Charter.”

Before Syria, Putin and his Communist Chinese allies also endorsed the UN resolution purporting to authorize international “intervention” in Libya against their former ally, Moammar Gadhafi. Both regimes also supported efforts to try Libyan officials at the UN’s kangaroo judicial branch, the self-styled “International Criminal Court” — yet another key tentacle of the “New World Order” that Obama has offered unprecedented support for (despite never obtaining ratification in the U.S. Senate for it).

Before singing the UN’s praises in the *Times* op-ed, Putin and his fellow BRICS rulers signed a declaration openly calling for global governance under the UN, a world currency, and more. “The UN enjoys universal membership and is at the center of global governance,” the 2013 BRICS declaration stated. “We underscore our commitment to work together in the UN to continue our cooperation and strengthen multilateral approaches in international relations based on the rule of law and anchored in the Charter of the United Nations.” Everything from terror and “global warming” to “human rights” enforcement ought to be dealt with by the UN, they said.

Putin’s unabashed support for the entire architecture of global governance should hardly be surprising. Indeed, long before Putin came on the scene, the Soviet regime he served played a key role in creating the UN, the IMF, the World Bank, and more after World War II. Even many of the most important supposed
American architects of the global system — Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, for instance — were later exposed as agents of the Kremlin.

Admittedly, despite all of the evidence, it may still seem preposterous to some that the supposedly adversarial and competing political and economic blocs on both sides of the East-West divide could someday be merged into one to form a genuine world government. But what may not be realistically achievable today could become very realistic in the not-too-distant future, should the current frigid relationship between Russia and the West thaw. Western relations with Russia have changed in the past, when Russia has been alternatively viewed as an enemy (during the Cold War) and as a friend (during détente and glasnost, after the apparent collapse of Russian communism, and even during the post-9/11 “war on terror”).

Of course, the fact that Putin is a key player on the road to world order does not mean there are no genuine disagreements between the Kremlin and the Western establishment. It also does not mean that Putin is indispensable — countless globalist minions have been eliminated by the establishment after outliving their usefulness.

Finally, Putin’s globalist and establishment credentials hardly preclude the orchestration of a real war between “East” and “West” at some point, particularly if America cannot be induced to surrender its sovereignty to a global regime. Indeed, more than a few analysts have suggested that another World War between the two sides may be in the cards as a way of accelerating the move toward global government.

In 1962, globalist Lincoln P. Bloomfield with the Institute for Defense Analyses prepared a report for the U.S. State Department entitled “A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations.” In it, he explained how competition or even wars between regional super-regimes could dramatically accelerate the quest for global government.

“A ‘normal’ historical process, in which ever-larger units evolve through customs unions, confederation, regionalism, etc., until ultimately the larger units coalesce under a global umbrella, could take up to two hundred years, on past performance figures, and even this may be optimistic,” wrote Bloomfield. “I have suggested that an alternative road may bypass the main path of history, short-circuiting the organic stages of consensus, value formation, and the experiences of common enterprise generally believed to underlie political community.”

The plan, he said, “relies on a grave crisis or war to bring about a sudden transformation in national attitudes sufficient for the purpose.” Using such plotting, the “order” could “be brought into existence as a result of a series of sudden, nasty, and traumatic shocks,” Bloomfield explained. “Thus a hypothetical model can be constructed, fulfilling the characteristics of ‘a world effectively controlled by the United Nations.’ ... We concluded that in theory it could come about in the short, medium, or long run by a brink of war — or a war — combined with the development of evolutionary trends that might favor it as the time span stretches out.”

Either way, as globalists continue their plotting, young Miguel Calehr, his brother, and the other 296 victims on MH17 are unlikely to be the last “collateral damage” tragedies on the road to world order. Unless the American people become educated and organized, the New World Order will march on, leaving even more misery and death in its wake.
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