



[CLICK HERE FOR ADVERTISEMENT RATES](#)




Soros And CFR Exploit Refugee Crisis For New World Order

[0002](#)

[February 2, 2016](#)

[george-soros2](#)



This article was written by Alex Newman and originally published at [The New American](#)

After having literally created the refugee crisis from start to finish — [destroying multiple Middle Eastern nations and then demanding that Europe accept the millions of displaced victims](#) — the internationalist establishment is now exploiting the chaos it unleashed to push more globalism and statism. Europe, Africa, and the Middle East are all in the cross-hairs of billionaire George Soros (shown), the global government-promoting [Council on Foreign Relations](#), and other key globalist forces. Among other efforts, the [refugee-crisis instigators are using the horror they unleashed](#) as a pretext to erode what remains of national sovereignty in those regions — all while further empowering supranational institutions such as the United Nations, the European Union, the African Union, and even a [globalist-backed “Middle East Union” yet to be formally unveiled](#). A new “Marshall Plan” and even an EU paramilitary force with unprecedented powers are also on the agenda, all on the road toward what establishment voices [regularly refer to as a “New World Order.”](#)

With the refugee situation quickly spiraling out of control across parts of the continent — the mass sexual assaults on New Year across Germany and beyond, the implosion of law and order around Calais in France, the widely reported overrunning of Stockholm’s central station by refugee youths, and more — the public is now growing increasingly outraged. Indeed, as *The New American* reported last week, even the establishment forces responsible for unleashing the chaos are [now loudly denouncing it](#). The *New York Times*, an establishment mouthpiece that dutifully promoted the globalist wars that sparked the refugee crisis, and then the subsequent flooding of the West with the victims of those wars, ran an op-ed pointing out that Germany was “on the brink” due to the crisis. Top European political bosses have also been sounding the alarm.

Another senior globalist, [Rothschild banking dynasty protege](#) and billionaire hedge-fund boss Soros,

played an instrumental role in encouraging the myriad wars and the subsequent tsunami of refugees into Europe that was sparked by those wars. And now, like other establishment voices, Soros is also pointing out the obvious. The European Union, he said in a recent interview, is “on the verge of collapse” due to the sudden influx of well over a million Islamic refugees last year. Not coincidentally, Soros also has ideas about “solutions.” And not surprisingly, those alleged “solutions” involve more globalism for Europe, Africa, and the Middle East — along with less sovereignty, self-government, and liberty.

In an [interview with Bloomberg from the World Economic Forum](#) in Davos, Switzerland, the radical anti-national sovereignty statist claimed that Europe needed to finance a new “Marshall Plan” for the regions of the world from which the refugees are fleeing — regions and nations destroyed in large part by the globalist Western establishment figures pushing the new plan. Soros was expressing support for a proposal made earlier by a fellow globalist, German Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble. The new “Marshall Plan” they envision seeks to transfer wealth from struggling European taxpayers to a multitude of nations ruined by globalist machinations such as Libya, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, and beyond — but the real agenda goes much deeper, as did the last Marshall Plan after World War II.

“What is most important is for us to invest billions in those regions from which the refugees come to reduce the pressure on the external frontiers of Europe,” Schäuble argued in a panel discussion at the globalist World Economic Forum, speaking alongside several European prime ministers who also played a key role in flooding Europe with refugees displaced from the nations they helped destroy. “That will cost Europe much more than we thought.” Of course it will, and you will pay for it. Writing in the Soros-backed “Project Syndicate” propaganda organ in 2014, Schäuble [previously called for a global taxation regime](#), one of his many calls for more globalism and statism.

So what would a new “Marshall Plan” for the Middle East and Africa look like? A [brief history of the original Marshall Plan](#) might offer some clues. Officially known as the “European Recovery Program,” or ERP, the scheme involved transferring the equivalent of almost \$150 billion in today’s dollars from U.S. taxpayers to Western European governments. The ostensible purpose was to help rebuild Europe after World War II. In practice, though, it served as a key tool in the transformation of Western Europe into a statist region dominated by Big Government and supranational institutions, eventually culminating in the subjugation of Europeans under the unaccountable EU super-state. [That was the goal all along](#).

As far back as 1947, then-U.S. Secretary of State George Marshall (CFR) — [a key player in handing China to Chairman Mao’s murderous communists, and perhaps mass-murdering dictator Joseph Stalin’s most important ally in the world](#) — strongly suggested in a speech that European “economic cooperation” was a precondition for the desperately needed American aid after the war. “It is already evident that, before the United States Government can proceed much further in its efforts to alleviate the situation and help start the European world on its way to recovery, there must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part those countries themselves will take in order to give proper effect to whatever action might be undertaken by this Government,” said Marshall, the man after whom the scheme was named. “The initiative, I think, must come from Europe. The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so. The program should be a *joint one, agreed to by a number, if not all European nations*.” (Emphasis added.)

The Committee of European Economic Cooperation, chaired by then-British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, officially responded with a major report that was ultimately transmitted approvingly by the State Department to President Harry Truman. Signed by government representatives from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and more, the committee outlined efforts to create a customs union that could eventually lead to even further cooperation. U.S. officials were pleased.

Members of Congress, especially Representative Walter Judd (R-Minn.), even tried to get language in the statement of purpose for the original Marshall Plan bill of 1948 explicitly declaring that it was the policy of the United States to encourage the economic unification and the political federation of Europe. In the end, language calling for the development of economic cooperation was included instead. The next year, the “political federation” amendment was pursued again, with the result being the addition of the

sentence: “It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification of Europe.” By 1951, Congress finally came out and said it openly, with a clause included in the 1951 Mutual Security Act stating: “to further encourage the economic unification and the political federation of Europe.”

The goals of U.S. government support for European integration were explained in part decades ago, though largely ignored, by top U.S. officials. On September 20, 1966, for example, then-Under Secretary of State George Ball (CFR) testified before Congress on the State Department’s view on forming an “Atlantic Community,” essentially merging the United States with Europe. “I find little evidence of any strong interest among Europeans for any immediate move toward greater political unity with the United States,” he explained. “They fear the overwhelming weight of U.S. power and influence in our common councils.... We believe that so long as Europe remains merely a continent of medium- and small-sized states there are definite limits to the degree of political unity we can achieve across the ocean.”

Not coincidentally, the new “Marshall Plan” is being pushed by the same globalist establishment that has been [openly advancing the imposition of a “Middle East Union” on the region in recent years](#). “Just as a warring [European] continent found peace through unity by creating what became the EU, Arabs, Turks, Kurds and other groups in the region could find relative peace in ever closer union,” claimed Mohamed “Ed” Husain, an “adjunct senior fellow for Middle Eastern studies” at the CFR, in a piece published in the *Financial Times* and on the CFR website in mid-2014. “After all, most of its problems — terrorism, poverty, unemployment, sectarianism, refugee crises, water shortages — require regional answers. No country can solve its problems on its own.” That is, of course, nonsense, but it is standard globalist rhetoric.

Plenty of other globalists have offered similar admissions. It has even become fashionable for establishment figures and their hangers-on to compare today’s Middle East with Europe before the EU. Indeed, Richard Haass, the CFR boss and a former leader at the U.S. State Department, writing in Soros’ Project Syndicate, [does precisely that](#). In an incredible admission, though, Haass explains, without admitting the CFR’s giant role in instigating all of the tragedies he mentions, that the CFR-backed globalist wars of the last decade and a half were crucial in setting the region on fire — the same blaze that now supposedly requires a CFR-inspired “Middle East Union” to be extinguished. The globalist strategy used over and over again goes like this: create a problem, then exploit and manage the inevitable reaction to push a “solution.”

“The 2003 Iraq war was highly consequential, for it exacerbated Sunni-Shia tensions in one of the region’s most important countries and, as a result, in many of the region’s other divided societies,” Haass wrote, omitting the instrumental role of CFR members and operatives in the Bush administration, the media, Congress, and beyond who demanded and launched the destruction of Iraq. “Regime change in Libya [by Obama, the United Nations, NATO, and CFR apparatchiks] has created a failing state; lukewarm support for [CFR and Soros-backed] regime change in Syria has set the stage for prolonged civil war.” And the chaos, bloodshed, and terror will continue, he says, until “a new local order emerges or exhaustion sets in.” In the meantime, globalists should treat the region as a “condition to be managed,” Haass said. How convenient — the CFR sets a fire, and now purports to have the fire extinguisher, promising a raging inferno unless and until everyone submits to the globalist demands, including a new regional “order.”

Multiple news reports have [suggested](#) that the Kremlin in Moscow, which is currently building its own “Eurasian Union,” might be called upon to help out with the new “Marshall Plan.” Several media outlets have even reported that Soros wanted Russia to cooperate in the scheme, though for now, at least, those reports appear to be inaccurate. But the notion of Putin’s Kremlin [helping to push regionalization and ultimately globalism in tandem with the EU is hardly new](#). In fact, before the recent tensions, top EU bosses were quite open about it. During a meeting in late 2012 between Russian and EU leaders, the Bilderberg-selected European “President” at the time, Herman Van Rompuy, said: “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 G 8 and G 20, and to a broad range of international and regional issues.” Russian heavyweights have also started publicly calling for “integration” — including political — between the EU and Russia.

In Africa, the same regionalization strategy is being pursued, as *The New American* [documented in a recent article about the globalist agenda becoming clear](#) amid the imposition of an “African Union” on the peoples of the continent. Unsurprisingly, the EU, along with the Obama administration and the communist dictatorship enslaving mainland China, is already the chief financier of the African Union. The UN, meanwhile, is helping orchestrate the process.

The end game is clear, too: Using the regional blocs as building blocks in erecting what [globalists such as Soros, Bush, Clinton, Biden, and others, often refer to in public as their “New World Order.”](#) In his recent book *World Order*, globalist operative and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger laid out the plan. “The contemporary quest for world order [world government] will require a coherent strategy to establish a concept of order [regional government] within the various regions and to relate these regional orders [governments] to one another,” he [wrote](#). State Department documents going back decades outline the same strategy.

Other internationalist schemes being pushed by exploiting the refugee crisis include the creation of new EU institutions, including agencies to usurp control over immigration from formerly sovereign nations, as well as to create military outfits ostensibly aimed at “protecting Europe’s borders” from the refugee tsunami sparked by globalist machinations. If approved, the proposed EU military force would even be able to “intervene” in European nations without permission from national authorities if the situation was “urgent.” Globalist former Goldman Sachs boss Peter Sutherland, currently “serving” as the UN “special representative of the secretary-general for international migration,” [openly declared](#) that national sovereignty is an “absolute illusion” that must be “put behind us” in the interest of the refugee crisis and, more broadly, creating a “better world.”

If humanitarianism was truly the motivation, though, countless experts have pointed out that it would be radically more cost effective to help refugees and victims of globalist wars closer to their homes. Literally 25 to 50 times more people could be supported in Lebanon or Jordan than in Europe, for the same amount of tax funds. The wars that destroyed those countries and caused the crisis to begin with would never have been launched if the purported “humanitarian concerns” of the establishment were genuine. Instead, the agenda is to advance globalism, pure and simple, and the establishment barely even seems interested in concealing that fact anymore. Europeans, Africans, Americans, Middle Easterners, and all of humanity should resist.

Categories: [All](#), [CPT-Community-Preparedness-Teams](#), [Current Events](#), [Featured](#)