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“Be extremely subtle, even to the point of formlessness. Be extremely mysterious, even to the point of soundlessness. Thereby you can be the director of the opponent’s fate.”
Sun Tzu, The Art of War

Even as President Donald Trump ramps up the U.S. regime change machinery to “take care of” Venezuela, Syria, Iran, Nicaragua, and Julian Assange’s Ecuador, it very well could be that the U.S. regime change machinery has already been turned inward against him! The apparent Democrat versus Republican “Public State” display masks a much more sinister (and potentially violent) Deep State clash. The only question not asked is how far will each of the contending factions go to win? I believe the Samson Option has been activated and that could very well mean that the contending factions are in a fight with each other to the death. Meanwhile the U.S. war machine continues to crush countries, creating “Sh*thole” countries in its death march. Other countries must understand what is happening inside the U.S. in order to better guard against any more hostile or belligerent U.S. actions toward them and to take advantage of any coming imbroglio that could serve as a distraction to their own targeting. People inside the U.S. must formulate a strategy to make themselves players in this deadly match, so that they might become the arbiters of the U.S. fate. And of their own.

Donald Trump is seen as a disruptor to the plans of the currently ascendant global elite and their U.S. empire building. Even Gareth Porter asks if Trump is a threat to the U.S.

1 Speaking at the United Nations, President Trump vowed to “take care of” Venezuela (https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/white-house/trump-all-options-on-the-table-for-venezuela-even-the-strong-ones) and later Trump used the same language against countries that continue to defy U.S. sanctions and buy oil from Iran (https://www.news18.com/news/world/trump-says-will-take-care-of-countries-that-continue-to-buy-oil-from-iran-1905685.html); both articles accessed November 23, 2018.

2 “Deep State” and “Public State” are terms innovated by Dr. Peter Dale Scott to distinguish between those movers of state policy who are unknown and faceless to the public (and hence who never answer to the public) and can be considered a part of a state’s Deep State versus those individuals whose names the public knows and holds accountable for state policies.


global empire. If not, he certainly is a threat to the empire builders. As President, Trump has threatened to pull U.S. troops from Afghanistan, South Korea, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), North Africa. He has threatened to pull the U.S. from the World Trade Organization (WTO)\(^5\) and more! Porter writes:

“Trump’s attacks on the system of the global U.S. military presence and commitments have gotten far less notice. He has complained bitterly, both in public and in private meetings with aides, about the suite of permanent wars that the Pentagon has been fighting for many years across the Greater Middle East and Africa, as well as about deployments and commitments to South Korea and NATO. This has resulted in an **unprecedented struggle between a sitting president and the national security state** over a global U.S. military empire that has been sacrosanct in American politics since early in the Cold War. “\(^6\)

According to Porter, when the military state asked Trump for more troops in North Africa, Trump outlandishly reportedly asked for “justification.”

According to Philip Giraldi, candidate Trump put off the usual Washington, D.C. “swamp” of lobbyists during the 2016 Presidential campaign. He wrote:

“But there is one significant difference between Trump and the “establishment,” be they Democrats or Republicans that has not been highlighted. I would suggest that quite a lot of the depth and intensity of what we are experiencing is actually about Israel. Trump is the first high level politician aspirant within living memory to challenge the notion that the United States must stand by Israel no matter what Israel does. Even while affirming his affection for Israel, he has said that Washington must be even handed in its efforts to bring about peace between Israelis and Palestinians, implying that Tel Aviv might have to make concessions.

Trump has also added insult to injury by delinking himself from the blandishments of Jewish political mega-donors, who largely call the tune for many in the GOP and among the Democrats, by telling them he doesn’t need their money and can’t be bought. **His comments have challenged**

---


conventional interest group politicking in America and have predictably produced a firestorm reaction in the usual circles.”

Already, President Trump has done more by threatening to remove U.S. troops from Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria than all of the Congressional votes on U.S. wars made by the so-called independent “progressive” standard-bearer and Hillary Clinton-supporting Senator Bernie Sanders. Trump, according to Porter quoting Bob Woodward on the Trump Presidency, told his national security team, “We should just declare victory, end the wars and bring our troops home.”

Thus, in my opinion, President Trump is certainly a threat and disruptor to the current world order, that has a decision-making process that he describes as a “swamp” and that produces a system that Trump claims is “rigged.” I believe that only those who personally benefit from the current system (combined with those who don’t know how the current system operates) could possibly disagree with this assessment. I also believe that the efforts to dislodge Trump, seen and unseen, have some of the characteristics of hybrid warfare. Thus, quite possibly, the United States is in a position of having a hybrid war game played against its current leader by its own military/police state. The last President to amass this combination and array of enemies with this level of celebrated vitriol was President John F. Kennedy, whose brains were blown out in broad, open daylight for all the world to see, 55 years ago on November 22, 1963. Moreover, I believe that a marriage of convenience and mutual interest between the Democratic Party has been “arranged” in desperate “Deep State” circles, the manifestations of which could portend poorly for the people of the U.S. and the change that the people voted for when they elected Trump to the Presidency. That such a marriage has taken place was evidenced uniquely in the Brett Kavanaugh confirmation hearings that took on a surreal air as the Supreme Court nominee was targeted by attempted rape allegations when he was a teenager and by sexual assault allegations as a young college student. Other alleged victims gained attention from the press and from press accomplices in the Democratic Party. What the Democrats in Congress failed to do was question Kavanaugh on the substantive policies that he approved, was aware of, or remained silent on that supported the erosion of the U.S. Constitution and its Bill of Rights: the approval of torture under the George W. Bush Presidency, the Department of Justice coverup of information regarding the death of Philip Giraldi, “Hating On Trump: It Could Be About Israel,” The Unz Review, March 8, 2016 (emphasis added) located at https://www.unz.com/pgiraldi/hating-on-trump/ accessed November 23, 2018.


Hillary Clinton confidant, Vince Foster. I believe that the Senate Democrats refused to tackle these real issues because, in the end, they are complicit in these policy decisions. Or know that higher powers than them want them and so chose to fight Kavanaugh on the fuzzy memories of a drunken teenager and a few now-mature women—but-then young women.  

If my hunch is correct, then this marriage of convenience will show its evidence in new and disturbing ways. The entry of George Soros into domestic U.S. politics—in a huge way—is one line of evidence that points to a new trend that could spell trouble as well as present new opportunities for the people of the U.S. Add to that the disturbing rise of the CIA/intelligence marriage into the Democratic Party by way of its Congressional candidates. Moreover, when speaking of her election loss, Hillary Clinton declared the “Purple Revolution.” Given what we now know of its contours in the 2018 midterm elections, during which many Democratic Party candidates sported purple clothing, inquiring minds want to know what might this “Purple Revolution” really mean and if it is a cause for worry. 

But, before we explore the significance and the presence of George Soros in domestic U.S. politics in 2018, let’s take a look at who George Soros is to others around the world.

### George Soros’s Involvement in Politics Elsewhere

From Senegal to Cote d’Ivoire, throughout Africa and beyond, the name of George Soros is synonymous with nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), regime change, and so-called “color” revolutions. George Soros is a Hungarian national who has been banned from Hungary and who has filed a lawsuit in order to regain the right to enter Hungary.

---

10 For more on this perspective, please see my paper “Brett Kavanaugh Trapped In Deep State Hybrid Warfare,” in the soon-to-be-published book by James Fetzer, The Kavanaugh Conspiracy: Was #MeToo Weaponized For Partisan Politics? A copy of this paper can be had by contacting this author directly on https://antioch.academia.edu/CynthiaMcKinney.

11 This phenomenon will be discussed more later in this paper.


his country of birth. But actually, Russia was the first country to outlaw Soros-financed NGOs. This came after leaked documents indicated that Soros was behind an effort to effect regime change in Russia against Putin. A search for those documents revealed that they seem to have been wiped from the internet. Despite that, stories about the leaked documents have not. Take, for example, Sputnik’s “Leaked Memos Show that George Soros Plotted to Oust Putin, Destabilize Russia.” The article ends:

“The memo was followed up with what was called "the Russia Project" which called for identifying and organizing opponents to Putin, advancing principles of globalism, and undermine Russia’s image in the lead up to the Sochi Winter Olympics.”

Thus, for much of the world, George Soros IS Mr. Regime Change, Mr. Color Revolution—working hand in hand with certain U.S. Deep State players. Honing all that global experience for what was dubbed by the Hillary Clinton Presidential campaign as the “Purple Revolution,”—the coming together of Republican majority (red) states and Democratic Party blue states under the leadership of the Clintons. When Hillary lost, some began to wonder if the color revolution technique, used to devastating effect in other parts of the world (like Serbia, Georgia, and Ukraine), was finally about to come home to roost.

**George Soros Interviewed**

George Soros, born Gyorgy Schwartz in Hungary in 1930, is currently a U.S. citizen. CBS News’s Scott Pelley, on the U.S. network’s popular Sunday evening show, “60 Minutes,” described Soros as a man who “amassed billions through ruthless business decisions only to turn around and give away most of his fortune to advance his own personal philosophy.” Pelley continues, “He can move world financial markets simply

---


15 Ibid. Also see U.S. State Department records, obtained through legal action, that show a partnership between the Obama Administration (Hillary Clinton State Department) and Soros-funded NGOs in order to interfere in the domestic politics of Albania located at http://www.judicialwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/JW-v-State-Soros-Albania-01012-3.pdf accessed October 18, 2018.

16 CIA-backed efforts to “open” former Soviet Republics and elsewhere after the collapse of the Soviet Union utilizing NGOs, social media, and SMSes have been labeled a new kind of warfare by Russia Defense Minister Shoigu and Russia Foreign Minister Lavrov.


18 On election night, the Hillary Clinton campaign wore the color purple because the campaign goal was to turn the (Red) Republican states to majority (blue) Democratic voting states. It didn’t happen.
by voicing an opinion or destabilize a government by buying and selling its currency. . . . But now George Soros is worried. He thinks the global economy is coming apart at the seams and that the world needs to be protected from people like George Soros.”

Soros made his billions as the co-founder of The Quantum Fund, a hedge fund that has returned an average of thirty percent to investors each year since its founding in the 1970s. With a background as a Hungarian Jew, Soros admits to helping the Nazis confiscate property from other Jews. He states in the interview that his rationale is that had he not done it, someone else would have served in that role. On this point, he is probably correct. Sadly.

Scott Pelley continues in describing Soros: “He can move world financial markets simply by voicing an opinion or destabilize a government by buying and selling its currency. . . . But now George Soros is worried. He thinks the global economy is coming apart at the seams and that the world needs to be protected from people like George Soros.” According to 60 Minutes, Soros has been blamed for the financial collapse of Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Japan, and Russia, all within the span of just two years! Soros admits that his intervention in Thailand did make the situation “catastrophic.” He also admits that he made “in excess of a billion dollars of profit” speculating on British currency that he did not own. Malaysia’s Prime Minister in the 1990s and again in 2018, Tun Dr. Mohamad Mahathir, said that Soros was punishing ASEAN countries for admitting Myanmar (Burma) into that regional organization—at a time when the U.S. was punishing Burma’s military rulers—pre-Aung San Suu Kyi.

Despite having been born in Hungary, currently, Soros is persona non grata there. The Soros-founded Central European University (CEU) was recently shut down by Hungarian authorities. The anti-Soros sentiment stems from Soros’s pro-migration stance and the feeling held by some Hungarians that Soros and his Open Society Foundations is bringing open borders and millions of African and Asian migrants into Europe. However, the attack on Soros-funded non-governmental organizations is seen

---

19 Interestingly, a search on youtube.com readily reveals many uploads of the famous “60 Minutes” interview in which Soros makes the admission. However, a careful search of the CBS website, under the 60 Minutes menu, fails to reveal the 1998 interview on its site. However, the interview in full can be found here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QSyczwuTQfo and is embedded here: https://www.vox.com/2018/6/11/17405784/george-soros-not-a-nazi-trump.


21 George Soros says this in a BBC documentary on what has become known as “Black Wednesday” located at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K_oET45GzMI accessed on November 21, 2018. The story of Soros’s speculation on the British currency, Black Wednesday 20 years on: how the day unfolded,” is located at https://www.theguardian.com/business/2012/sep/13/black-wednesday-20-years-pound-erm accessed November 21, 2018.

as a larger attack on civil society by some in Hungary. Nonetheless, CEU is currently trying to negotiate with the government of Hungary, but is prepared to shut its doors in Hungary and move to Vienna for the 2019-2020 academic year.23 In June 2018, Hungary’s parliament passed the “Stop Soros” law which makes it illegal to help undocumented immigrants. Soros’s Open Society Foundations no longer operates in Hungary, having left in August 2018, transferring its Hungary-based operations to Germany.24

Countries React To George Soros’s Interventions

In 2015, Russia banned Soros-funded NGOs from disbursing grants to Russian NGOs as a threat to Russian state security.25 Soros-funded Open Society Foundations and Open Society Institute were named in the Russia ban. The Russian Parliament also named the U.S. National Endowment for Democracy on its list of “foreign agents.” At a press conference with President Trump in Helsinki, Finland, Russian President Vladimir Putin called Soros’s name after addressing U.S. media allegations that Russia interfered in the 2016 U.S. Presidential elections to the detriment of Hillary Clinton.26 Putin’s sly, tongue-in-cheek response was that surely no one would accuse George Soros, the private individual, of acting on behalf of the U.S. state. (But, of course, leaks of important internal Soros documents demonstrate just that!). On Austrian TV, Putin said, “Mr. Soros interferes in affairs all over the world.” He went on to say that when discussing Soros’s actions against certain countries, the U.S. responds that Soros has nothing to do with U.S. policy; so his response to allegations of Russians interfering in the U.S. election is that the actions of Russian nationals, or even dual citizens, has nothing to do with the Russian state.

More recently, the new government in Italy has also taken a swipe at Soros. Deputy Prime Minister Matteo Salvini rejected Soros accusations that his political party, The League, was financed by Russia.27 What is the reason that so many Europeans dislike


George Soros? Part of the explanation could be found in his position on migration and the role of Soros-funded organizations in what Europeans call the “Migration Crisis.”

Soros describes himself as “one person who at one time engages in amoral activities and the rest of the time, tries to be moral.” He also states that he is in business to make money and that he does not care about the social consequences of his work. This reminds me of Roger Ver, CEO of bitcoin.com, who recently said that the means are the ends, saying: “The means are the ends. There is no unethical way of achieving ethical goals and there is no ethical way of achieving unethical goals. So every step of the way, you need to be doing the right thing.” Clearly, George Soros would disagree.

George Soros: Weaponizing Migration?

First of all, I have to remark on the irony of Europeans (and the U.S.), who carried colonialism, neocolonialism, and neoliberalism from their shores to the rest of the world—oftentimes to the detriment of other peoples, cultures, and civilizations, without regard to how many were killed in the effort—and enforced by soldiers and bombs—being offended by migration. But, more than ironic is the trans-Atlantic migrant “trade” of people rushing away from the “Sh*thole” countries that European and U.S. policy has created. However, with that having been said, there is something distinctly different about this wave of migration that makes it appear to be an orchestrated “crisis.”

The epicenter of the European migration crisis is Italy and is financed by NGOs that receive support from Soros and his Open Society Foundations (OSF). This large-scale human trafficking is fueled largely by U.S.–European–Israeli foreign policy that destroys African and Asian countries and turns them into “Sh*thole” countries. Recently, speaking at the European Council of Foreign Relations, Soros reportedly stated, “The idea of Europe as an open society continues to inspire me. . . . Now, to remain a reality, it will need to reinvent itself.” A leaked OSF document—which has since vanished from the internet—explained that migration across borders was to become the “new normal.” Thus began the global phenomenon that basically weaponizes people who flee deprivation and worse across borders.


Think the European migrants and think the Rohingya of Myanmar—to which I will come shortly.

Italy’s new Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior, Matteo Salvini, made the following accusation: “Soros Wants to Fill Italy and Europe with Migrants Because He Likes Slaves.” According to Pew Research, over one million African refugees have migrated to Europe since 2010! GEFIRA, an organization that publishes articles “from the European Perspective” decided to investigate the mysterious source of funding that, all of a sudden, seemed to make massive migration into Europe a possibility for hundreds of thousands of Africans and Asians able to move from their war-torn countries, especially after the destruction of Libya. Here’s what was found: “NGOs are smuggling immigrants into Europe on an industrial scale.” GEFIRA found that there are seven NGOs that are primarily involved in the massive human trafficking operation reminiscent of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade when one views photos of the ships and the utter deprivation of the migrants. Among those seven NGOs are Medecins Sans Frontieres (Doctors Without Borders) and Save the Children. That at least one of the organizations has close links to whatever the current iteration of U.S. mercenary outfit, Blackwater, is today, because it has changed its name several times. GEFIRA concludes that open borders activists are facilitating these massive population shifts around the world. GEFIRA traces these migrant flows to organizations financed directly or indirectly by Open Society Foundations. On the GEFIRA chart above, you will notice that the organizations financed directly by Open Society Foundations are in green; Italian NGOs financed by OSF are in blue; and organizations that share some projects with OSF are in purple. The Soros-financed, pro-open borders migrant network includes trusted media outlets like Democracy Now!, human rights groups like Human Rights Watch, political advocacy groups like MoveOn.org.

Now, consider how the Rohingya issue could be utilized by someone(s) to pressure both Bangladesh and Myanmar. Very few in Bangladesh have forgotten the U.S. request to place a military base not too far from where the Rohingya are currently encamped. Soon, one is not surprised to find George Soros circling around the very wealthy Myanmar state. Felix Haas, a German national who currently lives in Myanmar,


identifies Open Society network organizations and individuals as part of a network of manipulation for the purposes of stripping Myanmar assets. In his Report, he names George Soros as someone who characterizes Myanmar as a “Long-Term Investment that Paid Off.”

In addition to Haas, Asia watcher, Tony Cartalucci, writes that the situation in Myanmar is precarious largely due to efforts to “Balkanize and then dominate” from outsiders an already-divided population. In an article entitled, “The Fruits of Globalization: Regression, Destitution, Domination—Globalists Grind Development to a Halt in Myanmar (Burma),” Cartalucci observes that the neoliberal prescription for elsewhere in the world is the same for Myanmar: “Division, Destitution, Then Foreign Domination.” Now, if that sounds familiar, it’s because that particular neoliberal, globalist prescription is exactly what was facilitated through NAFTA and other so-called trade agreements championed by the Clintons and President Obama and reviled so much by Trump’s “Make America Great Again” (MAGA) supporters. With Central American migrants currently massing on the U.S. border, might the U.S. be Soros’s next color revolution playground? With advocates in both Europe and the U.S. helping undocumented migrants become non-citizen voters, imagine all of the chaos, manipulation, and “divide and rule” mischief that can be created in these countries for decades to come.

George Soros’s Involvement in US Politics

As a U.S. citizen, it is not only his right, but also his responsibility to involve himself in the political life of his country. George Soros opposed the Presidency of George W. Bush and supported John Kerry and other Democratic Party candidates. A Soros-linked organization, Americans Coming Together, was fined over $700,000 for campaign finance violations. That can’t happen now because of two 2010 Supreme

---


Court decisions; George Soros’s considerable wealth can be put to work recreating the U.S. into his likeness.

A Vast NGO Network Affecting U.S. Policy?

Astroturf, first innovated in 1965, is a type of synthetic grass first used by the Houston Astrodome for its professional athletic games. “Astroturfing” an issue in U.S. politics, then, is “the practice of masking the sponsors of a message or organization, to make it appear as though it originates from and is supported by grassroots participants” and is reflective of public opinion. The purpose of “astroturfing” an issue is to persuade policy makers (and public opinion) in order to achieve a particular policy outcome. By definition, astroturf is artificial. And thus, policies that are based on astroturfing are usually deep in special interest support and shallow in public support. Special interests are the array of immediate private beneficiaries of selected public policies. Astroturfing has as a goal the creation of enough public support (or chaos) for (or against) a particular policy so that public opinion either supports the desired policy outcome or is indifferent to it, thus allowing policy changes to occur with little resistance. Sadly, for policy making in the U.S., especially when big money interests are involved, astroturfing has become a way of life in Washington, D.C. and in all of the 50 U.S. states. Nothing short of election and campaign finance reform (and in the wake of the controversial Citizens United Supreme Court decision that opened the floodgates of special interest money into the U.S. political system), maybe even only Constitutional amendment will stop it.

Thus, there exists a vast NGO network that supports the work of full- and part-time non-corporate activists whose policy inputs are critical to leveling the process. When Trump campaigned saying that the system is rigged, he quickly added that he had worked with policy makers and understood how the U.S. political game was played. His “The system is rigged” became a favorite line during the campaign because average, ordinary folks have long known that something was terribly wrong in a system that no longer served them. Although they might not have been able to articulate exactly the ways in which the system was rigged. Although, with the clamor for term limits, I think the people were pretty sure that it had something to do with the way elections were administered in the U.S.

However, in January 2010, the Supreme Court held that the Constitution prohibits the government from limiting independent communications expenditures which the Court considered to be “speech” and thus, guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution. This opened the floodgates for the kind of speech that drowns out smaller, unmegaphoned voices. Then, again, just a few months later, a federal court

---


38 The Court case was Citizens United v. F.E.C. (2010).

Cynthia McKinney, Ph.D. November 27, 2018
decision made the system even more rigged by allowing the creation of Super PACS. Super PACs can raise unlimited funds from any source and then spend those sums for independent political activity, including advocacy either for or against political candidates. According to OpenSecrets.org, as of October, 18 2018, there were over 2,200 Super PACs registered with the Federal Election Commission (FEC) reporting almost $1 billion having been raised with expenditures of under $470 million. There are over 5,000 PACs registered with the FEC. For example, according to OpenSecrets, the National Beer Wholesalers Association gave federal candidates just under $3 million in the current 2018 election cycle. Thus, money and big money are ubiquitous (and necessary?) in U.S. elections and political campaigns. Combine this with a closed-loop neoliberal economy and fewer and fewer “ordinary” Americans without billionaire backing will be able to become elected officials in the U.S.

In 1988, Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky gave us “Manufactured Consent,” describing the role of the mass media in creating beliefs that become behavior. By the same process, it is also possible to manufacture dissent. And that’s basically what politics has become today in the U.S. where the winners and losers on any given issue duke it out through their consent and dissent manufacturing processes all financed by one or two wealthy self-interested donors. The structure of the U.S. political influence system is such that the biggest players, then, are not the ones whose policy rectitude contributes to the common good . . . no! U.S. politics is now all about the money—and the more money you have, the longer you can play on the field. Unfortunately, this is true in just about every sphere of life in the U.S.: from justice (prisons have become a profit center, skewing outcomes in favor of the wealthiest) to agriculture (how else could cloned meat be deemed healthy??) to health care which is also a profit center because there’s more money in illness than in good health! It should surprise no one then that the U.S. life expectancy rate is going in the opposite of the desired direction. Under neoliberal policies, where everything becomes a profit center for those lucky enough to be winners in a dog-eat-dog environment, there is no such thing as “the common good.” In my opinion, there is no longer anything like “One Man, One Voice.” And, as a result, as it stands today, I believe it is certainly possible for one group of like-minded, extremely wealthy persons to sit in one room at one table and completely control the outcome of every election in the U.S. The U.S. currently is hardly a democracy. And this is consistent with the understanding of former President Jimmy Carter who said exactly that when he pronounced the U.S. an oligarchy. Have we already had one regime change and the people didn’t notice it? Even worse, could the

---

39 The Court case was SpeechNOW.org v. F.E.C. (2010).

40 Please see the section on Super PACs for Open Secrets located at https://www.opensecrets.org/pacs/superpacs.php accessed October 18, 2018.


42 President Carter observed on the Thom Hartmann radio show that the U.S. has violated the very essence of what made the US political system so great; that the complete subversion of that system occurs in the form of unlimited political bribery and payoffs. This interview is located at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hDsPWmioSHg accessed November 23, 2018.
U.S. regime change machinery, honed to perfection against other countries around the world, actually be put to use inside the U.S.? Could that also happen while very few notice?\footnote{President Jimmy Carter is not the only one who is publicly lamenting the shambled state of the U.S. political system and its democracy. John Whitehead of the Rutherford Institute (an organization that fights to protect the Bill of Rights) wonders if the U.S. is already a disguised dictatorship.}

**What’s Different About the 2018 Elections?**

Well, politics in the U.S. has undergone a seismic shift with the election of Donald Trump. Instead of the globalist perspective, he has repeatedly chanted, “America First, America First.” Many in the U.S. Congress claimed not to know even what that meant! Those with a “globalist” perspective were also the ones who had pursued the interminable wars. Their perspective, since 2001, had become the “new common sense” of U.S. policy. Wars against mostly Muslim-majority countries became commonplace. “Radical Islamic Terrorism” became the new excuse for erosion of civil liberties as the War on Drugs had been before September 11. Consent was manufactured; very few dissented. However, Trump’s campaign articulated everything that was wrong with the so-called Globalist point of view and Trump, the billionaire, was viewed as a Populist: thus setting the stage for a globalist rejoinder to his win. I believe that what we are seeing is the crystallization of this duality and its Public State leaders are Trump, for the Populists, and Hillary Clinton and Senator Chuck Schumer for the Globalists. In the U.S., we have long had the special interests with which to contend. Nowadays, those special interests have names: like the Koch Brothers, Sheldon Adelson, Haim Saban, Robert and Rebeka Mercer, Pierre Omidyar, and George Soros. Money has become so concentrated, mired in neoliberal capitalist wealth inequality that is not supposed to be noticed or mentioned, and now it’s time for political power to become just as concentrated.

So, the battle lines have been drawn. And because Trump told an unspoken truth during his campaign, descriptively describing the rigged system as it works against the average folks and how Washington, D.C. politics is nothing but a “swamp,” he helped to set the stage for the epic battle that has come.

But really, in my opinion, it all goes back to Drs. Scott and Turchin.\footnote{Please see my draft paper on divisions inside the U.S. Deep State, “Brett Kavanaugh Confirmation Fight: Deep State Factions On Display?” Located at https://www.academia.edu/37834159/_Ruminations_At_the_Margins_Brett_Kavanaugh_Confirmation_Fight_Deep_State_Factions_On_Display accessed November 23, 2018.} Viewed in their way, there is much more at stake than just Democrats versus Republicans winning an election. I believe the very character of the U.S. polity is at stake.

Initiated by the unexpected Trump victory, I believe now that everything is up for grabs. And in 2018, George Soros is on the playing field in a big way—in the way that he best
knows. According to Open Secrets, he has donated more than $200,000 directly to Congressional candidates in the 2018 election cycle. (In the scheme of things, that’s peanuts. However, it’s the indirect donations that are important, and the NGO support.) Here is some of what we know so far of Soros’s political financial contributions:

- A Soros-funded PAC donation of over $1.5 million to support an African-American District Attorney candidate in San Diego;
- More than $1 million to support the African American Democratic nominee for Governor of Georgia;
- More than $1 million to support the African American Democratic nominee for Governor of Florida;
- Support for Ayanna Pressley, Democratic nominee for U.S. Representative in Massachusetts who defeated incumbent Mike Capuano in the Party’s primary;
- National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL) whose members participated in the #CancelKavanaugh protests;
- ACLU, whose members participated in the #CancelKavanaugh protests;
- Human Rights Campaign, whose members participated in the #CancelKavanaugh protests;
- Planned Parenthood, whose members participated in the #CancelKavanaugh protests;
- The lawyer for Christine Blasey Ford, Kavanaugh’s accuser, is Vice Chair of a Soros-funded organization, Project On Government Oversight;\(^\text{45}\)
- The Center for Popular Democracy, a Soros-funded organization, organized opposition to Kavanaugh’s confirmation and paid bail for those arrested for disrupting the proceedings;\(^\text{46}\)
- An organization formed specifically to oppose Kavanaugh received funding from Soros–backed organizations.\(^\text{47}\)
- Media Matters for America, a $13 million dollar Soros-supported influence organization that produced a 49-page manual of strategy to defeat Donald Trump either through impeachment or at the ballot box in 2020;\(^\text{48}\)


• $133 million for Black Lives Matter and associated organizations with a significant chunk of that coming from Soros-related organizations;  

• George Soros is a contributor to a $50 million fund, created by 7–10 wealthy donors—to dig dirt on President Trump colluding with the Russians to win the 2016 election so that such an investigation can continue beyond that of Special Counsel Robert Mueller for the purpose of sharing said findings with the F.B.I.;  

• Perhaps the most damming of all possible examples of manufacturing dissent comes from the original eye witness who saw Kavanaugh protesters receiving stipends.

Perhaps the strangest twist of all for the Democrats is the number of former intelligence agents who ran for Congress in 2018 as Democrats. It seems that the Democratic Party is verily trying to live up to its label by veteran journalist and former Black Panther Party member, Glen Ford, who now runs the Black Agenda Report (BAR) news magazine, as the “more effective of two evils.” Apparently, the Democratic Party has undergone a fundamental transformation and the tell-tale sign of that is its fielding former intelligence operatives as Democratic Party candidates for Congress. James Hohmann first drew attention to the phenomenon with his October 2017 article in the Washington Post—itself owned in part by the C.I.A. Patrick Martin took the bait and delved deeper into this unprecedented “whatever-it-is.” His two-part investigation begins:

An extraordinary number of former intelligence and military operatives from the CIA, Pentagon, National Security Council and State Department are seeking nomination as Democratic candidates for Congress in the 2018 midterm elections. The potential influx of military-intelligence personnel into the legislature has no precedent in US political history.

“If the Democrats capture a majority in the House of Representatives on November 6, as widely predicted, candidates drawn from the military-intelligence apparatus will comprise as many as half of the new Democratic

---


members of Congress. They will hold the balance of power in the lower chamber of Congress."\(^53\)

In the end, in a follow-up investigation, Martin found that eleven Military/Intelligence candidates won their elections for Congress under the Democratic Party banner.\(^54\)

Bruce Dixon, BAR co-founder, writes that the Democratic Party is about to “pimp” progressive voters once again and correctly asks: “So what will we get when and if a 2018 blue wave sweeps a Democratic majority into Congress?"\(^55\)

Democrats are flush with cash, rolling in the dough, according to Bloomberg,\(^56\) who pronounces this as “uncharted territory,” when a system driven by cash has so much cash available for Democratic Party challengers to Republican and certain Democratic incumbents. The Democratic Party has become the champion for open borders, undocumented entry into the U.S., no immigration law enforcement, elimination of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and even for allowing noncitizens to come into the U.S. and vote in U.S. elections. It just seems that the Democratic Party is ideologically bankrupt and Soros ideology—along with the hefty Soros pocketbook—is just good enough for them. Add to that, the increase in the level of political violence in the U.S. with one Republican Congressman already having been shot at a friendly inter-party baseball game practice. Democratic Party leaders have already actually called for marching and bleeding, if necessary, against Trump.\(^57\)


Danny Haiphong, writing for BAR, calls it the “Deep State” takeover of the Democratic Party and asserts that the C.I.A. is “taking the American political apparatus into its own hands.” None of this should be taken lightly.

Even the President and at least one Republican Member of Congress are expressing concern about what this all means. The implications of this in terms of the integrity of the U.S. polity, like separation of powers and the checks and balances system of the U.S. government, go both wide and deep.

I believe the people of the U.S. should be asking themselves did they get what they bargained for in the 2018 elections? Or did they get more?

**Weaponizing Social Media**

While Soros might not like FaceBook and Google, the organizations he funds are ready to use social media in order to bring down the Trump Administration. Soros characterized Russia as a “mafia state” and described President Trump as “a danger to the world.” Thus, it would not be surprising that Soros-funded organizations seek to use social media to destabilize the Trump Administration. And that is exactly what is happening. A document leaked to the media written by a Soros-funded NGO has this to say about its mission:

- “Trump will be defeated either through impeachment or at the ballot box in 2020;
- The balance of power will shift back to Democrats. We will measurably impact US Senate, and State Legislative races;
- We will free ourselves from solely relying on the press. Our robust digital program will reach voters directly online.”

---


This forty-nine page “private and confidential” document goes even further and describes exactly how the Trump Administration will be brought down and the Soros-funded network of NGOs that will do the job.\(^{62}\)

Racialized election violence has long been a part of the U.S. election scene. Going forward, political and election violence in the United States should come under more intense scrutiny.

**Populism Versus Globalism: The Real Fight?**

Just as the unipolar world with the U.S. as global leader has come under attack by a resurgent multipolar thrust led by Russia, China, Brazil, India, and to a lesser degree, South Africa, the unipolar faction strikes back locally, inside each country, taking advantage of cleavages (or creating them). Thus, the struggle inside the U.S. also mirrors a global struggle for multipolarity that boils down to identity. This struggle intensified after attempts to bring Russia into the unipolar fold as a colony for the U.S. failed. Russia’s truculence set the stage for the internal U.S. dynamics at play today. GREXIT, BREXIT, ITALEAVE, PODEMOS in Spain, all were harbingers of the struggle now in the U.S. and, like them, is a reaction to grossly exacerbated income and wealth inequality in each country. The situation in the U.S. is also similar. There are clear winners and losers in neoliberal globalism—but the winners are not the average citizens. This should be seen as a struggle between the majority of average citizens of the U.S. who have been hurt by the past neoliberal policies and the minority of citizens who are neoliberalism’s winners. In other words, the 99% versus the 1%. And, without the muscle of the U.S. to push the rest of the world, the globalists’ dream will have to be deferred. Thus, the outcome of the struggle in the U.S. has implications for the global restructuring that had been underway, in terms of concentration of power (the globalists’ preference) or decentralization of power (the non-globalists’ preference).

In a review of the book, *The Internationalists*, the Rothschild-owned *The Economist* opines that “Donald Trump’s America First doctrine explicitly repudiates [liberal internationalism]” or globalism as it is called in some circles. Alarmingly, *The Economist* writes that “The liberal order of the past 70 years is under threat.”\(^{63}\) And, echoing George Soros, *The Economist* identifies Donald Trump as that threat.

---

\(^{62}\) Many social media users who support President Trump or who present inconvenient truths have found themselves locked out of their social media accounts or the account disappearance altogether! This author is locked out of her FaceBook account that has over 100,000 followers. This article lists some of the more popular pundits whose social media accounts have been deleted: Jessica McBride, “Facebook Purge’: List of Some Deleted Accounts on Left & Right,” heavy.com October 12, 2018 located at https://heavy.com/news/2018/10/facebook-purge-list-deleted-accounts/ accessed November 23, 2018.

On October 23, 2018, Trump declared himself a “nationalist” which resulted in yet another round of his condemnation by the U.S. press: with allegations that Trump was sending “dog whistles” to White Nationalists. Imagine the state of U.S. politics when a President is condemned for being pro-U.S.!64

It should come as no surprise that George Soros does not like nationalism and believes in his internationalist cause. In a January 2018 interview, he blamed Putin for the smears against him and said that he will redouble his efforts through his organizations. Quoting an interview with Financial Times (that is behind a pay wall), Business Insider writes that Soros reportedly said, “I think you can say I’m quite lucky with my enemies. It makes me feel more than ready to fight back and stand up for what is right.”65 Well, President Trump identifies them as a threat to U.S. military readiness.66 Trump supporters view them as a threat to their livelihoods and quality of life.

Hybrid Warfare

Much has been written about Hybrid Warfare. I won’t endeavor to reproduce that here because that is not my objective.67 Instead my goal was to explore whether or not hybrid warfare had been or could be deployed inside the United States, itself. Despite the U.S. being a master at this type of warfare, Dr. Hal Brands writes that the United States might not be “fully prepared” for this type of warfare. He concludes that succeeding in the “Gray Zone” of Hybrid Warfare requires more than just money and resources; he writes, “It is a matter of orienting ourselves organizationally and conceptually for the challenge.”68 That is exactly what this paper attempts to do.

Regime change without tanks is one form of hybrid warfare. It can involve states and non-state actors. It can also involve state military actors assuming the identity of a

---


66 Please see this September 2018 report, “Assessing And Strengthening the Manufacturing And Defense Industrial Base And Supply Chain Resiliency of the United States: Report to President Donald J. Trump By the Interagency Task Force In Fulfillment Of Executive Order 13806.”


non-state entity. Al Qaeda, ISIS, Daesh, Boko Haram, Al Shabab are all non-state actors created or aided by certain states to further the state’s geo-strategic or ideological objectives. Dr. Christina Lin writes about U.S. use of the White Helmets to further its regime change operations in Syria.\textsuperscript{69} Dr. Rod Thornton writes that Russia is using “non-violent asymmetric means” against NATO. He writes:

“The Russian military can and is using non-violent asymmetric means to considerable strategic advantage against NATO. They are, wherever one looks, destabilising and manipulating to good effect. Given this continuing situation and the strategic results that are patently being produced in NATO countries, why would the Russian military need to consider the conventional use of force? What utility does it have?”\textsuperscript{70}

Seems a lot more like the pot calling the kettle black, to me. The important point to make here is that regime change is a form of hybrid warfare and the easiest entry point is in destabilizing discriminated-against minority groups. This means that every state that is not a nation-state, is subject to the tactics of hybrid warfare. Defending against such tactics is a topic for another day. But in brief, it would consist of:

- Maintaining an adequate defense arsenal so that conventional and other outright conquest is avoided;
- Maintaining a worst-case-scenario means of public communication;
- Acknowledging and then resolving the grievances of disgruntled minority groups inside the country;
- Understanding modernization without Westernization and the importance of holding on to cultural roots in order to minimize cultural invasion.

As has been noted before, today’s tools for hybrid warfare can be as simple as SMS text messages on ubiquitous cell phones, the internet, smartphones, Twitter accounts, other social media accounts, cyber warfare (including trojan horse viruses and worms) and most importantly, actors willing and trained to act. Intibah Kadi explains how Western governments used social media as a Hybrid Warfare tool in Syria:

“Western governments have outlaid millions for this purpose and countless allied agencies are involved across various languages and media, from actual military personnel managing multiple fake characters to other programs targeting online socio-political activism, even to the extent of online


publications being created and “discovered” that appear as belonging to ISIS.”

I remember when a host of ISIS twitter accounts were traced back to the U.K. government that claimed that it had no control over who used its IP addresses. I was in Libya and remember when members of the “media” used their twitter accounts to relay bombing targets to the Pentagon/NATO.

Hybrid Warfare tactics can also be as convoluted as ensuring a steady supply of Chinese Uighyrs and facilitating them to make their way to Syria to fight for U.S.-backed regime change in that country. This, of course, provides a double-edged sword to the U.S. when the time comes to activate these seasoned fighters for the battle in China, their home country. The 9/11 terrorist attacks could also fall into the category of Hybrid Warfare.

With that having been said, there is not one better suited for waging Gray Zone Hybrid Warfare than George Soros. He is perhaps the most experienced; but the U.S. political system is so captured by the billionaire class, that anyone willing to spend his or her money for the task, could upend U.S. politics by implementing a slow and deliberate plan.

There is no one better suited for leading a Gray zone warfare effort than George Soros. But, George Soros is not the only one who can weigh in on this struggle and affect its outcome while the fight is being waged inside the U.S. In 2018, the United States has more billionaires than “China, Germany, and India combined.”

Conclusion

“The whole secret lies in confusing the enemy, so that he cannot fathom our real intent.”

Sun Tzu, The Art of War


In this paper, I have tried to outline some of the recent phenomena that have become more visible since the unexpected victory of Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton. I have also attempted to outline a few ways in which the U.S. political system is transforming before our very eyes, but that very few people in positions of authority are discussing. I have tried to demonstrate that the entry of George Soros in a big way into the domestic politics of the U.S. since Trump’s victory is also materially different in potential than the involvement of oligarchs who want this or that specific policy adjustment for their businesses. These policy adjustments could be small (tax breaks, for example) or huge (wars). These policy adjustments could also be ideologically driven (support for Israel, for example). These policy adjustments, generally speaking, encourage power consolidation within the existing regime. I believe that George Soros’s interventions, could, however, transform the U.S. polity—as his interventions have done or attempted to do in other countries. But transform it into what? Hence the question asked by many, does George Soros intend regime change color revolution inside the U.S.?

The current set of circumstances inside the U.S. presents distinct threats as well as opportunities for other countries. I would like to turn to this topic at another time in our discussion.

As for me, I believe the hybrid war for control of the United States has already begun.