



The consequences of losing state sovereignty for national elites

The colonization of territories from the second half of the XX century occurs in a hybrid way. Depending on the case, external interested parties or interventionists use political, economic, military or humanitarian methods. In any case, the key tool of this work is social engineering. To suppress the national state, its society is divided into three categories: the resource elite, passionaries and the passive majority. The tasks of the first category: to partially finance the processes of social recoding and in time to betray the ruling elite to intercept power. The second category is the most active. These are the main performers who fill in the influence matrix, people raised by external interested parties, ideologically prepared and directly materially motivated. The third category should remain as passive as possible. This is the task that is put to the people responsible for working with it.

The motivation of passionaries is understandable. They receive direct economic benefits from the change of power and dramatically improve their status in society. The passivity of the majority is achieved by misleading them and replacing historical as well as social codes. After the loss of sovereignty by the national state, the real living conditions of the overwhelming majority become worse. This is a natural process, because interventionists belong to any territory under their control, based on their interests. Sometimes these interests are of strategic nature, then the standard of living of the majority of the population does not fall so sharply. In those cases when the country is interesting to the colonialists as a source of raw materials, resources are pumped out of it as quickly as possible. Thus, with these two categories, everything is very clear.

Working with people with resources and influence is the most difficult for external interventionists. The subtleties of this work, is to mislead people who have much more information than the rest of society. In the case of a lack of analytical skills to predict the result of the loss of sovereignty, these people have the resources necessary to purchase the relevant experts.

The deterioration of the living conditions of the overwhelming majority of the population of the territory is an absolutely logical consequence of colonization. We see an example of this in most countries that have come under external control, such as Greece, Romania, Ukraine, and so on. Such conclusions can be made by analyzing open sources.

An unpleasant situation for external interested parties can arise if the results of their interventions for resource elites are analyzed.

After the transition of the state under the control of external interested parties, including through the illusory revolution, the national resource elites begin to lose their influence and, as a result, cease to be a conceptual authority in the state. The functions of conceptual power are transferred to the interventionist brain centers. This model is inherent in all post-socialist countries that have come under external control.

Episode 1

Take the example of Romania. The loss of critical sovereignty for this country falls at the beginning of the zero years of the XXI century. In 2002, Romania created a judicial anti-corruption presence - an analogue of the anti-corruption court. In 2005, a national anti-corruption department was created, which received wide powers. The fight against the national elite of Romania has developed exponentially. The abolition of immunity, the actual abolition of the presumption of innocence for officials and the external management of anti-corruption

bodies, clearing the local elite. On the dock were the largest businessmen of Romania, more than 10 ministers, dozens of parliamentarians, the richest Romanian oligarch - John Nikule and even ex Prime Minister Victor Ponta.

The clientele of the Social Democratic Party of Romania suffered most of all, and although it is pursuing a policy of comprehensive Euro-Atlantic integration and integration into the global economic space in its foreign policy, it nevertheless defends the principles of the welfare state and national sovereignty. i.e. stands for the support of the national manufacturer.

The analysis showed that, at the same time, a significant number of those politicians and businessmen who support foreign economic intervention in Romania in every possible way and contribute to the seizure of key positions in politics, finance and production by foreign capital aren't on the dock.

Foreign investors bear no criminal or administrative responsibility for the privatization mechanisms of enterprises in Romania, while thousands of government officials and hundreds of Romanian entrepreneurs are involved in hundreds of criminal cases initiated by the National Anti-Corruption Administration: cases of return of property privatized by foreign companies to state ownership are single.


We conclude: modern Romania is an example of neo-colonization. **And the colonial system of governance that the Western democracies have used and developed for centuries to siphon resources from the territories under their control does not imply the existence of national elites as such.**

Episode 2


Now consider the result of the neo-colonization of Ukraine, which took place in 2014, precisely from the point of view of the local elite. 2.7 times - it was in this proportion that the capital of the TOP-100 Ukrainian businessmen "sank" for 3 years from 2013 to 2016 according to Forbes magazine. The condition of the 100 richest Ukrainians in 2013 was estimated at 55.3 billion US dollars. By 2016 this amount decreased to \$ 22.2 billion. As for the 10 richest Ukrainians, their condition has decreased from 31.1 to 10.8 billion US dollars. These figures clearly show that the loss of state sovereignty adversely affects the capitals of the local resource elite. Moreover, if you look at the business structure of the 100 richest people in Ukraine, you can get even more interesting conclusions. For example, the number of people engaged in metallurgy from 2013 to 2016 decreased from 13 to 8. During the same period, the number of businessmen engaged in such knowledge-intensive business as mechanical engineering decreased twice from 6 to 3. At the same time, the number of successful businessmen who are engaged in agribusiness in the Ukrainian elite increased from 14 to 19. During the same period, more than 88 out of 186 banks were closed in Ukraine. This analysis proves that external interested parties view Ukraine exclusively as a raw materials appendage. Thus, we can conclude that the loss of national sovereignty will primarily affect businessmen who are engaged in high-tech, processing business, finance, or critical infrastructure management.

If the suppression of local elites were the main task of the interventionists, then the local oligarchs would have a chance to agree, and at least prove their effectiveness as managers. However, the interception of conceptual power (the suppression of the local) is only a tool for the main goal of any colonization, starting from ancient times, which is to get resources as cheap as

possible. Under the conditions of neocolonialization, this means a drop in the value of the enterprises of the colony-state against the USD of the FRS.



We analyzed 27 large enterprises of Ukraine for changes in revenue (in US dollars) in the period from 2013 to 2016. In 2013, the total revenue of these companies was almost 40 billion US dollars. In 2016, the figure fell to 19.8 billion US dollars. We see a twofold decrease in the revenue of the 27 largest private enterprises in Ukraine for 3 years of neo-colonization. It is interesting that the company dealing with fertilizers takes the first place in the drop in revenue, but the second and third place of the company Igor Kolomoisky (the main Ukrainian sponsor of the Maidan). His Nikopol Ferroalloy Plant and Ukraine International Airlines lost 90.1 and 88.1 percent of revenue, respectively. The situation with state-owned enterprises is even worse. Odessa Port Plany was estimated by Dmitry Firtash at 2.5 billion US dollars in 2013. In 2018, OPP and 9 more strategic enterprises, including Turboatom and Ukrspirt, were put up for privatization for 1 billion US dollars.



We conclude: the goal of external interested parties is to maximize the cost of national assets of the colonized country. Thus, the complete suppression of the national element at the level of conceptual power in the colonized territories is a side effect of the process of a higher level. Therefore, the chances of preserving their capital (influence) from the locals aren't. In this regard, remarkable relations of the Rothschild clan and President Poroshenko.

Having such examples as Romania, the Ukrainian elite, headed by which in 2014. became Petro Poroshenko (precisely as a consensus of elites), began the process of maximum resistance to external pressure on the transfer of anti-corruption bodies under external control. Moreover, Poroshenko tried to compensate for the sabotage of the so-called anti-corruption reforms by heightened aggressiveness towards Russia. This scheme suited the West during the active phase of the confrontation in 2014-2016, but the costs of maintaining the Ukrainian elite are becoming increasingly critical.

Six months after he came to power, in December 2014, Petro Poroshenko signed an agreement with RothschildTrust (Schweiz) AG about transferring to trust management of this structure his largest asset - the corporation Roshen. Thus, the Rothschilds received Poroshenko's loyalty guarantee, and he became their clientele. Soros manages to form Poroshenko-Pinchuk tandem in Ukraine, which, according to the ancient Ukrainian tradition, hate each other, and compete with each other to give the "master" the best result (which is completely satisfactory).

Through the Minister of Finance, a US citizen, Natalie Jaresko, Soros takes control of the external debt of Ukraine - the favorite method of usurers. In addition, Soros gains control of the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine, the creation of which is supervised by his personal faction in the parliament, Self Help. Valery Chaly - a person who has worked in the structures of Soros - Pinchuk for more than 10 years, becomes the deputy head of the presidential administration for international affairs. A month later, Valery Chaly moved to the US ambassador, where he was responsible for removing Donald Trump from the presidential race, by promoting the case of Manafort. At the same time, Victor Pinchuk becomes the largest foreign sponsor of the Clinton Foundation.

But the floral-bouquet period of relations between Poroshenko and Soros does not last long. In April 2016, Poroshenko was able to send Arseniy Yatsenyuk, another Rothschild protégé, resigning from the post of Prime Minister. In addition, Poroshenko sabotage the decision to create an anti-corruption court and the transfer of customs to foreign companies. In November 2016, another creature of Soros, Mikheil Saakashvili, resigns. The unexpected for many Donald Trump victory in the elections in the United States, Poroshenko makes a drastic change in their policies. He is trying in every way to enlist the support of the new owner of the White House: he buys coal from Pennsylvania, the old diesel locomotives General Electric, which causes the wrath of the Rothschild-Soros clan.

A period of pressure on Poroshenko from Soros begins: French LeFigaro accused him of corruption, Qatari AlJazeera published data about the “billions of Yanukovich” who disappeared, not without his participation, the Georgian TV channel Rustavi 2 laid out an explanatory letter allegedly written by Peter Alekseevich of the Russian FSB in 2007 when crossing the border (fake), the devastating article “Ukraine: One Step from the Kleptocracy” by Gustav Gressel, an expert of the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR), appears. ECFR is one of the most influential global structures. George Soros and his son are personally in it, being one of the key sponsors of the Council.

All Ukrainian grant eaters are connected to pressure: dozens of compromising materials are published, including Poroshenko's confidential holiday details with his family in the Maldives. The anti-corruption campaign, called upon to subordinate the court to external interested parties, is gaining momentum: protests are taking to the streets, activists occupy the square in front of the parliament, and slogans about impeachment are heard.

A remarkable fact: the Ukrainian media themselves admit that they know how the President has been flying to the Maldives for the third year. But for some reason, only three years later, in January 2018, journalists inflate a scandal from it. It's simple - because the scandal with the rest of the Maldivian Poroshenko NEEDED JUST THEN. And all the leading media involved in the promotion of the history of the Maldivian holiday Poroshenko, use the same pitch - savor the details of an elite holiday in order to ignite a simple Ukrainian envy of primitive social envy.

Information about the president's vacation was “leaked” through the Schemes program, which is a joint project of Radio Liberty and the UA: First TV channel. George Soros Open Society Institute plays a dominant role in the administration of “grant” funds that were initially managed by Central intelligence agency (CIA) before the control de facto passed to Soros after the collapse of communism in Europe.

The protests brought down the rating of the President, opened many Overton windows to criticize his course, and almost led to the loss of power. This proves that for external boarding schools neither “their own” nor “foreign” local oligarchs exist. The separation takes place on the line: an effective / inefficient manager.

Consider the results of neo-colonization for representatives of the Ukrainian resource elite.

Dmytro Firtash- a man whose fortune was estimated at 3,3 billion US dollars in 2013, after Ukraine's external control, is forced to sit under arrest in Austria. Before the escape of Yanukovych, Firtash owned: DFGGroup, the largest media holding Inter. In addition, he was the

head of the Federation of Employers of Ukraine and had a high level of influence in the state, was a major player in the gas market of the country. The sphere of his influence included such posts as the head of the Presidential Administration and the head of the Security Service of Ukraine. It was he who hosted Poroshenko and Klitschko in Austria in the spring of 2014 and agreed on the first one as a single presidential candidate. Later arrested at the request of the FBI. He lost most of his assets after 2014, and in August 2018, US Senator Vicker sent Poroshenko a letter asking him to take the latest assets from the gas distribution system from Dmitry Firtash. "The gas market in Ukraine is covered by systemic corruption, the source of which is from intermediaries controlled by Firtash. Their elimination would significantly improve the transparency of the gas market in Ukraine and bring it closer to the free market," the American legislator writes without hesitation. The irony of fate is that the dispersal of the students, which became the cause of the Maidan, was initiated precisely by Firtash's junior partner, the then head of the Presidential Administration - Sergey Levochkin.

Ihor Kolomoyskyi - co-owner of Privat Group, channel 1 + 1, the main player in the oil market of Ukraine for 10 years. For a short time after the coup of 2014, he actually became the "master" of the south-east of the country. Its assets fell from 5.3 to 1.1 billion US dollars, PrivatBank was nationalized, and the businessman lost control over its main oil asset, Ukrnafta, lives in Geneva.

Mykola Martynenko is the personification of the hardware elite in the fuel and energy sector of Ukraine since the time of Viktor Yushchenko, the main sponsor of the Popular Front Party, Arseniy Yatsenyuk (Soros). The National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine (NABU) detectives, created on the initiative of the "front-line soldiers" and the "Self-help" party (both Soros clientele), detained the oligarch in November 2015. A record number of MPs came to court, ready to bail him - more than 20 people. However, Yatsenyuk was forced to abandon his colleague by foreign curators. Mykola Martynenko passed the deputy mandate in December 2015. It is still under criminal case.

Rinat Akhmetov is the richest man in Ukraine. Its assets during the external governance of the country fell from 15.4 to 2.3 billion US dollars. The main asset - DTEK is divided by the contact line in the east of Ukraine. Rinat Akhmetov first encountered external interests in 2005, when Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko confiscated him and Viktor Pinchuk "Krivorozhstal" in favor of TNK Lakshmi Mittal. Akhmetov's direct losses then amounted to 500 million US dollars.

Vyacheslav Boguslayev is the owner of ZAO Motorsich (closed joint stock company), a strategic enterprise that provided rocket and helicopter engines for the Russian Federation, the United States and other countries. The influence of Boguslayev on Zaporizhia in the 2000s is difficult to overestimate. He was persuaded many times to go to the deputies. He could afford to fly to the parliament's meetings with his plane and in the evening to have dinner at home in Zaporizhia. At the moment, Motorsich has been bought out by the Chinese, in fact a criminal case has been opened by the SBU at the request of colleagues from the United States, who are unpleasantly surprised by the leakage of secret rocketry technologies to strategic competitors. It is symptomatic that Vyacheslav Boguslayev went on sale of ZAO Motorsich to the Chinese due to the loss of the Russian market and the lack of orders from the Ukrainian government, despite the fighting and the need for engines and helicopters. At the same time, Poroshenko signs a contract with Airbus Helicopters for the supply of 55 helicopters of 10 million US dollars each, while Motorsich helicopters for the same needs would have been 5 times cheaper.

Mykola Zlochevsky - a major Ukrainian gas producer, former Minister of Environment of Ukraine. His assets fell from 114 but that the business of Mykola Zlochevsky was unable to save even the transfer of a share in his company Burisma to the son of US Vice President Joe Biden. At the moment, Mykola Zlochevsky emigrated to Israel.

This list can be continued, it is specifically included influential people who both supported the revolution and its opponents, the results are similar for all, the conclusions are obvious. Most of the Ukrainian resource elite actually supported the transition of the country under the external control of the United States. Three years later, about half were forced to emigrate, their capital decreased by a multiple. Most of these people are under investigation, the prospects for business development are extremely small. If we compare the situation with Romania, then the redistribution of the main flows in favor of external interested parties is evident, which significantly reduces the revenue base of large business and increases the struggle between clans within the target country. The war of the clans allows the colonialists to gradually destroy them one by one and buy their assets for a pittance. An example with OPP, Ukrspirt and Turboatom is described above.

Romania and Ukraine are two different examples of neo-colonization. Romania is an example of soft colonization designed for a long-term effect, while Ukraine is a country for which the interventionists chose a short-term strategy of quick results. Despite these seemingly conceptual differences, the result of the intervention for the local resource elite is the same - gradual destruction.

From the foregoing, it can be concluded that the general line on the destruction of national resource elites, as an unnatural link in the food chain, is an integral element of the colonial policy, pursuing the maximum price reduction of national assets. For external boarding schools, there are neither "own" nor "foreign" local oligarchs. The separation takes place on the line: an effective / inefficient manager. The example of Ukraine proved that oligarchs' support for the transition to interventionists does not help them to preserve assets.

Considering that for the Western model of neocolonization there is an inherent conflict between the supranational and national elite, and the destruction of the national elite due to resource constraints, the Russian Federation, China and other countries need to offer the national elite an alternative - a continental management model that allows the elite to preserve their assets.