

# NATO 2030: Global Domination or Bust

## [NATO 2030: Global Domination or Bust](#)

by [James Corbett](#), [The Corbett Report](#)

June 27, 2020

It's like something out of a comic book.

*Speaking from his billion-dollar headquarter fortress, the Overlord of the dreaded military alliance, S.N.A.K.E. (Supreme Nasty Alliance for Killing Everyone) delivered his starkest threat yet, declaring a "S.N.A.K.E. 2030" vision that would see the organization ruling supreme over the planet in the next 10 years. "All challengers will be destroyed!" he brayed over the video uplink as the world cowered in terror.*

If this were a comic book story, this is the point where the valiant fighters of the F.R.E.E.D.O.M. Alliance would swoop in and capture the Overlord, defeating his robot army in the process.

Sadly, this is not a comic book story, it's a very real one; and we're not dealing with S.N.A.K.E. but NATO, a very non-fictional military alliance that has just put forward its vision for NATO 2030—a vision that threatens to realize NATO's quest for total global domination.

So let's roll up our sleeves and go over the details, shall we?

The venue for the declaration of this NATO 2030 manifesto was, unsurprisingly, an Atlantic Council-hosted virtual event. Speaking via video uplink from NATO's new [billion-dollar headquarters](#), NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg [unveiled](#)

[his outline](#) for strengthening the military alliance over the next decade, an agenda which he is rather unimaginatively calling “[NATO 2030](#).” (Hmmm . . . [The 2030 Agenda](#). [China 2030](#). [Saudi Vision 2030](#). It’s almost like they’re telling us something . . .).

You can [watch the full presentation for yourself](#) or [read the official account](#) on the Atlantic Council’s website . . . but if you follow global geopolitics, you already know what Stoltenberg said. Not because you heard about the speech, necessarily, but because these types of speeches are so boringly predictable.

Suffice it to say, Stoltenberg used the opportunity to identify his alliance’s new arch-enemy, the dastardly fiends who will provide the justification for NATO’s grand project of global domination in the coming decade. And you’ll NEVER GUESS who that bogeyman is!

. . . Oh, wait. You totally will. [It’s the Chinese](#). But yeah, you already knew that, didn’t you? In fact, you could play globalist BINGO with the key words from his speech and everyone’s card would be completely full within five minutes.

Yes, apparently “The rise of China is fundamentally shifting the global balance of power” and, in order to counter Beijing’s “bullying and coercion,” the alliance needs to take a “more global approach.” Blah blah blah “security consequences” yadda yadda yadda “missiles that can reach NATO-allied countries” something something “freedom, democracy and the rule of law.” You know, the usual.

Still, as predictable as Stoltenberg’s “grand vision” is, it should not be dismissed lightly. We all [know by now](#) that the wildly misnamed “North Atlantic” Treaty Organization has spread, via its “[partnerships](#)” with various countries, to every corner of the globe. And we have even seen how NATO’s operational domain has been [expanded to include outer space](#).

So it should come as absolutely no surprise that Stoltenberg is now firming up this globalist agenda by attempting to draw Australia, Japan, New Zealand, South Korea and other “like-minded countries” into a closer relationship with the alliance.

One ominous sign of this expanded global NATO vision comes in the form of the the North Atlantic Council’s recent [decision](#) to recognize Ukraine as an “Enhanced Opportunities Partner.” While the material benefits of such a designation are dubious at best—Ukrainians can now enjoy “enhanced access to [NATO] interoperability programmes and exercises”—the real meaning behind this move is not difficult to discern. The drawing of Ukraine into NATO has been the ultimate goal of the western warmongers since the fall of the Soviet Union, broken promises about “[not one inch eastward](#)” notwithstanding. With the Ukrainian feather in NATO’s cap, the alliance will be right on the doorstep of former arch-enemy (and still high-ranking enemy) Russia.

Now, by specifically citing China as a rising threat to world order and by calling on South Korea by name to expand its cooperation with the alliance, NATO is attempting to plant a flag on the doorstep of President Xi as well.

It is not difficult to see where the push behind this agenda is coming from. As Brian Cloughley points out in his [recent article](#) on the subject:

*In May 2020 members of the US Senate Armed Services Committee proposed a multibillion dollar “Pacific Deterrence Initiative” intended to expand US military deployment in Asia and “send a strong signal to the Chinese Communist Party that the American people are committed to defending US interests in the Indo-Pacific.” Then in early June Senator Tom Cotton (he who wishes to use armed soldiers to put down protestors in his own country) introduced legislation titled “Forging Operational Resistance to Chinese Expansion (FORCE)” with a*

*multi-billion dollar price tag. It is intended to “help thwart the Chinese Communist Party’s main geopolitical aim [of] pushing the United States out of the Western Pacific [and] achieving cross-strait unification with Taiwan via military force.”*

(FORCE? Really? Yet another sign that we’re living in comic book land.)

But even as Stoltenberg starts to ramp up his Evil Overlord rhetoric and begin beating the war drum for the next “Great War” with the dastardly ChiComs, signs are emerging that things are not all peachy keen in NATO-land.

Take the latest developments in NATO-ravaged Libya, for example. Historical enemies Greece and Turkey have become embroiled in a spat over the question of who is the rightful government of Libya. The quarrel goes back to late last year when Turkey [inked a maritime accord](#) with Libya’s Muslim Brotherhood’s so-called “Government of National Accords” (GNA) that gives Ankara nominal control over parts of the Mediterranean currently falling in Greece and Cyprus’ Exclusive Economic Zone. The deal is, unsurprisingly, not recognized by the Greeks and the Cypriots, who insist that the Tobruk-based House of Representatives represents the real government of Libya.

Normally, such a dispute between Turkey and Greece would be just another Tuesday, i.e., a routine disagreement between historical enemies. But here’s the rub: Both countries are NATO members. This means there is a [rift in the alliance](#), and that rift is expanding.

France, after having its own naval vessel [attacked by Turkish frigates](#) in a brazen NATO-on-NATO skirmish, has issued its own stark rebuke of its erstwhile NATO “ally”: “We cannot accept that an ally behaves this way, that it does this against a NATO ship, under NATO command, carrying out a NATO mission.”

And, even if NATO's Turkey problem is resolved in time for the implementation of its 2030 plan, it still faces an even greater problem: that of American recalcitrance. [The Great Withdrawal](#) that we noted last week is not lost on the alliance, after all, especially when it means America is unilaterally signing deals with the Taliban to begin winding down its operations in NATO-ravaged Afghanistan. And, even more unthinkably, the US has recently surprised everyone with its plans to withdraw troops from NATO ally Germany.

Trump's campaign blather about "draining the swamp" and pulling the plug on the NATO alliance was, of course, just that: campaign blather. But the reality behind those statements—the increased American push to get its fellow NATO allies to pay "their fair share" for the alliance's upkeep—is not necessarily any better for the NATO planners. They can hardly go about realizing their grandiose global vision for 2030 when their main ally keeps threatening to withdraw its support.

Of course, none of this is meant to get anyone to shed any tears over the poor state of the NATO alliance, nor is it meant to give succor to those who hold China or Russia up as pure innocents on the global stage who only deliver freedom, sunshine and rainbows to people around the world (not to mention their own heavily surveilled and controlled populations at home). No, unlike the comic books, there are no good guys to root for in this Great Powers conflict because, as I've [pointed out before](#), WWII is really a struggle between the powers-that-shouldn't-be and the mass of humanity.

But make no mistake: The "NATO 2030" vision of Overlord Stoltenberg and his string-pullers is no empty rhetoric. They certainly do intend to drive ahead with this agenda for global domination, consequences be damned. And if those consequences happen to be military conflict between military superpowers, so much the better for those who seek to bring order out of chaos.

Consider this fair warning: NATO has put the world on notice that there will be no peace until they consolidate total global control. But then again, peace has never been part of the agenda, 2030 or otherwise.