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Introduction

Since the 1950s nation states have been governed by [**public international law**](https://www.wisegeek.com/what-is-public-international-law.htm), framed by intergovernmental organisations, particularly the United Nations (UN) and their specialised agencies: World Health Organisation, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank.

These international laws have become the common legal language and frameworks, rules and customs that guide nation states through a number of important domains. From war to diplomacy, trade to human rights. But increasingly, world citizens are being subjected to these laws, enacted by unelected statesmen who are without recourse to the people. This shift from one distant form of centralised democracy, to an even more remote one, is worth further examination.

The World Health Organisation (WHO)

The World Health Organisation (WHO) is the embodiment of an organisation whose policy and strategy is directed by the pharmaceutical corporations it apparently regulates and not the citizens is supposedly serves.

This is unsurprising when 76% of WHO funding is from voluntary contributions. Notably: foundations and pharmaceutical corporations who wield unimaginable influence over global health policy. This cosy financing relationship between the regulator and the regulated, has resulted in one man alone, the anodyne [**Bill Gates**](https://www.bitchute.com/video/TY-vLrz9XCc/), being crowned the Tsar of international public health.

Why not?  Gates [**contributes 20%**](https://open.who.int/2018-19/contributors/contributor) of WHO funding through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance. It is no secret that money buys influence.

This corporatised takeover of global health policy bears many hallmarks of the Fabian-imagined world run by a ‘[**body of experts**](https://daddydragon.co.uk/2020/05/24/the-fabian-society-the-masters-of-subversion-unmasked/)’ (as we explored in[**Part I**](https://www.thecogent.org/post/the-rise-of-world-socialism-part-i-the-socialist-wolf-at-the-door)). Only this time, the ‘qualified rulers’ are multinational pharmaceutical corporations and billionaires, whereas the role of intergovernmental organisations like the WHO is to help Big Pharma sell patented drugs.

Not much has changed then since the days of rule by royal dynasties, where the richest and most powerful bloodlines ruled the land. The difference nowadays: the wealth of billionaires like Gates buys the necessary political influence to set public policy and agenda.

In her brilliant documentary, [***Trust WHO***](https://www.imdb.com/title/tt6818554/), filmmaker Lilian Franck reveals the unhealthy ties between the WHO and big lobbying firms.

Particularly, it was not until the late nineties that new regulations began to emerge around the dangers of smoking. This was largely down to big tobacco lobbying the WHO since the 1950s to downplay the public health risks associated with smoking. Giving rise to the iconic cigarette advertising campaigns of the eighties and the smoking epidemic that followed. Notwithstanding the dangers of smoking was long understood by health professionals, especially the WHO.

Likewise, the nuclear industry has been a strong lobbying force behind the WHO around events like Fukushima and Chernobyl, to effectively gloss-over the effects of radiation poisoning in support for the feasibility of nuclear energy.

SARS-CoV-2

To fully understand the strategy of the WHO throughout SARS-CoV-2, it is important to note the agency’s [**erroneous declaration**](https://www.health.com/condition/cold-flu-sinus/swine-flu-is-officially-a-global-pandemic-announces-who) of the Swine Flu*pandemic*in 2009. Following  unorthodox relaxing of rules around the definition of a ‘pandemic’. Specifically the criteria: ‘severity of illness’ and ‘mortality rate’.

Swine Flu brought about a new culture of disease classification where [**you could now have a pandemic with zero deaths**](https://www.forbes.com/2010/02/05/world-health-organization-swine-flu-pandemic-opinions-contributors-michael-fumento.html%236ad0430c48e8).  These amendments took place following secret deals between European governments and [**GSK**](https://www.theguardian.com/society/2010/apr/06/swine-flu-vaccine-stockpile-glaxosmithkline), Sanofi & [**Novartis**](https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-perspective/2009/09/fda-approves-four-companies-h1n1-vaccines). Resulting in a paycheque for Big Pharma in the region of [**$18 billion dollars**](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10396382) for a vaccine that was not required, for a pandemic that did not happen. Later, The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) held an [**emergency inquiry**](http://www.pharmatimes.com/news/eu_to_probe_pharma_over_false_pandemic_982876) into the “influence” exerted by drugmakers over the WHO, for a disease that it transpired [**killed between one third to one tenth the rate of seasonal flu**](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2010/01/facing-inquiry-who-strikes-back-fake-pandemic-swine-flu-criticism).

CCP Influence

In 2020 the WHO crowned China the global pacemaker for a new phenomena known as lockdowns. Unsurprising when Tedros Adhanom became the WHO’s first non-doctor Director-General, amid allegations of [**heavy lobbying by CCP diplomats**](https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-8199719/Dr-Tedros-Ghebreyesus-career-politician-running-China-centric-WHO.html). Adhanom was effectively China’s dog in the fight, despite an appalling track record on public health and human rights.

In 2017 Adhanom was [**accused**](https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/flashback-whos-tedros-was-accused-of-covering-up-cholera-outbreaks-in-ethiopia) of covering up three cholera epidemics as Ethiopian Health Minister, when he had served as a central committee member for the Tigray People’s Liberation Front — a Marxist political party accused of [**crimes against humanity**](https://www.zehabesha.com/tedros-adhanom-played-a-key-role-in-kidnapping-of-prominent-dissident-by-abebe-gellaw/).

Preceding his appointment at the WHO, Adhanom [**was Chair**](https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/news/2017-05-23-global-fund-welcomes-dr-tedros-adhanom-ghebreyesus-as-director-general-of-who/) of The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (an international financing organisation established in 2002 with seed funding from Gates BMFG). Later he served as a board member of GAVI, another BMGF public health hydra.
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Prior to 2020 the WHO’s reputation was blemished by multiple controversies, with calls from the international community to rethink global health policy and especially [**the role of the Specialised Agency of the UN**](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/politics/obamacare-trump-health-ebola-flu-pandemic-who-reforms-cancer-tb-a7622416.html).

The [***Lancet Medical Journal***](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736%2815%2900946-0/fulltext) published an independent report calling for the WHO to be stripped of its role in declaring disease outbreaks, whereas the journal *Nature* called out their poor response to the Ebola outbreak of April 2014, when it took the Agency until August of that year to declare a global emergency.

Later In 2017, the WHO were criticised for allocating[**$200 million**](https://www.nbcnews.com/health/health-news/who-spends-more-travel-aids-malaria-n762896) a year for executive travel expenses. Exceeding the Agency’s combined budget to combat AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.  Reminiscent of how the Red Cross raised half a billion dollars for Haiti, [**and built just six houses**](https://time.com/3908457/red-cross-six-homes-haiti/).

Brock Chisholm

To fully understand the role of the WHO in international public health, we must set the GPRS to 1948, and take a closer look at the WHO’s first director general, celebrated psychiatrist, Brock Chisholm, who many have accused of being a Communist.

In his famous paper, ‘[**The Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress**](https://mikemcclaughry.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/psychiatry-of-enduring-peace-and-social-progress-chisholm-and-sullivan-1946.pdf)’, Chisholm advocated for ‘the world citizen’. Believing man’s environment ‘was no longer local’. He saw the individual as a type of *neurosis*that must be treated for his*malady* and the solution was *psychiatrists*. “One or two million of them” to be specific. “Trained as salesmen to break down the doors of resistance”. Especially within the family, which according to Chisholm was a breeding ground for individualism. He therefore “induced governments to institute compulsory treatment” for this *neurosis*as with other “infectious diseases” Going on to suggest: we must “watch carefully for signs that any individuals or groups are becoming potential enemies and kill them all ruthlessly before they can become strong”.

In 1946 Chisholm presented his controversial paper at a US conference on mental health. Two years later it was published by the now prestigious magazine *Psychiatry*, by his socialist friend, [**Alger Hiss**](http://www.crossroad.to/Quotes/globalism/chisholm.htm%23poison). A senior US State Department official who was exposed as being a top Soviet agent and [**jailed for perjury**](https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/alger-hiss-convicted-of-perjury).  Remarkably, Hiss was involved in the creation of the United Nations and the WHO, acting as the UN’s presiding Secretary General and co-authoring the *UN Charter*.

United Nations Organisational Structure

[**According**](https://www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/democracy/) to the United Nations ‘democracy is core to its values’. They claim: “the UN has done more to support democracy around the world than any other global organisation,”despite there being nothing even remotely democratic about the UN’s organisational structure. UN officials are not democratically elected for and by the people, but rather, the UN is governed, in the Fabian tradition, by ‘qualified rulers’ or a ‘body of experts’. Those elected to the UN’s committees, programs, funds, conferences and specialised agencies, are *diplomats*appointed by the executive branch of national governments, and not by *citizens* of those nation states. What’s more, UN officials are protected by diplomatic immunity, meaning that they are not subject to the very laws they partake in framing. Nothing out of the ordinary then in the cosy world of politics where it’s one rule for those making the rules, another rule for everyone else.

The UN’s organisational structure is a loose association of sovereign nation-states, frequently gridlocked by the veto/unanimity principle. On the one hand, Article 2 of the UN’s Charter [**stipulates**](http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter1.shtml) that its “organisation is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members”. But on the other hand, the veto powers of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council directly contradicts that assumption. Because when that veto is used by China, France, Russia, United Kingdom or United States, it cancels the adoption of any substantive resolution, regardless of the level of international support the draft has amongst members. The game is indeed rigged from the outset.

The UN claims to have done more for human rights than any other organisation. Yet, according to Freedom House’s [**annual global analysis**](https://freedomhouse.org/article/new-members-un-human-rights-council-goes-bad-worse) of political rights and civil liberties: Of the 46 members of the UN Human Rights Council, 22 are from countries rated *Free Democracies*, 10 are from countries rated *Partly Free*, and 14 are from countries rated *Not Free*. Put into perspective: 53% of members from the world’s foremost authority on human rights, are governments of undemocratic countries.

United Nations and Eugenics

In 1994, the UN would inherit the zeal of Francis Galton’s[**eugenics**](http://exhibits.hsl.virginia.edu/eugenics/2-origins/) programs with the[**International Conference on Population and Development**](https://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/ICPD_1994.shtml). A $17 billion project to “stabilise” the world’s population. Later it was incorporated into the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

Amongst other questionable investments, the UNFPA supported a[**forced sterilisation and ethnic cleansing program in Peru**](https://newrepublic.com/article/151599/dont-talk-perus-forced-sterilizations), launched by then-President Alberto Fujimori who argued that a lower birth rate would alleviate poverty.

The consequences of Fujimori’s *poverty mitigation* efforts resulted in [**200,000**](https://www.upi.com/Defense-News/2002/07/24/Peru-apologizes-for-forced-sterilizations/80301027529085/?ur3=1) mostly poor, indigenous women, being sterilised without their consent.

The UNFPA also established ‘family planning programs’ that supported China’s brutal sterilisation agenda. Which the UNFPA claimed were “fully voluntary and non-coercive.” Despite an independent investigation by the [**Population Research Institute**](https://www.pop.org/full-report-on-unfpas-involvement-in-china/) concluding, the policies of the program included: “age requirements for pregnancy; birth permits; mandatory use of IUDs; mandatory sterilisation; crippling fines for non-compliance; imprisonment for non-compliance; destruction of homes and property for non-compliance; forced abortion and forced sterilisation.”

As of 2018, Eugenics-heir Bill Gates is [**the largest non-government**](https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/UNFPA-donor-statistics-2018.pdf) funder of the UNFPA, through the BMGF.

UN and Human Rights

The UN’s top ranks have been a breeding ground for[**unsavoury characters**](http://www.users.dircon.co.uk/~iits/newalliance/unchume.htm), especially former[**high-ranking Nazi**](https://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/14/world/europe/14iht-waldheim.3.614https%3A/www.nytimes.com/2007/06/14/world/europe/14iht-waldheim.3.6141106.html1106.html), Kurt Waldheim, who served as Director General from 1972 to 1981. Socialists and Communists at the helm of the agency have included: Swedish socialist Dag Hammarskjold, Burmese Marxist U Thant, Peruvian socialist Javier Perez deCuellar, and Egyptian socialist Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

In fact, the majority of the UN’s nine Director Generals have been socialists or communists, including the UN’s current Director General, António Guterres, former VP of the Socialist International, a worldwide group of Social Democrats (in the Fabian tradition), originally founded by communists, and once headed by Karl Marx.

Under the leadership of Guterres and his predecessor, Ban Ki-moon’, the UN moved furtively from one controversy to another.

According to a UN report obtained by [**Associated Press**](https://apnews.com/e6ebc331460345c5abd4f57d77f535c1/AP-Exclusive%3A-UN-child-sex-ring-left-victims-but-no-arrests), between 2004-2007 at least 134 Sri Lankan peacekeepers in Haiti were found guilty of exploiting children in a sex ring from 2004 to 2007. In the wake of the report, 114 peacekeepers were sent home, none were imprisoned.

In 2010, UN peacekeepers transferred from Nepal to assist with emergency rescue work in the wake of the 2010 Haitian earthquake brought with them [**the cholera epidemic**](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/dec/01/haiti-cholera-outbreak-stain-on-reputation-un-says). Killing between 10,000-30,000 people. It was not until 2016 that Ban Ki-moon officially acknowledged the responsibility of the UN, following six years of denying the agency’s culpability and maintaining complete impunity from any claims of compensation from the families of the deceased. In 2017, fourteen [**UN human rights experts**](https://haitiantimes.com/2020/07/11/human-rights-experts-still-dissatisfied-with-un-cholera-response-in-haiti/) put out a joint statement, slamming the UN’s coverup, directly accusing Ban Ki-moons’ successor, Guterres of [**gross violations of his obligations**](http://hrp.law.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/HLS-IHRC-IJDH-BAI-Submission-to-Special-Procedures_Cholera.pdf) to remedy the crisis through adequate UN funding and compensation.

In 2016, following significant pressure from the international community, Guterres published an [**annual review**](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=56322%23.WNVOLfmLSUl) of the UN’s Peacekeeping Forces that revealed 145 incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse in 2016 alone. Troops and diplomats were implicated across all UN peacekeeping missions in cases involving 311 victims, which the UN admitted “was merely the tip of the iceberg”.

The scandal broke after repeated attempts by Guterres to cover-up the endemic rape of children by UN peacekeepers in Africa. The [**Independent**](https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/united-nations-soldiers-paedophilia-un-child-rape-ngo-staff-a7648791.html) revealed 2,000 paedophiles were working for the UN, many in positions of authority and operating with diplomatic immunity. Later, the[**UN whistleblower**](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jun/07/child-sex-abuse-whistleblower-resigns-from-un) who had exposed the scandal quit his post in protest over what he claimed was “an institutional coverup” that provided  “complete impunity” for the diplomats and peacekeeping forces responsible. With rare exceptions, the names of those found guilty have been kept confidential, making accountability and indeed justice for the victims impossible.

Guterres, a lifetime socialist and globalist, has been a leading voice throughout COVID-19, repeatedly [**calling**](https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2020/07/02/u-n-chief-guterres-renews-call-for-more-global-governance-bureaucratic-regulation/) for  “more robust global governance” bt imploring the World Bank, IMF and EU to bring about “order” to a future world disrupted by coronavirus.

Another VP of the communist-rooted Socialist International is Gro Harlem Brundtland who served as Director-General of the World Health Organization (1998-2003) and [**UN Special Envoy on Climate Change**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_Special_Envoy_on_Climate_Change) (2007-2010).

In 1987, Brundtland chaired a pivotal report of the UN’s World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), called [***Our Common Future***](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/5987our-common-future.pdf) (also known as The Brundtland Report), considered by many to be the seminal paper for sustainable development that introduced the world to the global warming doomsday scenario.

An important contributor to the report was a lesser known but hugely influential public figure called Maurice Strong. The report revealed some uncomfortable truths at the heart of climate change policy:

Traditional forms of national sovereignty raise particular problems in managing the global commons and their shared ecosystems…In many parts of the world, the population is growing at rates that cannot be sustained by available environmental resources….Urgent steps are needed to limit extreme rates of population growth.

UN on Climate Change

The UN’s programs on climate change, or more precisely: the multi-billion dollar environmental industrial complex has been paving the way for pro-world taxation, resource inventorying & consolidation and one world governance since the 1970s.

As a doomsday scenario, climate change pulls emotively on the same heartstrings as COVID-19, with its apocalyptic vision of a world citizen crying out for change and institutional giant strides towards global governance.

Climate change leverages the Fabian-envisaged ‘body of experts’. In this instance, environmental scientists and UN policy makers guide national policies towards the implementation of Agenda 21 and the SDGs of Agenda 2030, while noble custodians of the planet – environmental activists – steer civil society towards the same destination. This process of using the scientific community and weaponising the left, first conceived by the Fabians and mastered through climate change, is now perfected to a fine art with COVID-19.

This is unsurprising when the same principle actors have been at the helm of both doomsday mechanisms, including Brundtland who has been a leading pundit throughout COVID. He has been [**calling for**](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/jun/04/world-leaders-fund-covid-19-vaccine-global-vaccine-summit) an unprecedented scale of partnership between governments, businesses, intergovernmental organisations, nonprofits, scientists and researchers (otherwise known as one world government). According to Brundtland, all must come together to coordinate the critically important global vaccination program. Which, for the layperson, means *mandatory*.

In a world marred by inequalities, extreme poverty, social injustice and the corporatised theft of the world’s resources, the sweeping momentum of environmentalism is largely down to its cachet with those on *the left,*predisposed towards humanitarian causes, even in their anthropomorphic sense, where environmentalism has become the asthenic cousin of humanitarianism.

Climate change provides a hobby and mantra to grassroots activists who would otherwise present a legitimate threat to the machinations of the state. Instead, they join the ranks of [**co-opted**](https://off-guardian.org/2020/06/26/the-co-opting-of-activism-by-the-state/) movements like [**Extinction Rebellion**](http://symbioticculture.co.uk/index.php/2020/06/05/the-devil-is-in-the-details-a-closer-look-at-extinction-rebellion/), unaware they are doing the unofficial bidding for a global elite as ‘aggressive salesmen’ knocking down doors in the Brock Chisholm tradition, peddling privations and collectivism.

Given the scientific consensus of this looming environmental catastrophe, it would be wise to examine the origins of the theory of climate change, and take a closer look at the principal players who put this important agenda at the heart of *global sustainable development*.

Maurice Strong

The man who put the UN into the climate change business and pioneered the theory of sustainable development, is a lesser-known billionaire oil tycoon and self-confessed socialist, [**Maurice Strong**](http://www.mauricestrong.net/2008072115/strong-biography.html).

Strong spent decades ascending to the highest ranks of the UN, standing at the right hand of the agency’s Directors General, and serving as the founding director of the U.N. Environment Program (UNEP) that produced Agenda 21. Strong was the founder of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). He organised the Rio Earth Summit, which paved the way for the Kyoto Protocol and later the Paris Agreement. Strong was also co-Chairman of the World Economic Forum, mentor to Klaus Schwab, and member of the influential think tank, The Club of Rome.

Even by the most credulous of estimations, Strong’s role as climate doomsayer presented a serious conflict of interest when his[**shady business dealings**](https://quadrant.org.au/opinion/doomed-planet/2015/12/discovering-maurice-strong/) in the oil industry and personal track record on conservation directly contradicted the very values which he helped popularise, On the one hand, Strong presided over the UN’s global affairs on climate from 1962 to 2005. On the other, he was one of the wealthiest men in the world, having amassed billions of dollars from the oil industry.

While many questioned why an oilman would be unofficially elected as the custodian of the environment, Strong enjoyed the full endorsement of his cronies at the UN, despite one of his companies, Desarrollos Ecologicos, building an illegal $35 million luxury hotel within the Gandoca-Manzanillo Wildlife Refuge in Costa Rica (an important conservation area where development is restricted unless it has the approval of the Kekoldi Indian Association). Naturally, Strong was above the very laws he helped popularise on conservation and proceeded with his development without the necessary permits.

In 1992 as the Cold War drew to a close, Strong organised the UN’s seminal event on climate: the Rio Earth Summit. The event enshrined what would become the climate change agenda through the groundbreaking action plan: Agenda 21, which called for a greater level of international cooperation on issues relating to sustainability between UN member states in the wake of the Cold War.  At the Rio Earth Summit, Strong revealed some of the agenda at the heart of climate change policy:

We may get to the point where the only way of saving the world will be for industrialised civilisation to collapse.

Another high-profile speaker at the Rio conference was US State Department rep, Richard Benedick, who negotiated the Ozone Accord for the United States. At the conference, Benedick ambiguously [**declared**](http://www.warwickhughes.com/icecore/zjmar07.pdf):
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A global warming treaty (Kyoto) must be implemented even if there is no scientific evidence to back the (enhanced) greenhouse effect.

Also speaking at the Rio Conference was Senator Timothy Wirth, undersecretary of State for Global Affairs in the Clinton-Gore administration, who [**stated**](https://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2013/01/22/the-u-n-s-global-warming-war-on-capitalism-an-important-history-lesson-2/%237f56d69429be):

We have got to ride the global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic policy and environmental policy.

Wirth collaborated with Al Gore to organise the Science, Technology and Space Committee hearings, which put global warming at the heart of US foreign policy. The hearing took place during an unusually hot summer in 1988, and in an [**interview with PBS Frontline**](https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/hotpolitics/interviews/wirth.html), Senator Wirth, reflected:

We called the Weather Bureau and found out what was historically the hottest day of the summer…so we scheduled the hearing that day, and bingo, it was the hottest day on record in Washington, or close to it…we went in the night before and opened all the windows so that the air conditioning wasn’t working inside the room.

The last leader of the Soviet Union, Michail Gorbachov, was inspired by the Rio Earth Summit to establish the Green Cross International.  Let’s put this into perspective: Gorbachev – who fought his way up the ranks of the Soviet Communist Party, became the protege of Yuri Andropov, head of the KGB, before becoming the supreme leader of world communism – upon seeing that communism had reached the end of its journey, adopted climate change as the vehicle to construct his vision of a new world order from the ashes of global warming, despite Gorbachev never expressing any concern for the environment throughout his political career.

In 1992 Gorbachev made a speech at Westminster College, [**declaring**](http://www.speeches-usa.com/Transcripts/mikhail_gorbachev-westminster.html)

The new world order will not be fully realised unless the United Nations and its Security Council create structures, which are authorised to impose sanctions and make use of other measures of compulsion.

Later in 1996 Gorbachev admitted the arcane agenda at the heart of climate change policy, when he [**emphasised**](https://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2013/02/05/in-their-own-words-climate-alarmists-debunk-their-science/%23%3A~%3Atext%3DIn%25201996%252C%2520former%2520Soviet%2520Union%2Cunlock%2520the%2520New%2520World%2520Order.%25E2%2580%259D) how important climate alarmism would be to the advancement of Marxist objectives:

The threat of (an) environmental crisis will be the international disaster key to unlock the New World Order.

Over the years, a number of high-profile climate scaremongers have joined Gorbachev in unwittingly revealing the socialist-totalitarian agenda central to global sustainable development, including Canadian Minister of the Environment, Christine Stewart, who in 1998 [**told reporters**](https://www.aei.org/carpe-diem/quotations-of-the-day-from-friends-of-science/) from the *Calgary Herald*,

No matter if the science of global warming is all phoney…climate change provides the greatest opportunity to bring about justice and equality in the world.

In 2010, Ottmar Edenhofer, co-chair the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), put it bluntly when he [**said**](https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/another-climate-alarmist-admits-real-motive-behind-warming-scare/):

One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with the environmental policy anymore. Instead, climate change policy is about how we redistribute de facto the world’s wealth

Influential think tank, The Club of Rome, which counted Maurice Strong amongst its membership ranks weighed in on the globalist agenda at the heart of climate change in their 1991 book,[***The First Global Revolution***](https://www.amazon.com/First-Global-Revolution-Report-Council/dp/0679738258):

The common enemy of humanity is man. In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill…All these dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behaviour that they can be overcome. The real enemy then, is humanity itself.

While members of the Club of Rome, Maurice Strong and Mikhail Gorbachev authored the[**The Earth Charter**](https://earthcharter.org/about-us/), a declaration of fundamental values and principles towards global interdependence and collectivist ideology. Written by elites, in the Fabian tradition, and endorsed by multinational corporations supposedly representing the interests of billions of people globally, the Charter presents environmentalism as a new world religion. Or as Maurice Strong evangelically puts it:

The real goal of the Earth Charter is that it will in fact become like the Ten Commandments.

Another key to understanding climate change is a widely circulated publication distributed at the [**First Earth Day**](https://www.earthday.org/history/?gclid=Cj0KCQjwp4j6BRCRARIsAGq4yMGe1WEL2UC9DF9T81A2I6BJYlI15ear_In78FAX4Y7QayZSq9icMf4aApwvEALw_wcB), entitled [***The Environmental Handbook*.**](https://www.amazon.com/Environmental-Handbook-Garrett-Bell/dp/0345018923) A contributor to the book was Princeton University Professor, Richard A. Falk, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) who discusses the four interconnected threats to the planet, as:

Wars of mass destruction, overpopulation, pollution, and the depletion of resources.

Falk goes on to espouse his authoritarian ideology:

The basis of all four problems is the inadequacy of sovereign states to manage the affairs of mankind in the twentieth century.

Later in*The Environmental Handbook*, the CFR continued the globalist-authoritarian rhetoric with the question:

Are nation states manageable now that they have the power to destroy each other in a single afternoon?…What price would most people be willing to pay for a more durable kind of human organisation – more taxes, giving up national flags, perhaps the sacrifice of some of our freedoms?

Are you beginning to connect the dots between climate change, the wholesale theft of our rights and freedoms, population control and one world government?

During times of war (or the threat of war), populations become more compliant with the terms of their bondage, submitting to greater levels of austerity as indentured servants of the state war effort. War has historically ushered in seismic transformation that is favourable only to those in power. One of the first casualties of war is civil liberties and human rights. But war is costly, depleting natural resources and exposing the snakes in the long grass. An alternative for war is, therefore, preferential; it has long been understood that environmentalism presents a legitimate alternative.

This idea is best illustrated in the words of Fabian socialist, Bertrand Russell, who confirms his support for one world government and population control, in his book, [***The Impact of Science on Society***](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=AEr7CwAAQBAJ&pg=PT65&lpg=PT65&dq=I+do+not+pretend+that+birth+control+is+the+only+way+in+which+population+can+be+kept+from+increasing.+There+are+others,+which,+one+must+suppose,+opponents+of+birth+control+would+prefer.+War,+as+I+remarked+a+moment+ago,+has+hitherto+been+disappointing+in+this+respect,+but+perhaps+bacteriological+war+may+prove+more+effective.++If+a+Black+Death+could+be+spread+throughout+the+world+once+in+every+generation+survivors+could+procreate+freely+without+making+the+world+too+full.+There+would+be+nothing+in+this+to+offend+the+consciences+of+the+devout+or+to+restrain+the+ambitions+of+nationalists.++The+state+of+affairs+might+be+somewhat+unpleasant,+but+what+of+that?+Really+high-minded+people+are+indifferent+to+happiness,+especially+other+people%25E2%2580%2599s.+However,+I+am+wandering+from+the+question+of+stability,+to+which+I+must+return.++There+are+three+ways+of+securing+a+society+that+shall+be+stable+as+regards+population.+The+first+is+that+of+birth+control,+the+second+that+of+infanticide+or+really+destructive+wars,+and+the+third+that+of+general+misery+except+for+a+powerful+minority.++All+these+methods+have+been+practiced:+the+first,+for+example,+by+the+Australian+aborigines;+the+second+by+the+Aztecs,+the+Spartans,+and+the+rulers+of+Plato%25E2%2580%2599s+Republic;+the+third+in+the+world+as+some+Western+internationalists+hope+to+make+it+and+in+Soviet+Russia+%25E2%2580%25A6++Of+these+three,+only+birth+control+avoids+extreme+cruelty+and+unhappiness+for+the+majority+of+human+beings.+Meanwhile,+so+long+as+there+is+not+a+single+world+government+there+will+be+competition+for+power+among+the+different+nations.++And+as+increase+of+population+brings+the+threat+of+famine,+national+power+will+become+more+and+more+obviously+the+only+way+of+avoiding+starvation.+There+will+therefore+be+blocs+in+which+the+hungry+nations+band+together+against+those+that+are+well+fed.+That+is+the+explanation+of+the+victory+of+communism+in+China.&source=bl&ots=occJWtM6Al&sig=ACfU3U22rhiXo-wJSjK7lIlxZK8k2UdXKQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ah)*.*

****

[**Libertarian Clothing for Men and Women**](https://libertasbella.com/collections/murray-rothbard)

Do not pretend that birth control is the only way in which population can be kept from increasing…War has hitherto been disappointing in this respect, but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective…If a Black Death could be spread throughout the world once in every generation survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full…Birth control avoids extreme cruelty and unhappiness for the majority of human beings…Meanwhile, so long as there is not a single world government there will be competition for power among the different nations…The need for a world government, if the population problem is to be solved in any humane manner, is completely evident on Darwinian principles.

Another climate alarmist that succinctly revealed the socialist agenda at the heart of global sustainable development was the **[Worldwatch Institute](http://www.earth-policy.org/about_epi/C32)**, an environmental research organisation established by celebrated analyst Lester Brown with support from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. In 2006, the institute published its doomsday book [***State of the World***](https://www.amazon.com/State-World-2006-Worldwatch-Institute/dp/039332771X), which suggested:

The battle to save the planet, will replace the battle over ideology as the organising theme of the new world order.

In support of unlocking the ideological potential of climate change, in 2015, Costa Rican Marxist, Christiana Figueres, Executive Secretary of the [**UN Framework Convention on Climate Change**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UN_Framework_Convention_on_Climate_Change) (UNFCCC) weighed in on the transformative potential of environmental catastrophe:

This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the Industrial Revolution.

Does any of this sound familiar to [**the words**](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/06/now-is-the-time-for-a-great-reset/) of Klaus Schwab of the World Economic Forum, who in the tradition of Lester Brown and Christina Figueres, has been calling for a Great Reset as part of the ‘battle to save humanity’ in the post-COVID era?

In support of this rhetoric, in his 2000 autobiography *Where Are We Going?* The original climate doomsayer, Maurice Strong, predicted:

By 2031 two thirds of the world’s population could be wiped out…It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation states, however powerful.

Strong’s cousin,[**Anna Louise Strong**](https://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/2020/03/chairman-maos-american-red-guard-remembered-lloyd-billingsley/) was a passionate supporter of Lenin and Stalin, and later formed a close bond with[**Chairman Mao**](https://www.heritage.org/asia/commentary/the-legacy-mao-zedong-mass-murder). As a journalist living in China, she sent her pretty snapshots of Mao’s functioning communist utopia back to the US in iconic propagandised magazine editorials.

Having always had great admiration for socialism and Chairman Mao, Maurice Strong later relocated to China to live out his own final years. This followed an investigation by federal agents in the US who sought charges of fraud against Strong for receiving $1 million in bribes in the[**oil for food crisis**](https://www.foxnews.com/story/at-the-united-nations-the-curious-career-of-maurice-strong) during the Iraq war.

Now, let’s follow the money

It is relatively easy to purchase enough power and influence to control the ideological landscape and indeed scientific consensus. Bill Gates is a prime example of a billionaire monopolising global health policy according to his own myopic vision. If globalists with significant vested interest in bringing about world interdependence can influence government policy makers, the leveraged buy-out of scientific consensus by comparison is child’s play.

Why not? Scientists are paid handsomely for their contribution to the climate agenda. Whereas those putting their head above the parapet are branded shills for the oil and gas industry, or worse, conspiracy theorists. Overall, scientists and academics not singing from the same recycled hymn sheet lose their funding and can be blacklisted professionally, as we have [**seen throughout SARS-CoV-2.**](https://www.irishtimes.com/news/ireland/irish-news/ucd-professor-asked-to-resign-from-eu-committee-over-covid-19-claims-1.4277698)

And it’s not just scientists and academics who are unwittingly duped into propping up the deception. The media plays an important role ([**all six of them**](https://gbhsasmaxd.blogspot.com/2016/01/what-is-institution.html)), along with pundits, influencers and [**celebrities**](https://www.leonardodicaprio.org/projects/climate-change/). Each are looking to maintain their own special interests, status and reputation by repeating the narrative inside the institutional echo chamber of populism. Until populism ushers in the post-truth era and consensus and conformity replaces the epistemology of truth.

According to the [**US Government Accountability Office**](https://www.gao.gov/key_issues/climate_change_funding_management/issue_summary):

Federal funding for climate change research, technology and adaptation increased from $2.4 billion in 1993 to $11.6 billion in 2014. With an additional $26.1 billion for climate change programs and activities provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in 2009. This does not take into account [**tax subsidies**](https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/follow-the-climate-change-money) providing a further 30% tax credit for wind and solar, adding an additional $8 – $10 billion a year.

A few years ago, *Forbes* magazine analysed the US Federal budget and  estimated $150 billion was being spent on climate change and green energy subsidies, and that’s during President Obama’s first term, alone. Indeed, climate change has become a multi-billion dollar industry.

According to influential think tank, [**The Climate Policy Initiative**](https://www.climatepolicyinitiative.org/press-release/climate-change-investment-totals-usd-359-billion-worldwide/):

Global investment in climate change plateaued at USD $359 billion in 2012.

Much of this funding goes to environmental scientists, now generously incentivised with significant vested interest to push the climate agenda, or lose their sources of government funding.

Again under Obama, [**The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act on the Clean Energy Transformation**](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2010/04/21/impact-american-recovery-and-reinvestment-act-clean-energy-transformation) invested $90 billion of government investments and tax incentives to lay the foundation for the clean energy economy in 2009, creating “more than 80,000 clean energy jobs in the first quarter of 2010.”

Let that sink in – an entire cottage industry of scientists, professionally employed and bankrolled with grants and funding from the federal government, with no choice but to write pro-climate change papers, in order to unlock the next round of funding.

This art of buying consensus was perfected during the creation of the Federal Reserve Bank at the turn of the century. The Fed was America’s fifth attempt at introducing a Central Bank, after four catastrophic failures, that caused the boom and bust cycles that perpetually robbed US citizens of their wealth, transferred common assets to Wall Street bankers through the hidden tax of inflation, while depreciating the money supply by up to1000%. Until the American people were, to put it mildly, distrustful of yet another Central Bank.

In order to sidestep this mistrust, a cartel of Wall Street bankers, including Rockefeller and JP Morgan, financed universities and recruited some of the most influential economics academics of the day to publish papers and newspaper articles extolling the virtues of the Fed.  The architects – including Warburg, Rockefeller and JP Morgan – bought up vast swatches of US media, beginning the process of media conglomeration in the US, in order to control the ideological narrative, until the perception of the American people was transformed and Congress ratified the Federal Reserve Act. Some years later, the great Depression struck as a result of the monetary policies of the new central bank.

Government versus Voluntary Associations

Intergovernmental organisations are in natural conflict with the cooperative and self-organising nature of humanity, who organise according to bottom up, rather than top down structures, contrary to what we have been led to believe.

The free market ensures the means of production; and the more incentivised the workforce, the more creative and productive its output. In practice, the government is an extraneous player in this process, with the exception of arbitrary laws, regulations, taxes and the setting of minimum wage; standards that would be arrived at anyway through voluntary association and indeed common sense. The market regulates itself after all.

The greatest advancements driving us from cave to cyberspace are a result of the ingenuity of individuals and groups, thinking outside of the box, whose enterprise runs contrary to consensus and convention. The advancements of technology, science and philosophy are made possible by individuals thinking freely, as expressions of the free market, provided they can circumvent state stranglehold and cross the Rubicon from consensus to innovation and productivity.

On the contrary, governments are inherently interested in their own conservation, and are in natural conflict with the emergent nature of humanity. Despite government institutions claiming to be the defender of individual freedom, the very opposite is in fact true: governments are driven by self-interest. As a means to consolidating more power and control, government leverages doomsday scenarios such as climate change, terrorism and a pandemic as the means to justify their position and consolidate their reputation as the defender of individual freedom and security. At the same time, the emergency model licenses the state to bring about systemic change, hidden within the Trojan Horse of disaster planning. For example, the Patriot Act was ratified in the wake of 9/11 to ostensibly protect US citizens from terrorism, but in reality it became the first of many fundamental changes to US constitutional law that would enable the US government to spy on ordinary Americans.

The UN was founded by one world socialists in the Fabian tradition, and since its inception has been meddling in the affairs of nation states, breaking down national borders, and guiding world citizens towards collectivist ideology under the equitable global village model.  Meanwhile, specialised agencies of the UN, including the IMF and World Bank, arcanely redistribute the wealth of industrialised nations into developing countries, because striking this economic balance between nations provides the necessary framework for the emergence of one world government, as we shall explore in part III.