

11.22.2022 SHOW NOTES;

ESG, AGENDA 20-WHATEVER, THE JABS AND THE NOW

EPOCH TIMES

Federal Agencies Become ESG Activists

Biden's 'whole-of-government' plan to enact an environmentalist agenda

By Kevin Stocklin, November 7, 2022 Updated: November 15, 2022

News Analysis

House Republicans produced a [1,000-page report](#) on Nov. 4 that details how the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the FBI have shifted their focus toward targeting conservative Americans who protest at abortion clinics and parents who protest at school board meetings.

But the politicization of federal law enforcement is just the tip of the iceberg.

Since Joe Biden assumed the presidency nearly two years ago, his administration has been relentless in redirecting virtually every federal agency toward activism for “climate and social justice” and aligning the federal government in lockstep with the corporate environmental, social, and governance ([ESG](#)) movement.

Among his first actions, in January 2021, Biden issued his [“Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity,”](#) which set out “an ambitious whole-of-government equity agenda.” He [appointed](#) Susan Rice to lead his Domestic Policy Council and to “coordinate efforts to embed equity principles, policies, and approaches across the Federal Government.” This effort diverted federal agencies from their designated function and, in some cases, even pushed them to take action outside their legal authority.

Fed, Treasury Prioritize Climate Change, Racial Equity

Under this new regime, even the most technocratic U.S. agencies, such as the Federal Reserve, have taken up the ESG cause. Tasked with the responsibility of fighting inflation and keeping unemployment low, the Fed is also one of America’s key bank regulators, with a mandate to ensure that our financial system is secure and robust. However, in the midst of record inflation and a deepening recession,

the Fed under the Biden administration has taken on environmental and racial causes.

In November 2021, for example, the Fed [declared its support](#) for the Glasgow Network of Central Banks and Supervisors for Greening the Financial System (NGFS), stating that “the Federal Reserve is committed to working within our existing mandates and authorities to address the implications of climate change, particularly the regulation and supervision of financial institutions.” In support of racial ideology, the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco [declared](#) that “racial equity is central to the SF Fed’s mission.”

That prompted Sen. Pat Toomey (R-Pa.), the ranking Republican on the Senate Banking Committee, to [notify](#) Fed officials that their focus on “politically charged social causes” was “wholly unrelated to the Federal Reserve’s statutory mandate.” Critics of the Fed’s effort to promote racial equity charge that this led the Fed to keep money too cheap for too long, leading to rampant inflation that has ultimately hurt the poor the most.

Following the government mantra that “personnel is policy,” Biden nominated activist senior officials to the Fed, such as Sarah Bloom Raskin, who [criticized](#) the Fed for not following European governments in their pursuit of environmental goals. Raskin said that America’s bank regulators “stand in stark contrast to the financial regulators in other rich countries, where policies and processes are being reimaged to accelerate a rapid, orderly, and just transition to a renewable, biodiverse, and sustainable economy.”

Raskin was ultimately rejected when Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W. Va.) withdrew his support; but another Biden nominee with [similar views](#), Lael Brainard, was subsequently approved as vice chair in May and promoted to the Fed’s No. 2 post.

Similarly, the U.S. Department of the Treasury, whose designated role is to “maintain a strong economy,” has established a Racial Equity committee, and its new vice chair, Felicia Wong, vowed to make “racial equity central to the Treasury Department’s mission.”

DOJ to Prioritize ‘Environmental Justice’

Under Biden's watch, the DOJ announced in May that it was launching a "[comprehensive environmental justice strategy](#)," adding the obligatory racial justification that "communities of color, indigenous communities, and low-income communities often bear the brunt of the harm caused by environmental crime."

It's unclear how "environmental justice" differs from what had heretofore simply been justice; namely, equal treatment under the law. But the DOJ's recent [reestablishment](#) of Obama-era "settlement slush funds" may give a clue about at least some of what this entails.

[Settlement slush funds](#) became common during the Obama administration and featured the DOJ cutting deals with corporations such as Volkswagen, which was fined for fraudulent emissions testing. In return for the department agreeing to reduce the fines, Volkswagen agreed to invest \$2 billion in zero-emissions technology. In this way, money that should have gone to the U.S. Treasury was diverted to causes that the Obama administration favored.

Wall Street banks that were assessed fines related to the mortgage crisis also participated, donating to organizations such as the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the National Community Reinvestment Coalition, and getting charitable tax deductions in return for reduced settlement payments. The Obama administration was thus able to channel money to pet causes and circumvent Congress, which has sole budget authority under the U.S. Constitution and had refused to allocate federal funds according to Obama's wishes.

Settlement slush funds were [banned](#) in 2017 under the Trump administration by then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions, who stated that any corporate fines must either be paid directly to victims or go to the U.S. Treasury, and not be diverted to fund the pet causes of federal agencies. However, they were revived under the Biden administration by a January 2021 executive order titled "Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis," in which Biden revoked all Trump administration directives related to climate change or environmental causes.

Stocks Regulator Mandates 'Green Accounting'

Under the DOJ's new "environmental justice" strategy, gathering evidence of environmental crimes will be facilitated by a new directive from the Securities and

Exchange Commission (SEC) that requires listed companies to publish audited reports of all CO2 emissions and climate-related risks, as well as their plans to address them.

Although the SEC was established to protect small investors from securities fraud, its new “green accounting” rule requires that all listed companies report not only their own carbon emissions but also those of their vendors, even if those vendors are small businesses that are not listed.

“Here’s what’s particularly horrifying about that,” Will Hild, executive director of Consumers’ Research, told The Epoch Times. “Those companies themselves may not be publicly traded. ... And yet through this rule, they’re going to force people to force their vendors to adhere to this.”

An additional aspect of this SEC rule applies to the end users of corporate products; in other words, “carbon emissions disclosures around the consumers’ use of the product,” Hild said.

“[That] means there’s going to be a huge incentive to start tracking the behaviors of consumers by putting literal trackers on the products.”

There’s also the concern that this SEC ruling will give an advantage to large corporations over small businesses that may not be able to afford the cost of compliance. According to a [report](#) by The American Farm Bureau, small farmers, though they have nothing to do with Wall Street stock exchanges, are one segment of our economy that could be threatened by this rule.

According to Farm Bureau President Zippy Duvall, “Farmers have never [before] been subjected to regulations intended for Wall Street.”

“Unlike large corporations currently regulated by the SEC, farmers don’t have a team of compliance officers or attorneys dedicated to handling SEC compliance issues,” Duvall said. “This proposal could keep small farmers from doing business with public companies at a time when all farms are needed to ensure food security here and abroad.”

Bank, Pension Regulators Allow ESG Policies

In October 2021, the Department of Labor under the Biden administration [instituted a new rule](#) that allows private pension funds to invest on ideological grounds, again revoking a Trump administration rule, which limited pension investing exclusively to maximizing investor returns. Similarly, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, a bank regulator, [overturned](#) a Trump administration rule that prohibited banks from engaging in blanket discrimination against politically disfavored industries.

This gave a green light to banks to shun the firearms industry, coal plants, oil drilling in Alaska, and others that are disfavored by ESG ideology. Other activist agencies under Biden include the Department of the Interior, which in September [revoked](#) drilling permits on 113 oil and gas leases in Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota in response to environmental protests.

According to a [report](#) by The Heritage Foundation, “To date, Biden is the only president in modern history not to have held a single oil and gas lease sale on federal lands, despite clear direction from Congress to do so quarterly. While the Department of the Interior is being forced by court order to hold a lease sale this quarter, it increased fees by 50 percent and decreased the amount of available acreage for drilling by 80 percent—even as it cuts fees and red tape for renewable ‘green’ energy production.”

Courts Block Biden’s Most Flagrant Violations

In some cases, the Biden administration’s violations of the U.S. Constitution have been so flagrant that federal courts have stepped in to block them. An attempt by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to force electric utilities to switch from fossil fuels to wind and solar, for example, was [struck down](#) by the U.S. Supreme Court in the landmark West Virginia vs EPA decision. In a 6–3 ruling, the court stated that only Congress has the power to legislate industrial energy policy; it ruled that an unelected executive agency such as the EPA lacked the constitutional authority to effectively create laws on “major questions” of this magnitude.

This decision set a precedent that will likely be applied to other areas of administrative overreach going forward. Similarly, numerous other Biden administration intrusions into the private sector were also slapped down by [court rulings](#); for example, that federal agencies did not have the right to force companies to fire employees who refused the COVID-19 vaccine, or to ban landlords from

evicting tenants who don't pay rent, or to force mask wearing on public transportation.

In June 2021, federal courts [ruled](#) that Biden's attempt to use racial equity preferences in paying COVID-relief grants to farmers and restaurant owners, prioritizing minorities and excluding white men, was also illegal.

EPOCH TIMES

ESG: The Merger of State and Corporate Power

Corporations and government form alliance for environmental, social activism

By Kevin Stocklin, November 13, 2022 Updated: November 15, 2022

News Analysis

In 2022, in the midst of a recession, record inflation, and a tumbling stock market, a corporate ideology known by the acronym [ESG](#) emerged from obscurity to become a headline topic. It has been called everything from a risk-management tool and a movement for a cleaner, more just world, to a “con,” a “fraud,” and even—in an [Elon Musk tweet](#)—“the devil incarnate.”

The term itself is opaque; ESG brings environmental, social, and governance causes together under one umbrella. The environmental component includes things such as transitioning to wind and solar energy from fossil fuels, and to electric vehicles from gasoline-powered cars.

The social component includes racial and gender equity, diversity training for employees, economic equity, and gun control. The governance component focus on how companies are run and includes racial and gender quotas for corporate boards, management, and staff, and—in the case of Exxon—putting green energy advocates on the board.

The Origins of ESG Ideology

The ESG movement is a derivative of the [United Nations Sustainable Development Goals](#) (SDGs). There are 17 SDGs in all, ranging from “no poverty, zero hunger, and good health” to “responsible consumption and production” and “peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development.”

In 2019, the World Economic Forum (WEF), an annual gathering of the world’s most powerful political and corporate leaders in Davos, Switzerland, signed a strategic partnership with the U.N. to advance the SDGs throughout the corporate sector.

Led by founder and Chairman Klaus Schwab, the [WEF issued](#) the “Davos Manifesto 2020: The Universal Purpose of a Company in the Fourth Industrial Revolution.”

Klaus Schwab, founder and executive chairman of the World Economic Forum, delivers remarks at the Congress Centre during the World Economic Forum (WEF) annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland, on May 23, 2022. (Fabrice Coffrini/AFP via Getty Images)

The manifesto declared that “a company is more than an economic unit generating wealth. It fulfills human and societal aspirations as part of the broader social system.”

During the annual meeting, Schwab told the gathered corporate executives and world leaders, “Let’s be clear, the future is not just happening; the future is built by us, by a powerful community here in this room. We have the means to improve the status of the world.”

In a [CNBC interview](#) in 2020, Bank of America CEO and WEF International Business Council Chairman Brian Moynihan said, “To solve these huge problems that the world faces—this is U.N. week and the SDGs are the statement to the world of what we’d like to make progress on—you have to bring capitalism to the task.”

On Nov. 4, 100 executives from the Alliance of CEO Climate Leaders issued a [joint letter](#) to attendees of the U.N. Climate Change Conference (COP27), stating, “We are ready to work side-by-side with governments to deliver bold climate action.”

“Accelerating the transition to net zero requires significant collaboration and shared responsibility between the private and public sectors.”

Signatories of the letter included Coca-Cola, Dell, Hewlett Packard, Microsoft, Nestle, PepsiCo, Siemens, Sysco, and Unilever.

Speaking at the [COP27 conference](#), former Vice President Al Gore concurred, saying, “We need \$4.5 trillion per year to make this transition, and that can only come by unlocking access to private capital.”

Author and political analyst Michael Rectenwald told The Epoch Times, “This is a massive campaign that has already metastasized to almost all of the corporate world. The tentacles of the WEF extend to almost every sector of society.”

More than 500 of the world's largest corporations have signed pledges to support ESG goals across industries including banking, insurance, asset management, tech, media, energy, manufacturing, and transportation. These pledges are signed as part of membership in international clubs like Climate Action 100+, the Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero, the Net Zero Banking Alliance, and the Net Zero Asset Managers Alliance.

There's no segment of the U.S. economy that's outside the reach of this movement.

From its origins in U.N. think tanks and WEF conference rooms, ESG is then passed down to the corporate world via Wall Street, marketed as an investment strategy for companies to follow—voluntarily or involuntarily.

Carole Crozat, BlackRock's head of sustainable investing research, [explained to investors](#) that “while measuring the alignment of investments to the U.N. SDGs is a complex and evolving task, we believe that their integration in investment decisions can help secure long-term financial performance.”

“Redirecting capital toward U.N. SDGs could offer \$12 trillion of market opportunities linked to our long-term social and environmental well-being,” Crozat said.

ESG in Practice

In principle, ESG means that companies look beyond making profits and consider higher political and moral issues, such as the welfare of the planet; in practice, it means that corporations become political agents for left-wing causes. This concept is also called “stakeholder capitalism,” which has been endorsed by CEOs across the corporate world.

Speaking for Bank of America, Moynihan said, “Our research shows that companies that do well on ESG end up doing better ... It defines capitalism the way that people want to define it, which is stakeholder capitalism and solving the big problems of the world.”

Stakeholder capitalism means that, instead of answering exclusively to shareholders, CEOs will focus on employees, the environment, and society at large. As head of the Business Roundtable, a club of America's largest corporations, JPMorgan Chase CEO Jamie Dimon applauded the organization's announcement in

2019 that corporate executives would henceforth follow stakeholder ideology, [stating](#) that the American dream was “fraying” and that “these modernized principles reflect the business community’s unwavering commitment to continue to push for an economy that serves all Americans.”

In accordance with ESG principles, stakeholder-oriented banks such as JPMorgan Chase refused to lend to oil drilling companies in Alaska. Delta Air Lines, Coca-Cola, and Major League Baseball fought against voter ID laws in Georgia that they claimed were racist.

The world’s largest food companies such as Nestle, Danone, Kellogg’s, General Mills, and Unilever encourage—and sometimes pressure—the hundreds of thousands of farmers who supply them to take up a U.N.-approved method of farming called “[regenerative agriculture](#).”

As part of the U.N. and ESG goals to reduce shootings, banks including Citibank restricted lending to the firearms industry. Credit card companies Visa, Mastercard, and American Express began tracking purchases from gun shops.

Amalgamated Bank President Priscilla Sims Brown stated in an [interview with CBS](#) that “where there may be gun sales that are intended for black markets or we see patterns of gun purchases made in multiple gun shops ... we can provide that information to authorities to investigate.” PayPal went a step further and refused to allow its payment services to be used to buy guns or ammunition.

Protesters rally in opposition to The Walt Disney Co.’s stance against a recently passed Florida law outside of the company’s headquarters in Burbank, Calif., on April 6, 2022. (Jill McLaughlin/The Epoch Times)

Following ESG social criteria, Disney fought to repeal a Florida law that bans the teaching of sexual topics to schoolchildren in kindergarten through third grade, which Disney said was a human rights violation. Disney [executives also announced](#) during a staff meeting they were “adding queerness” and “advancing a not-so-secret gay agenda” in the children’s shows they produce.

Corporations across the board began implementing diversity, equity, and inclusion training for employees, with Coca-Cola urging employees to “[be less white](#),” and asset manager Vanguard instructing its white male employees to accept “[uncomfortable](#)” criticism about their racist biases toward minorities. United

Airlines set [racial and gender quotas](#) for hiring new pilots, and Bank of America announced that it would provide [no-down-payment mortgages](#) for minorities who want to buy a house.

The WEF, Bank of America, Disney, Coca-Cola, and PayPal didn't respond to requests for comment.

A Money Machine That Spans the Globe

ESG isn't just an ideology; it's also an industry. ESG investment funds and other assets have rapidly grown over the past decade to reach a current \$55 trillion worldwide. ESG assets are projected to grow to \$100 trillion by 2025.

To put this in perspective, the gross domestic product (GDP) of the entire United States is currently about \$21 trillion. The ESG industry is enormous and pervasive; it's lucrative; and it has created a broad network of vested interests—consultants, rating agencies, accountants, investment managers, and proxy agents—to bring agnostics into the fold. Often, the companies that impose ESG ratings on companies, countries, and even U.S. states, also provide paid consulting services to help them improve their ratings.

The main drivers of the ESG movement are Wall Street banks and investment funds, which control the capital for the world economy. The three largest asset managers, BlackRock, Vanguard, and State Street, together control more than \$20 trillion in assets under management. Because they manage index funds, they own shares in most corporations that are included in market indexes like the S&P 500.

“If you just look at BlackRock by itself, it's the first, second or third largest shareholder in 80 percent of the companies in the S&P 500,” Andrew Puzder, the former CEO of CKE Restaurants, told The Epoch Times. “They use that tremendous voting power, not only to advance this economic leftist agenda, but to put it above their obligation to generate returns for their investors.”

BlackRock, State Street, and Vanguard didn't respond to requests for comment.

Will Hild, executive director of Consumers' Research, told The Epoch Times that “the way that these fund managers use ESG to push progressive politics is multifaceted. The first and probably the most public way is they get to vote the shares that they're managing.”

“The more quiet, sort of less public way is that they have what they call engagement meetings with corporate leadership on these issues,” Hild said. “And when they show up, they don’t say: hey, we’re just representing ourselves, they say we represent ownership of 7.5-20 percent of your publicly traded shares. BlackRock, State Street, and Vanguard together would be the largest shareholder in 90 percent of the S&P 500.”

Speaking at a [New York Times conference](#) in 2017, BlackRock CEO Larry Fink appeared to underscore this point, stating: “Behaviors are going to have to change and this is one thing we’re asking companies. You have to force behaviors and here at BlackRock we are forcing behaviors.” Fink writes an annual letter to CEOs, setting priorities for the coming year.

BlackRock CEO Larry Fink speaks at a forum during the opening of the Clinton Global Initiative (CGI), a meeting of international leaders in New York City on Sept. 19, 2022. (Spencer Platt/Getty Images)

“If you read his annual letter to CEOs, Larry Fink actually thinks he needs to tell the world’s CEOs every year what BlackRock thinks,” Puzder said. “He doesn’t have to go to every shareholder meeting, he just tells them what to do in a letter. And the letter the year before last said we need to get to net-zero carbon emissions by 2050, which will require a transformation of the entire economy.”

Despite its rhetoric to the contrary and its membership in various global ESG organizations, BlackRock has vehemently denied that it uses its influence to push a political agenda. Responding to a letter ([pdf](#)) from 19 state attorneys general who asserted that “BlackRock used citizens’ assets to pressure companies to comply with international agreements such as the Paris Agreement that force the phase-out of fossil fuels,” BlackRock countered ([pdf](#)) that its funds were highly rated from a performance perspective and that “our participation in these initiatives is entirely consistent with our fiduciary obligations.”

Other financial institutions that have pledged support for the ESG movement include Bank of America, Citibank, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Morgan Stanley, Wells Fargo, HSBC, Deutsche Bank, and UBS. And in pledging fealty to ESG goals, corporations are not only aligned with each other, but with governments, as well.

“It’s now becoming increasingly difficult to tell where the private sector ends and the government begins,” Alex Newman, CEO of Liberty Sentinel Media, told The Epoch Times. “We’re seeing a merger of the two.”

JPMorgan Chase, Citibank, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley also didn’t respond to requests for comment.

“In my experience, large Wall Street banks are not charitable institutions,” Vivek Ramaswamy, entrepreneur and founder of Strive Asset Management, told The Epoch Times. “You look at which firms are rewarded with government packages, like who gets the COVID-19 stimulus packages; a lot of that flowed through BlackRock.”

Tom Jones, president of the American Accountability Foundation, told The Epoch Times: “What we’re seeing is a new revolving door in Washington. We’re seeing liberal activists, whether they’re in the administration or on Capitol Hill, instead of leaving those positions and going to K Street to become lobbyists in Washington, what we’re seeing now is they’re going to Wall Street. And they’re using the enormous influence that these Wall Street firms have to really drive policy at the state and local level in a way they haven’t done before.”

Director of the National Economic Council Brian Deese speaks during a briefing in the James S. Brady Press Briefing Room of the White House in Washington, on March 31, 2022. (Nicholas Kamm/AFP via Getty Images)

Brian Deese, for example, who’s the current National Economic Council director, was global head of sustainable investing at BlackRock, Hild noted.

“And you have Tom Donilon, who’s now been put in charge of a significant portion of our foreign policy, vis-à-vis China. And again, he comes right out of BlackRock and it’s going down the line.

“The Biden administration has been heavily staffed by BlackRock alums, and in some cases, it’s even scary some of the issues that they handled when they were at BlackRock. Tom Donilon, for example, recommended to clients while he was there that they tripled their exposure to China, and now he’s in charge of a portion of the Biden administration’s foreign policy vis a vis China.”

A Democratic Deficit

What's most striking about ESG is how, in joining corporations with government under a common cause, it has created a new power structure that often supersedes national laws and overrides the Constitution. Working in collaboration with government agencies, corporations have engaged in enforcement, censorship, and warrantless surveillance, often doing what the government is legally prohibited from doing.

Some believe that this public–private alliance, which overrides democratic institutions, is necessary because the crises that humanity are facing—including climate change and racism—are so dire.

“The climate crisis is about human security, economic security, environmental security, national security, and the very life of the planet,” President Joe Biden said in his speech at the U.N. COP27 summit on Nov. 11.

Calling for a “sustainability revolution” at the COP27 conference, former Vice President Al Gore condemned “the culture of death that surrounds our addiction to fossil fuels by digging up dead life forms and burning them recklessly in ways that create more death.”

But others are wary about this concentration of power and authority in so few hands, and the public's loss of a voice or vote in such major decisions about the future.

“How you address racial inequity or global climate change, these are important enough questions that we should resolve them through free speech and debate in the public square by putting people into public office who are accountable to the American electorate. Companies are not accountable, BlackRock is not accountable, Larry Fink is not accountable,” Ramaswamy said.

“This is the heart of the question that was an issue in 1776, where we said for better or worse, citizens decide how to settle these common political questions through the political process where everyone's voice and vote counts equally.”

New York University Finance Professor Aswath Damodaran told the Prague Finance Institute in November 2021: “Do you really want Larry Fink and Jamie Dimon deciding what's good or bad for the world? You've outsourced what should be your responsibility as a voter, as a citizen, to CEOs of companies. Nothing good has ever come of doing that.”

EPOCH TIMES

ESG: How Woke Corporations Override American Voters and Threaten Freedom

[Emily Allison](#), October 31, 2022 Updated: October 31, 2022

Commentary

The conservative movement in America has often used the “go [woke](#), go broke” mantra to fight back against woke ideology in business. The concept of voting with one’s dollars and financially supporting businesses that respect the freedoms and values of their customers has allowed the political right to wield a certain level of power within a free market system. But, unfortunately, that system may be about to change.

An [EpochTV](#) episode titled “[Christians and ESG: What You Need to Know](#)” features ordained minister and best-selling author Lucas Miles in his series “[Church and State](#).” In the episode, Miles examines how the woke [left](#) circumvents voters and weaponizes corporations to control people and limit freedoms.

What Is [ESG](#)?

ESG, “Environmental Social Governance,” is a business scoring system that ranks businesses based on their response to woke ideologies.

Miles compares ESG to the social credit system of communist China, where those who do not acquire an acceptable score are punished in the marketplace. Publicly traded companies are evaluated based on ESG and given a score that ultimately affects how investable they are. This is a direct way of circumventing American voters and undermining religious liberty.

Miles says that at one time, the job of CEOs and company boards was to produce profits. Today, companies are putting ESG scores over profits. This means companies will continue going in a certain direction even if it affects profitability, solely because they don’t want their ESG scores to be negatively impacted.

Environment, Social, Governance

The environment portion of the ESG score rates companies on energy use, land use, and reliance on fossil fuels versus wind and solar, among other criteria. This will immediately hurt certain companies, given the nature of their services.

The social component evaluates how companies treat employees and looks at their HR policies, such as forming company culture to be “less white,” policies of inclusion, etc. This gives more power to woke views on equity and inclusion versus faith-based worldviews on God-given equality and human rights.

Governance applies to all aspects of the company. Scores are then put together to determine how investable a company is, prioritizing ESG criteria over profits and profitability.

ESG Resembles Social Credit Scores

ESG is a soft introduction to social credit scores in America. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) utilizes social credit scores to monitor what people do, say, and think.

Scores are used to evaluate individuals based on how each person lines up with behaviors that the CCP wants to reward or punish.

Being discredited makes getting a job, loan, or even a hotel room more difficult. In this [EpochTV](#) episode, viewers learn that 4 million people in China have been blocked from being able to buy a high-speed train ticket due to low social credit. More than 11 million have been prevented from buying a plane ticket.

The result of social credit is that those who comply with the political ideology of the government experience a bit more leeway, while those who step out of line are denied fundamental human rights and kept under a much tighter leash.

In America, it's easy to see how cancel culture and censorship by Big Tech could aid in implementing this social credit system. This will result in more liberties being taken away based on a person's compliance with woke ideology.

Miles comments that he would think this possibility far-fetched if it weren't already happening around the world.

For example, the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka recently went through a major upheaval due to a lack of food, energy, and basic services. Sri Lanka boasted an ESG score of 98 out of 100 ESG. By that standard, Sri Lanka should be one of the greatest places in the world to live, yet it proved to be one of the worst.

ESG Cripples American Businesses and Profits the CCP

America already has the cleanest manufacturing facilities and the highest level of standards in the world. Mandating ESG spending on top of current expenditures puts an extreme financial burden on American companies.

Meanwhile, China adheres to very different standards in its labor camps and factories. This creates a disadvantage for American companies while allowing China to continue to profit from slave labor and lack of human rights regulations.

This is already why many companies send their business overseas to China. James Lindsay, author of “Cynical Theories,” says ESG is a sword to divide, conquer and box out competition. ESG will drive business to the largest corporations that can afford to abide by its standards. Local and small businesses cannot afford to compete.

Lindsay also notes that ESG acts as a shield for major corporations

It allows them to look morally virtuous, while in reality, they are sending business overseas to oppressive regimes like communist China and profiting from slave labor, organ harvesting, and other human rights and environmental violations that are not allowed on American soil. While doing this, major corporations can still look like the good guys simply for having a high ESG score.

According to the Heritage Foundation, ESG forces companies to take positions on political issues that have nothing to do with the actual business they provide. This is why we see more and more companies pushing woke policies instead of emphasizing the products or services they provide.

ESG Hurts Employees

Employees are losing their jobs, not based on a person's quality of work, but on ESG requirements such as skin color. For example, if a company needs more minorities, it can fire someone for being white.

According to Lindsay, ESG is a scam to weaponize social justice and use it as a tool for control. Conservative commentator Glen Beck has said, "social justice has now been monetized." The idea of "go woke, go broke" won't hold any weight anymore. People are investing in ESG because people know this is the future of the marketplace. According to Beck, ESG investments rose from \$10 billion in 2015 to over \$246 billion in March 2021.

ESG Removes the Voice of American Voters

Lindsay tweeted recently that with ESG, leftists would no longer need the votes of Americans to enact the Green New Deal. Instead, they will have the power to tell your company what to do, how to do it, and who to hire and fire. This is the left's way around the Constitution, the branches of government, and the voice of the American people. Woke extremists will no longer have to go through Congress to dictate the laws of the land.

Miles calls this corporate fascism. "It is using American corporations and global corporations to push Marxist ideology on the people of the United States and around the world without ever having to take it to a vote," said Miles.

If woke policies had to go to the polls, American voters would have the power to make their voices heard and have their beliefs and rights represented. However, ESG is taking control of corporations and deriving its power from outside the government without the consent of the governed.

ESG Results in Religious Persecution

The [EpochTV](#) episode explores what ESG means for Christians or any people of faith. In short, ESG forces them to decide whether they will stand for their faith or participate in the woke system in order to feed their families. Miles hopes enough believers will refuse to do lip service to woke ideology and stand against it, regardless of the consequences.

ESG chases a score that will allegedly save the environment, while hurting people. The Bible tells Christians to take care of both the earth and the people in it. In contrast, the left treats people like parasites: they can be hired and fired based on skin color and oppressed based on compliance with the left's arbitrary political rule.

In a free society, no one should be forced to support woke ideology in order to feed their family or keep their jobs. Likewise, people of faith should not have to worry about how to comply with a political ideology while living out their beliefs.

Miles believes there is still time to reverse the course of the Great Reset. He calls for Americans to stay current on ESG policies and use every legal means available to fight back. Today, ESG may apply to corporations, but if allowed to continue, ESG will increase its scope, impacting nonprofits and people of faith.

Watch "[Christians and ESG: What You Need to Know](#)" on Epoch Cinema [here](#).

Views expressed in this article are the opinions of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Epoch Times.

EPOCH TIMES

The Great Reset in Action: Ending Freedom of the Press, Speech, and Expression

Birsen Filip, June 29, 2022 Updated: June 29, 2022

Commentary

Governments, corporations, and elites have always been fearful of the power of a [free press](#), because it is capable of exposing their lies, destroying their carefully crafted images, and undermining their authority. In recent years, alternative journalism has been growing and more people are relying on social media platforms as sources of news and information. In response, the corporate state, digital conglomerates, and the mainstream media have been increasingly supportive of the silencing and censoring of alternative media outlets and voices that challenge the official narrative on most issues.

At the recent [World Economic Forum](#) meeting in [Davos](#), Switzerland, "[Australian eSafety commissioner](#)" Julie Inman Grant stated that "[freedom of speech](#) is not the same thing as a free for all," and that "we are going to need a recalibration of a whole range of human rights that are playing out online—from freedom of speech ... to be free from online violence." Meanwhile, the Canadian government is seeking to [restrict independent media](#) and the [freedom of expression](#) via the implementation of [Bill C-11](#), which would allow it to regulate all online audiovisual platforms on the internet, including content on Spotify, TikTok, YouTube, and podcast clients.

Similarly, the UK is seeking to introduce an [Online Safety Bill](#), the United States "[paused](#)" the establishment of a Disinformation Governance Board following backlash, and the European Union approved its own [Digital Services Act](#), all of which aim to limit the freedom of speech. Attempts by elites and politicians to silence dissenters and critical thinkers is not something new. In fact, history is full of examples of "the persecution of men of science, the burning of scientific books, and the systematic eradication of the intelligentsia of the subjected people." [1]

However, these current efforts to curtail freedom of speech and press by supposedly liberal governments are still somewhat ironic, given that even “the most intolerant of churches, the Roman Catholic Church, even at the canonization of a saint, admits, and listens patiently to, a ‘devil’s advocate.’ The holiest of men, it appears, cannot be admitted to posthumous honors, until all that the devil could say against him is known and weighed.”[2]

The corporate state, digital conglomerates, and the mainstream media want to ensure that they have the exclusive authority to dictate people’s opinions, wants, and choices through their sophisticated propaganda techniques. To do so, they have even resorted to transforming falsehoods into truth. In fact, the word *truth* has already had its original meaning altered, as those who speak the truth on certain subjects are now regularly accused of spreading hate speech, misinformation, and disinformation.

Presently, truth is no “longer something to be found, with the individual conscience as the sole arbiter of whether in any particular instance the evidence (or the standing of those proclaiming it) warrants a belief; it becomes something to be laid down by authority, something which has to be believed in the interest of the unity of the organized effort, and which may have to be altered as the exigencies of this organised effort require it.”[3]

However, modifying the definition of truth comes with the potential for great peril, as truth-seeking often contributes to human progress in that it leads to discoveries that ultimately benefit society at large. It should be noted that *truth* is by no means the only word whose meaning has been changed recently in order for it to serve as an instrument of propaganda; others include *freedom, justice, law, right, equality, diversity, woman, pandemic, vaccine,* etc. This is highly concerning, because such attempts at the “perversion of language, the change of meaning of the words by which the ideals” of the ruling class are expressed is a consistent feature of totalitarian regimes.[4]

As a number of liberal-democratic governments increasingly move toward [totalitarianism](#), they want people to forget that there is “the greatest difference between presuming an opinion to be true, because, with every opportunity for contesting it, it has not been refuted, and assuming its truth for the purpose of not permitting its refutation.”[5] According to them, “public criticism or

even expressions of doubt must be suppressed because they tend to weaken public support.”[6]

In fact, they believe that all views and opinions that might cast doubt or create hesitation need to be restricted in all disciplines and on all platforms. This is because “the disinterested search for truth cannot be allowed” when “the vindication of the official views becomes the sole object” of the ruling class.[7] In other words, the control of information is practiced and the uniformity of views is enforced in all fields under totalitarian rule.

The suppression of freedom of the press, speech, expression, and thought means that current and future generations will be “deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error.”[8] They are also at risk of becoming ignorant of the fact that the only way in which a person can know “the whole of a subject” is by “hearing what can be said about it by persons of every variety of opinion, and studying all modes in which it can be looked at by every character of mind.”[9] That is to say, current and future generations will be unaware that “the steady habit of correcting and completing” one’s own “opinion by collating it with those of others, so far from causing doubt and hesitation in carrying it into practice, is the only stable foundation for a just reliance on it.”[10]

At present, it is likely that the masses do not regard freedom of the press, speech, expression, and thought as being particularly important, because “the great majority are rarely capable of thinking independently, that on most questions they accept views which they find ready-made, and that they will be equally content if born or coaxed into one set of beliefs or another.”[11] Nevertheless, no one should have the power and authority to “select those to whom” freedom of thought, enlightenment and expression is to be “reserved.”[12]

In fact, John Stuart Mill went so far as to claim that “if all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.”[13] He further added that silencing the expression of an opinion is essentially an act of “robbing the human race,” which applies to both current and future generations.[14] Even though the suppressors can deny the truth to people at a particular point in time, “history shows that every

age having held many opinions which subsequent ages have deemed not only false but absurd; and it is as certain that many opinions, now general, will be rejected by future ages, as it is that many, once general, are rejected by the present.”[15]

If current efforts to suppress freedom of the press, speech, expression, and thought succeed, then the search for truth will eventually be abandoned and totalitarian authorities will decide what “doctrines ought to be taught and published.”[16] There will be no limits to who can be silenced, as the control of opinions will be extended to all people in all fields. Accordingly, contemporary authoritarian policy makers need to be reminded about the crucial importance of freedom of speech, expression, and thought, which the U.S. Supreme Court [recognized](#) in the 1957 case *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* when it ruled that

to impose any strait jacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation. No field of education is so thoroughly comprehended by man that new discoveries cannot yet be made Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise, our civilization will stagnate and die Our form of government is built on the premise that every citizen shall have the right to engage in political expression and association. This right was enshrined in the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights. Exercise of these basic freedoms in America has traditionally been through the media of political associations History has amply proved the virtue of political activity by minority, dissident groups, who innumerable times have been in the vanguard of democratic thought and whose programs were ultimately accepted. Mere unorthodoxy or dissent from the prevailing mores is not to be condemned. The absence of such voices would be a symptom of grave illness in our society.

References

1. F.A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (New York: Routledge 2006), p. 168.
2. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001), p. 22.
3. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 167.
4. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 161.
5. Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 21.
6. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 164.
7. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 165.
8. Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 19.

9. Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 22.
10. Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 22.
11. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 168.
12. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 168.
13. Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 18.
14. Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 19.
15. Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 20.
16. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 165.

From [Mises.org](https://mises.org)

Views expressed in this article are the opinions of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Epoch Times.

EPOCH TIMES

From COVID to CBDC: The Path to Full Control

[Josh Stylman](#), November 21, 2022 Updated: November 21, 2022

Commentary

It's seemed evident for a while that the current [fiat monetary system](#) is, at best, unstable. At worst, it's a Ponzi scheme whose time has expired. If that's the case, I suspect the central bankers and 0.1 percent know this and might be prepared to usher in the new system before the old one collapses on itself—even as they loot it on the way down with the most significant wealth transfer in human history.

To anyone who pays attention to these trends, it seems evident that [Central Bank Digital Currency \(CBDC\)](#) will be that new system.

Every indication is that CBDC's arrival is imminent. Yesterday, [several global banks announced a partnership with the N.Y. Federal Reserve](#) to pilot digital dollars. Given the ubiquity of credit/debit cards, payment apps, and other online payment systems, digital money has been bound to happen for some time. The risk isn't the electronic part, that's inevitable—it's the fact that a central bank will oversee the digital currency.

From my vantage point, it's impossible to overstate the risk presented by CBDC. Whether it's a utopian vision based on good intentions or a sinister plot to crush our sovereignty, the result may be the same: [control](#). A Central Bank Digital Currency has all the downsides of fiat money, plus the added layers of surveillance and programmability overseen by the state.

So many people on [Team Reality](#) have likely felt like dissidents over the last few years simply for challenging anything beyond the herd mentality. Asking questions or speaking against the narrative about topics including the likely origins of the COVID virus, usefulness of PCR, risk to most of the population, benefits of early treatment, advantages of natural immunity, safety and efficacy of vaccines, pros and cons of masks/lockdowns, and the utility of vax passports created an environment where people were stigmatized, alienated, or outright censored.

Imagine a monetary system with features baked in to socially engineer how we live. For example:

- *Health: "You didn't take your booster ... sorry, you're not allowed in public spaces."*
- *Energy: "You used your energy allotment this month ... sorry, your electric car won't start."*
- *Food: "You ate too much meat this week ... sorry, your money is only good for plants (or bugs)."*
- *Savings: "If you don't take your rations soon ... sorry, your money will expire at the end of the month."*
- *Free Speech: "You shared info that we disagree with ... sorry, our algorithm is fining you." (PayPal has already started doing this.)*

If CBDC ultimately becomes the new monetary system, its core features will make it so that world governments will no longer need something like a global health crisis to print money or close society. Lines of code can shape our behavior and ensure we're forced to stay home. The entire platform will be designed to expel labor that is [no longer deemed necessary](#). While I initially believed the state-led pharmacological interventions were an isolated, acute threat in this era, it's become evident they were simply one tentacle in a much larger beast. Whatever forces are insinuating this direction on the world ([looking your way, Davos](#)), it's revealed itself to be unrelenting in its pursuit of perpetuating fear and power.

I'm well aware that this must sound insane, especially to anyone that hasn't paid attention to this trend for a while. A few years ago, I would have thought it was preposterous, but after witnessing the government's lies, deception, and grab for control, I've become fearful that this may be where we're headed.

When you consider that vaccine mandates had no medically justifiable purpose, it's entirely plausible that they were simply an onramp to normalize a "papers please" society. In NYC, where I lived until recently, most people accepted vaxports and loved the [Excelsior Pass mobile app](#) because it was convenient. How many will feel the same about digital money, which will undoubtedly come with its share of benefits?

Central Bank Digital Currency will enable governments to impose top-down control, a la the Chinese Social Credit Score. Some central bankers are even [saying the quiet](#)

[part out loud](#). Whether or not this is the program's objective, has there ever been a time in history when governments rejected the power they are given? At this stage, this isn't some tinfoil hat theorizing, either. There are many examples of how this type of finance-driven coercion is already underway.

- *"Now the government is asking people to apply for plastic My Number cards equipped with microchips and photos, to be linked to driver's licenses and the public health insurance plans. Health insurance cards now in use, which lack photos, will be discontinued in late 2024. People will be required to use My Number cards instead."* ([Source](#))
- *"The new pass will guarantee the allocation of fuel quota on weekly basis. A QR code will be given for each National Identity Card number (NIC), once the vehicle identification number and other details are verified."* ([Source](#))
- *"According to a report from 9News Queensland, the department has ruled that unvaccinated teachers who have been allowed to return to their employment this term after being placed on leave without pay, will cop yet another financial blow, with a 'reduction in remuneration' for a period of 18 weeks."* ([Source](#))
- *"The trial, which is voluntary, will use facial recognition to identify people and how many tickets they have. The technology could be extended to cover automated purchases at concession stands, restaurants, and bars."* ([Source](#))
- *"As part of plans recently announced by the Government, Uganda will begin harvesting DNA and biometric data from its citizens when their cards expire in 2024 to be used in its redesigned digital identity program."* ([Source](#))

This is just the tip of the iceberg, and it's global. As we saw with the lockdowns, [China is the model](#) emulated in the West. Like the creep towards health-related authoritarian measures, [unelected globalists with financial interests lurk in the background](#).

I'd love to be wrong about all this. However, until there is evidence, we need to be suspicious of anyone perpetuating this dangerous path, regardless of their motivations.

For a deeper dive into this topic, I highly recommend this essay by Fabio Vighi about [Long Covid Monetary Policy](#). Edward Dowd has also spoken extensively about the relationship between the monetary system and COVID, including at this [eye-opening presentation](#). Next, the excellent Maajid Nawaz has [covered the](#)

[drivers behind CBDC](#). Others, such as [Marty Bent](#), [Saifedean Ammous](#), and [Allen Farrington](#), have been ahead of the curve in identifying these risks. I share their assessment in realizing that Bitcoin likely solves this.

If you have yet to notice, a primary theme of the last three-plus years (at least) is “freedom vs. control” so it’s not hyperbole to suggest that the future must be decentralized if we want to ensure our children grow up in a free world.

From the [Brownstone Institute](#)

Views expressed in this article are the opinions of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Epoch Times.

EPOCH TIMES

UN, World Economic Forum Behind Global 'War on Farmers': Experts

They say 'Agenda 2030' development goals at root of sustainability policies that could lead to food shortages

By Alex Newman, July 26, 2022 Updated: July 27, 2022

The escalating regulatory attack on agricultural producers from Holland and the United States to Sri Lanka and beyond is closely tied to the [United Nations'](#) "Agenda 2030" Sustainable Development Goals and the U.N.'s partners at the World Economic Forum (WEF), numerous experts told The Epoch Times.

Indeed, several of the U.N.'s 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are directly implicated in policies that are squeezing farmers, ranchers, and food supplies around the world.

High-level [Chinese Communist Party](#) (CCP) members within the U.N. system [helped create the SDGs and are currently helping](#) lead the organization's implementation of the global plan, The Epoch Times has previously documented.

If left unchecked, multiple experts said, the U.N.-backed sustainability policies on agriculture and food production would lead to economic devastation, shortages of critical goods, widespread famine, and a dramatic loss of individual freedoms.

Already, millions of people worldwide are facing dangerous food shortages, and officials around the world say those are set to get worse as the year goes on.

There is an agenda behind it all, experts told The Epoch Times.

Even private land ownership is in the crosshairs, as global food production and the world economy are transformed to meet the global sustainability goals, U.N. documents reviewed by The Epoch Times show.

As explained by the U.N. [on its SDG website](#), the goals adopted in 2015 "build on decades of work by countries and the U.N."

One of the earliest meetings defining the “sustainability” agenda was the U.N. Conference on Human Settlements known as Habitat I, which adopted the [Vancouver Declaration](#).

The agreement stated that “land cannot be treated as an ordinary asset controlled by individuals” and that private land ownership is “a principal instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth, therefore contributes to social injustice.”

“Public control of land use is therefore indispensable,” the U.N. declaration said, a prelude to the World Economic Forum’s now infamous “prediction” that by 2030, “you’ll own nothing.”

Numerous U.N. agencies and officials have outlined their vision of “sustainability” since then, including calls for drastic restrictions on energy, meat consumption, travel, living space, and material prosperity.

Experts interviewed by The Epoch Times say that some of the world’s wealthiest and most powerful corporate leaders are working with communists in China and elsewhere in an effort to centralize control over food production and crush independent farmers and ranchers.

The WEF, a network of major multinational businesses that collaborates closely with the CCP, is a “strategic partner” of the U.N. on Agenda 2030.

The increasing regulation of food production and even efforts to shut many farms and ranches come as officials around the world such as U.S. President Joe Biden and U.N. World [Food](#) Programme chief David Beasley warn of looming food shortages worldwide.

But instead of easing restrictions and encouraging more production, Western governments and many governments dependent on aid are clamping down even harder.

Dutch farmers, already at the breaking point, have responded this summer with massive nationwide protests. That followed violent unrest in Sri Lanka tied to food shortages caused by government policy.

Governments and international organizations have cited various pretexts for the policies, ranging from increasing “sustainability” and protecting various flora and fauna, to promoting “economic justice” and even returning lands to aboriginal peoples.

According to critics of the policies, though, the goal isn’t to preserve the environment or fight climate change at all. Instead, the experts warn that the “sustainability” narrative and the other justifications are a tool to gain control over food, agriculture, and people.

“The end goal of these efforts is to reduce sovereignty on both individual nations and people,” said Craig Rucker, president of the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), a public policy organization specializing in environmental and development issues.

“The intent for those pushing this agenda is not to save the planet, as they purport, but to increase control over people,” he told The Epoch Times, adding that the goal is to centralize power at the national and even international level.

UN Sustainable Development Goals—Agenda 2030

The U.N. Sustainable Development Goals, often referred to as Agenda 2030, were adopted in 2015 by the organization and its member states as a guide to “transforming our world.” Hailed as a “master plan for humanity” and a global “declaration of interdependence” by top U.N. officials, the 17 goals include 169 targets involving every facet of the economy and life.

“All countries and all stakeholders, acting in collaborative partnership, will implement this plan,” declares the preamble to the document, repeatedly noting that “no one will be left behind.”

Among other elements, the U.N. plan calls for national and international wealth redistribution in Goal 10, as well as “fundamental changes in the way that our societies produce and consume goods and services.”

Using government to transform all economic activity is a critical part of the SDGs, with Goal 12 demanding “sustainable consumption and production patterns.”

Among the specific targets outlined in Goal 12 are several directly linked to agricultural policies that undermine food production. These include “sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources.”

Perhaps more importantly, the document demands “environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks.”

As a result, people and especially farmers must “significantly reduce their release to air, water, and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment.”

Other SDGs that are directly tied to what critics have called the “war on farmers” include Goal 14, which addresses “marine pollution of all kinds, in particular from land-based activities, including ... nutrient pollution.” The U.N. regularly describes agriculture and food production as a threat to the ocean.

The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), led by former CCP Vice Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs Qu Dongyu, is helping to lead the charge.

In its 2014 report “[Building a Common Vision for Sustainable Food and Agriculture: Principles and Approaches](#),” the U.N. agency calls for drastic restrictions on the use of fertilizers, pesticides, emissions, and water in the agricultural sector.

As an example of how agriculture must be reformed to be considered sustainable by the U.N., the FAO report declares that “excessive use of nitrogen fertilizer is a major cause of water pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.”

The Rome-based FAO didn’t respond to a request for comment.

Another of the 17 SDGs with a direct impact on agriculture and food production is Goal 2, with its calls for “sustainable agriculture” and “sustainable food production.”

Goal 6, meanwhile, calls for “sustainable management of water,” which includes various targets involving agricultural water use and runoff.

Because U.N. leaders see agriculture and food production as key contributors to what they call manmade climate change, Goal 13 is important, too. It calls for

governments to “integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies, and planning.”

Goal 15, which deals with sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, also has multiple targets that affect agriculture and food production.

All over the world, national and regional governments are working with U.N. agencies to implement these sustainability goals in agriculture and other sectors.

For instance, responding to U.N. biodiversity agreements, the European Union has [enacted various U.N.-backed biodiversity programs](#) such as Natura 2000 and the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, which have been cited by the Dutch government and others in their agricultural policies.

The U.N. also [boasts publicly](#) about its role in imposing the SDGs in Sri Lanka and other nations suffering from food shortages and economic calamities linked to the very same global sustainability programs.

Around the world, almost every national government says it’s incorporating the SDGs into its own laws and regulations.

World Economic Forum ‘Partnership’

Alongside the U.N. are various “stakeholders” that are critical to implementing sustainable development policies through “public-private partnerships.”

At the heart of that effort is the WEF, which since 2020 has been pushing a total transformation of society known as the “Great Reset.” In 2019, the WEF signed a “strategic partnership” with the U.N. to advance Agenda 2030 within the global business community.

The official agreement defined “areas of cooperation to deepen institutional engagement and jointly accelerate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.”

Many of the key officials behind Agenda 2030, including top U.N. leaders such as current Secretary-General António Guterres—a self-proclaimed socialist—have also been working with the WEF for decades.

Meanwhile, the WEF has been explicit with its goals. It recently launched a “Food Action Alliance” (FAA) that acknowledges on its website that Agenda 2030 “informs the ambition of the FAA to provide an enduring and long-term platform for multi-stakeholder action on food systems to meet the SDGs.”

Alongside the U.N.’s “Food Systems Summit” in September 2021, the WEF’s FAA released a report outlining its own [“leadership agenda for multi-stakeholder collaboration to transform food systems.”](#)

Among other elements, the document summarizes the FAA’s insights on “supporting transformative food system partnerships, and its value proposition beyond the UN Food Systems Summit 2021 towards achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals.”

The WEF’s public concern with transforming agriculture and the food supply goes back over a decade, at least.

In partnership with various companies, the WEF released a 2010 [report](#) outlining a “new vision for agriculture” that included a “roadmap for stakeholders.” Many of the world’s largest food companies that dominate the market and own countless popular brands are involved.

The WEF’s website is packed with information purporting to justify a total transformation of the food supply by “stakeholders.”

“As global food systems become increasingly interconnected, effective coordination among a diverse set of stakeholders will be required,” WEF says on its [“Strategic Intelligence”](#) platform, frequently citing the FAO as its source.

“The potential to craft new, systemic approaches to food systems that include a diverse array of stakeholders presents opportunities to help sustainably feed the world well into the future.”

The organization’s frequent references to “stakeholders” refers to governments, companies, and so-called nongovernmental organizations that are often funded by those same companies and governments. They are all working together on the issue.

For instance, the WEF boasts that it has brought corporate giants such as Coca-Cola and Unilever into the fold toward promoting a “more sustainable future.”

The Rockefeller Foundation, which recently [released a report on how to “Reset the Table” and “Transform the U.S. Food System,”](#) is also a key player.

The WEF’s “Food Innovation Hubs” around the world are set to be a major part of this global transformation.

Speaking to the World Economic Forum on “transforming food systems and land use” at last year’s Davos Agenda Week, Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte [announced](#) that the Netherlands would host the “Global Coordinating Secretariat of the World Economic Food Innovation Hubs.”

The secretariat, he said, “will connect all other Food Innovation Hubs” in order to facilitate creating “the partnerships we need.”

Neither the WEF nor the Rockefeller Foundation responded to requests for comment on their role in Agenda 2030 and on the agricultural policies being pursued around the world.

Other organizations and entities involved in the push include powerful tax-exempt foundations such as the Gates Foundation, the EU-style regional governments proliferating around the world, and various groups funded by them.

Squeezing Farmers—and the Food Supply

All over the globe, U.N. SDG-aligned government policies are squeezing farmers—especially smaller, independent producers unable to absorb the added costs of added regulation and control.

Celebrating U.N. sustainability ideas, recently ousted Sri Lankan President Gotabaya Rajapaksa [announced](#) at the U.N. COP26 climate summit in 2021 that his government was banning chemical fertilizers and pesticides.

“Sri Lanka recently restricted the imports of chemical fertilizers, pesticides, and weedicides due to public health concerns, water contamination, soil degradation, and biodiversity impacts,” Rajapaksa told world leaders, to widespread acclaim.

“Although opposed by entrenched lobbies, this has created opportunities for innovation and investment into organic agriculture that will be healthier and more sustainable in future.”

In reality, even though they were promptly rolled back, the policies produced catastrophic food shortages, widespread hunger, and eventually a popular revolt that ousted the president and his government.

In 2019, the socialist Sri Lankan government also partnered with the U.N. Environment Programme to [establish the U.N. Global Nitrogen Campaign](#), which promotes the U.N.-backed policies on nitrogen that are now proliferating worldwide.

In the Netherlands, headquarters for the WEF’s “Food Innovation Hub” secretariat, authorities are imposing nitrogen policies that are expected to decimate the nation’s highly productive agricultural sector. The plans also include widespread expropriation of farms.

“The expropriation plans of the cabinet are a downright declaration of war on the agricultural sector,” said Dutch Member of Parliament Gideon van Meijeren, of the Forum for Democracy party, as cited by De Dagelijkse Standaard. “Under false pretenses, farmers are being robbed of their land, centuries-old farms are being demolished and farmers’ families are being totally destroyed.”

Experts warned of dangerous consequences stemming from such sustainability policies including food shortages, skyrocketing prices, social unrest, and more.

“You can glimpse the green, sustainable future by beholding Holland and Sri Lanka now,” Bonner Cohen, a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research, told The Epoch Times.

And yet, the agenda is spreading rapidly. Canadian federal authorities last week announced similar restrictions on fertilizers and nitrogen after restrictions on energy production were put in place, sparking outrage from provincial officials and farmers.

In Ireland, the United Kingdom, and other European nations, various government entities are also working to slash agricultural production under sustainability programs.

Meanwhile, aside from continuing with policies that pay farmers not to grow food, the Biden administration is seeking to impose WEF-backed “Environmental, Social, Governance” metrics and reporting on companies through the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

Farm associations and more than 100 members of Congress argue that the plan would bankrupt owners of small and medium-size farms unable to comply with climate reporting requirements to do business with public firms, even as the world moves toward widespread food shortages.

In part, experts say the insistence on these sorts of policies is because those imposing them are largely insulated from the damage they are causing.

“Global elites in government, transnational organizations, corporate boardrooms—well represented in the WEF—are so caught up in their climate virtue signaling, from which many hope to benefit financially through investments in green energy, that they are slow to notice that they are completely detached from reality,” said National Center for Public Policy Research’s Cohen, who specializes in environmental issues.

“Few of those imposing regulations on farmers have ever set foot on a farm. By virtue of the power and wealth these people already have, they are shielded from the consequences of the misguided policies they impose on the rest of the world. That burden is borne by ordinary people around the world, about whom the Davos crowd and their partners in crime know nothing.”

Small, Independent Farms at Risk: Experts

Sri Lanka’s disaster offers a preview of what will happen to the United States and Europe if policymakers continue to follow the U.N. sustainability agenda, according to Sterling Burnett, who holds a doctorate in environmental ethics and leads the nonprofit Heartland Institute’s Arthur B. Robinson Center on Climate and Environmental Policy.

“It’s not a war on farming; it’s a war on small farming and independent farmers,” he told The Epoch Times. “It’s a war in support of elite, large-scale agricultural industries.”

Even though the U.N. SDGs speak of helping “small-scale food producers,” Burnett argued that independent farms and ranches are in the U.N.’s crosshairs to help consolidate control over the food supply.

Policymakers are “in the pocket” of major corporate interests including Conagra, BlackRock, State Street, Vanguard, and others, he said.

“They would just as soon have all their small competitors put out of business,” he said, echoing concerns expressed by numerous other experts.

BlackRock CEO Larry Fink, whose firm manages more money than any other company in the world, “wants to impose his values on companies using other people’s money,” Burnett said.

Fink, who serves on the board of the powerful Council on Foreign Relations and works closely with the WEF, is a key architect of the push to impose “environmental, social, governance” metrics on U.S. companies.

“This is the super-rich foisting their values on the rest of us,” said Burnett, pointing to those he says are happy to work with communists on the effort.

“As far as the World Economic Forum is concerned, you can’t have a Great Reset if you don’t reset the food supply, because food is necessary to everybody,” he said. “Stalin recognized this: Whoever controls the food controls the people. Same with energy.”

As prices soar and farmers go bankrupt, major corporations, in league with governments and international organizations, will pick up the pieces.

In the meantime, as seen recently in Sri Lanka, hungry people pushed to the brink are likely to react.

“People were not starving on January 6,” said Burnett, referring to the Jan. 6, 2021, protest and breach at the U.S. Capitol. “The supply chain crisis is happening, shelves are already going empty, and when people are hungry, they will not sit around and do nothing.”

American Policy Center founder and President Tom DeWeese, a leading expert on and critic of U.N. notions of sustainability, warned that the war on farmers was part of a broader agenda to strip people of freedom.

“Always in the past, when tyrannical forces wanted to rule the world, they built armies and invaded, broke things, killed people, and forced subjugation,” DeWeese told The Epoch Times. “We are now dealing with a diabolical force that has figured out a way to get us to voluntarily surrender our liberties and help them subjugate us.

“What could be such a powerful tool? The threat of Environmental Armageddon,” he said, pointing to the climate-change narrative as the prime example.

Citing numerous U.N. officials and documents, DeWeese says the agenda isn’t to save the climate, but to transform the planet and centralize control over the populace.

Aside from the U.N. and the WEF, major companies such as Vanguard and BlackRock are working to take over and control the food supply, he said.

Already, a handful of companies in which those two investment firms are top shareholders dominate the global food and beverage industry. By taking over the farming, they will control it all.

“The goal is to have total control over food production,” he said, noting that they seek to own all seeds and even grow synthetic meat in facilities already being backed financially by Bill Gates and other billionaires.

Genetically engineered crops are high on the agenda, too.

The U.N., the WEF, and others are also moving forward with promoting insects and weeds as food. Across the Western world, insect protein production facilities are popping up rapidly.

But it gets even darker, DeWeese says.

“If people are starving, they are much easier to subjugate,” he said, adding that depopulation and control over humanity have been on the agenda of global elites for decades.

The “war on farmers” also comes amid what critics have described as a government-backed “war on energy” that’s affecting agriculture and virtually every other sector.

This includes limiting energy exploration, shutting down power plants, charging special fees and taxes, and other policies that have resulted in rapidly rising costs across the Western world, although not in places such as China.

The experts interviewed by The Epoch Times urged Americans to resist the war on farmers and the U.N.-backed sustainability policies using a variety of means. These include getting involved politically, adopting different shopping habits, finding alternative sources of food such as local farmers, and other measures.

Officials at the U.N. didn’t respond to requests for comment.