

Energy as a Vehicle of Control and the War on Carbon

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

April 07, 2023

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › According to the globalists, climate change is the No. 1 threat to humanity, necessitating radical quality of life sacrifices and the total relinquishing of privacy and freedom
- › Climate change is also being used to explain away food shortages, justify the need to move people from the countrysides and suburbs into smart cities, and promote the replacement of beef with insects. The COVID-19 pandemic was even blamed on it
- › Globalists want health (which includes both medicine and food, under the new “food is medicine” agenda), climate action and energy control to be addressed not as three separate issues but as one
- › One of the globalists’ fraudulent solutions to the purported climate crisis is Environmental, Social and Corporate Governance (ESG) investing. A company’s ESG score is supposed to tell investors how socially conscious the company is, but recent scandals have revealed ESG is a scam
- › Carbon trade refers to the buying and selling of credits that allow a company to emit a certain amount of carbon dioxide. By buying credits from nonpolluters, industry can continue to pollute. Basically, like ESG investing, the carbon trade is a globalist scam intended to lower the living standards of the poor and usher humanity into carbon slavery

According to the globalists, climate change is the No. 1 threat to humanity, necessitating radical quality of life sacrifices and the total relinquishing of privacy and freedom. Germany's health minister Karl Lauterbach, for example, in December 2020

proclaimed that addressing climate change will require restrictions on personal freedom, similar to those implemented to "flatten the curve" of COVID.¹

Similarly, British economics professor Mariana Mazzucato in September 2020 warned that "In the near future, the world may need to resort to lockdowns again — this time to tackle a climate emergency."² The World Economic Forum (WEF), the United Nations and the World Health Organization have also published articles stating their intent to "fight climate change" by shutting down society.³

Climate change is also being used to explain away food shortages, justify the need to move people from the countrysides and suburbs into smart cities, and promote the replacement of beef with insects. The COVID-19 pandemic was even blamed on it.

Health, Climate and Energy To Be Addressed as One Issue

Just about anything is now being justified on the basis that it helps address climate change. Indeed, dietary controls, energy control, carbon restrictions and climate change are increasingly tied together, whether it makes sense or not, and the reason for this can be found in a September 2022 WEF article⁴ co-written by the director of WHO's Environment and Health Department. As noted in this article, titled "How to Fight the Next Threat to Our World: Air Pollution":

"[W]orld leaders must put health at the core of climate action and social equity. The fight for clean air can accelerate the reduction of climate-warming emissions, the shift to cheaper and more reliable energy sources and justice for the marginalized and most vulnerable communities ... We can confront these crises more effectively and fairly if we address them as one ..."

In other words, health (which includes both medicine and food, as government has now launched a "food is medicine" agenda), climate action and energy control are to be addressed not as three separate issues but as one. The potential implications of this are enormous.

If the WHO ends up having sole power over global health, combining health, climate and energy issues into one will automatically give the WHO the de facto power to seize control over society in general.

They could issue climate lockdowns, for example, on the basis that lockdowns reduce pollution, hence improving public health. That the WHO will jump at the opportunity to implement climate lockdowns in particular can be seen in the WHO "Manifesto for a Healthy Recovery From COVID-19," which states:⁵

"The 'lockdown' measures that have been necessary to control the spread of COVID-19 have slowed economic activity, and disrupted lives – but have also given some glimpses of a possible brighter future. In some places, pollution levels have dropped to such an extent that people have breathed clean air, or have seen blue skies and clear waters, or have been able to walk and cycle safely with their children – for the first times in their lives ...

Opinion polls from around the world show that people want to protect the environment, and preserve the positives that have emerged from the crisis, as we recover ...

Decisions made in the coming months can either "lock in" economic development patterns that will do permanent and escalating damage to the ecological systems that sustain all human health and livelihoods, or, if wisely taken, can promote a healthier, fairer, and greener world."

This manifesto also lays out many other aspects of The Great Reset agenda, including smart cities, travel restrictions, new food systems, a complete transition to green energy and more. But again, the thing that will really facilitate all of these changes is to have a centralized powerbase, and that is the WHO.

“ We're now told we have to sacrifice our standard of living because we have a responsibility to save the planet. However, 'green solutions' are a gigantic scam designed to disempower and

control everyone but the ones at the very top of the power pyramid, while accomplishing little in terms of producing a cleaner environment, let alone having a distinct effect on climate.”

The WHO could also mandate individual carbon footprint tracking,⁶ as carbon emissions are claimed to be a primary contributor to climate change. A likely argument would be "We have to rein in our personal carbon footprint because pollution is deadly, and if you don't, you're responsible for the death of others."

Sacrificing selfhood and the rights of individuals to "serve the greater good" is a hallmark call of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, and they used this "care for others" argument during COVID to pressure people into compliance with everything from lockdowns and social distancing to wearing a mask and getting the jab.

The same narrative is also being used to prop up the "climate emergency." We're now told we have to sacrifice our standard of living because we have a responsibility both for others and for the earth itself.

However, while pollution is a reality that needs to be addressed, the solution the totalitarian cabal is offering is a gigantic scam designed to disempower and control everyone but the ones at the very top of the power pyramid, while accomplishing little in terms of producing a cleaner environment, let alone having a distinct effect on climate.

The ESG Scam

One of the globalists' fraudulent solutions to the purported climate crisis is Environmental, Social and Corporate Governance (ESG) investing, first popularized in 2004.⁷ In more recent years, ESG funds have gained steam and now make up about 10% of all invested assets.⁸

A company's ESG score is supposed to tell investors how socially conscious the company is, based on its behavior within the environmental, social and corporate sphere. For example, does the company have safeguards in place to protect the environment or policies to address climate change?

How "equitable" is its relationship with employees, suppliers, customers and the local community? And how does it stack up in terms of company leadership, executive pay, audits, internal controls and shareholder rights?

Has the company taken steps to eliminate conflicts of interest that encourage self-dealing by executives? Does it conduct independent audits and is there a traceable line of fiduciary duty? And so on.

ESG investing is supposed to encourage companies to act responsibly, but it's actually having the opposite effect. Somehow or other, companies are greasing the right hands and getting great ESG ratings, only to later turn out to have the worst governance possible and/or a track record of environmental destruction.⁹

One of the latest in a long line of scandals is that of FTX, a cryptocurrency exchange that went belly up overnight while its CEO, Sam Bankman-Fried absconded with up to \$2 billion of client funds.

John Ray, the appointed CEO of FTX's bankruptcy stated: "Never in my career have I seen such a complete failure of corporate controls and such a complete absence of trustworthy financial information as occurred here."

FTX's ESG score really ought to have been nonexistent. Cryptocurrencies are extremely energy-intensive and wasteful (the "E" in the score), customer satisfaction (part of the "S" in the score) within the crypto space had been tanking for over a year, courtesy of the repeated evaporation of wealth.

As for the "G," FTX had no board of directors, an "irregular ownership structure," was rife with conflicts of interest and self-dealing, and had no financial controls whatsoever.

Bankman-Fried didn't even keep an accurate list of accounts. Yet at the time of FTX's demise, it had a higher governance score than Exxon Mobil. As reported by Forbes:¹⁰

"Of the many dimensions of the FTX fiasco, the most shocking is the comprehensive failure of corporate governance, now becoming clear as the bankruptcy process unfolds. Sloppy and likely illegal management practices at FTX have raised doubts that extend beyond the company to call into question the whole crypto premise. They also cast doubt on the integrity of the ESG rating business ...

ESG — broadly, let us call it 'virtuous investing' — is now a big business in the investment world. ESG ratings ... purport to score capitalists (i.e., private-sector profit-driven corporations) against a melange of 'goodness' indicia of all sorts. Does the company's business model help or hurt the Amazon forest?

Does the firm have enough ADA-rated bathrooms? Does it offer paternity-leave to its employees (regardless of gender)? Does it have board members who check all the right diversity boxes? ...

ESG has captivated many, on both the 'buy-side' of the market ... and on the 'sell-side' ... But ESG is still a fluid concept, and much has been made recently of the inconsistencies and discrepancies in the ratings. For many, the core of ESG is G ... Governance is the tip-of-the-spear when it comes to creating sustainable business models. It all starts from the top, which guides every other aspect all the way down ...

According to a recent academic study of six prominent ESG rating agencies ... 'ESG ratings from different providers disagree substantially...' Most of the divergence/confusion arises from differences in measurement methodology and execution. But there is also evidence of bias: 'we detect that the rater's overall view of a firm influences the measurement of specific categories' ...

The panoramic failure of FTX this month highlights a flawed governance framework, which today's simplistic virtue metrics fail to reflect accurately —

hence the absurd rankings cited for FTX vs Exxon and others."

FTX isn't alone in falling short of expectations though. According to a September 2021 report by climate change think tank InfluenceMap, more than half of the 723 funds marketed using ESG claims failed to meet the Paris Accord rules on carbon emissions and clean energy, and more than 70% of funds with broad ESG goals failed to meet global climate targets.¹¹

Similarly, a May 2021 report¹² by the Economist concluded some of the largest ESG funds in the world are "stuffed full of polluters and sin stocks." A 2019 report by the Wall Street Journal¹³ also noted, "Eight of the 10 biggest U.S. sustainable funds are invested in oil-and-gas companies, which are regularly slammed by environmental activists."

In short, the ESG investing scheme is yet another globalist scam that allows them to promote their own agenda outside of the democratic process.

Wind turbines, solar panels and electric-everything is touted as the answer to the purported climate crisis, yet most of these "green" solutions are far more environmentally destructive than oil and gas.¹⁴

Many also end up requiring more fuel rather than less. Importantly, there aren't even enough minerals in the world to allow even a single country to go 100% electric. As just one example, to replace the 31.5 million vehicles in the U.K. with electric cars will require twice the global supply of cobalt!¹⁵ The math just doesn't work.

So, are the globalists stupid? No. They're fully aware they can't replace all gas-powered cars with EVs, be it by 2030 or 2050. See, they know you won't even be allowed to travel very far by the time the EV goals and mandates go into effect, so you won't need a car in the first place.

Forcing states and countries to transition to EVs merely speeds up the end goal of preventing you from owning a car and driving anywhere. It also justifies the creation of "15-minute cities."

Farmers Are Being Pushed Into Carbon Slavery

As Vandana Shiva, Ph.D., cofounder of the Indian NGO Navdanya, has warned, we are being ushered into carbon slavery. As explained in Navdanya's report, "Earth Democracy: Connecting Rights of Mother Earth to Human Rights and Well-Being of All":¹⁶

"If 'feeding the world' through chemicals and dwarf varieties bred for chemicals was the false narrative created to impose the Green Revolution, the new false narrative is 'sustainability' and 'saving the planet.'"

In the new 'net zero' world, farmers will not be respected and rewarded as custodians of the land and caregivers ... the providers of our food and health. They will not be paid a fair and just price for growing healthy food through ecological processes, which protect and regenerate the farming systems as a whole.

They will be paid for linear extraction of fragments of the ecological functions of the system, which can be tied to the new 'net zero' false climate solution based on a fake calculus, fake science allowing continued emissions while taking control over the land of indigenous people and small farmers.

'Net Zero' is a new strategy to get rid of small farmers ... through the burden of fake carbon accounting. Carbon offsets and the new accounting trick of 'net zero' does not mean zero emissions. It means the rich polluters will continue to pollute and also grab the land and resources of those who have not polluted – indigenous people and small farmers – for carbon offsets."

Bill Gates has alluded to this double-standard in responding to those who criticize him for the hypocrisy of being a serious polluter himself, with a 66,000 square-foot mansion, a private jet, 242,000 acres of farmland and investments in fossil fuel-dependent industries such as airlines, heavy machinery and cars.¹⁷

This pollution is acceptable, Gates said, because, "I am offsetting my carbon emissions by buying clean aviation fuel, and funding carbon capture and funding low-cost housing

projects to use electricity instead of natural gas."¹⁸

Focusing solely on carbon reductionism also misses the point that lands, forests and ecosystems are more than just the carbon stored in them, and putting carbon conditions on small farmers will only make environmental injustices worse. As noted by Navdanya's report, "Conditionalities put on the nonpolluters by the polluters who want to continue to pollute is unjust and ecologically, morally and ethically bankrupt."

The Carbon Trade Scam

Carbon trade refers to the buying and selling of credits that allow a company to emit a certain amount of carbon dioxide, and by buying credits from nonpolluters, industry can continue to pollute. Basically, like ESG investing, it's nothing but a globalist scam that lowers the living standards of the poor while having no negative impact on the wealthy.

Indeed, you can be assured that the carbon restrictions that will be placed on humanity will not apply to the globalists. They can simply buy enough carbon credits to maintain their lifestyle, while the lower-, middle- and even upper classes of "regular" folk will be forced to make major sacrifices to theirs. Ultimately, carbon slavery will apply not just to farmers but to all of us, as our personal carbon footprint will be part of our social credit score.

The first credit card with a carbon-emission spending limit was introduced in April 2019. As explained by the World Economic Forum,¹⁹ "Everything we put in our shopping basket comes at an environmental cost ... Swedish fintech company Doconomy has launched a new credit card that monitors the carbon footprint of its customers — and cuts off their spending when they hit their carbon max." Isn't that nice? They're helping you do your part to save the planet!

Or are they? "Helpful" tools like this will ultimately become tools for control. Eventually, your carbon footprint will dictate what you can eat and wear, where you can live and how far you can travel, and you won't even need a special credit card. Meanwhile, there will be plenty of loopholes for the rich.

ESG, the carbon trade and personal carbon footprint tracking will all become barriers of entry — a way to keep the peons out of the rich boys' club. Needless to say, rigged schemes like ESG and the carbon trade also make it difficult for startup companies to compete, which will facilitate consolidation of companies and industries into mega-monopolies.

Last but not least, the focus on carbon emissions has made the world turn a blind eye to other far more harmful kinds of pollution, such as dioxin — thought to be the most toxic molecule on Earth — which in March 2023 was allowed to contaminate huge areas of Ohio without government lifting a finger to address it.²⁰

[Login](#) or [Join](#) to comment on this article