



## World Economic Forum Paper: Fighting Climate Change Necessary to Save “Democracy”

[A position paper](#) published by the World Economic Forum, released Monday, argued that more government action is needed to combat “climate change,” not just to avert damage to the world’s climate, but also to save democracy. The WEF insisted that the views expressed in the article “are those of the author alone and not the World Economic Forum.”

The views expressed, however, are terrifying to anyone who believes in a free market, and are quite consistent with the positions of the WEF, which are hardly friendly to limited government.



piyaset/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Klaus Schwab, the founder of the WEF, is clearly an advocate of more government control of the economy so as to protect the environment. In May of 2020, the WEF joined together with Prince Charles, the heir to the throne of England, in launching “The Great Reset” project, which has since been supported by progressive politicians all over the world, including President Joe Biden. The intention of the project, Schwab insists, is to reconsider the meaning of capitalism. He favors moving on from free-market fundamentalism toward international cooperation. Schwab is a former member of the steering committee of the Bilderberg Group, another organization of global elitists.

According to the paper, democracy has been in decline over the past 15 years, and ignoring progress toward a “low-carbon economy could put democracies in greater economic peril, not less.” The author of the article, Edward Barbier, is a professor at Colorado State University and has been promoting his radical environmental views for several years. He has been an advisor to the Green Party of Australia, and in 2009 authored the United Nations’ Global Green New Deal.

In other words, the solution to the alleged problem of climate change is more government, and not just more government, but more *world* government.

How does Barbier propose to save both the environment and democracy? “Reducing reliance on fossil fuels and transitioning to low-carbon alternatives also make democratic economies more sustainable. Major democracies should work together to achieve these two goals,” Barbier argues. “Democracy and green energy transition are linked.”

While many hear the word “democracy” and think someone is referring to the limited-government republic established by our Constitution, the word has a much more fluid meaning among those on the left. While *democracy* comes from a Greek term meaning “the people rule,” nothing could be further from the truth when it comes to the WEF.

The World Economic Forum is an international lobbying organization based in Geneva, Switzerland, founded in 1971 by Schwab, and is best known for its annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland, a mountain resort in the Alps. It is funded by 1,000 member corporations, mostly multinationals — hardly the “rule



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on July 11, 2022

---

of the people.”

Communists have long used the word “democracy” to describe their systems, but communist systems are actually oligarchies. Their concept of “democracy” is rule according to what elites think is best for the people, not by what the people think. And that rule always winds up being best for the oligarchs in power. It should also be noted that our Constitution did not establish a democracy, but rather a *republic*. The Founders were more interested in liberty than majority rule. After all, two wolves outvoting a lamb on what is for supper would be “democracy,” but it would not protect the rights of the minority lamb.

So, it should be clear that the views of this article, and the WEF that sponsored it, are hardly the views of the average people of the world.

“A clean energy transition led by major economies is essential for attaining net-zero carbon emissions by 2050, and any delay in progress over the coming years could make this target unattainable,” the article asserts. This goal is not going to be achieved by more economic freedom, but less.

“First, leading democracies should agree to end the underpricing of fossil fuels, which is the principal factor preventing a clean energy transition,” Barbier writes. By “underpricing,” he means that the “leading democracies” should “collectively commit to phasing out cost and tax breaks for the production and consumption of fossil fuels.” They should also “phase in” policies to make fossil fuel producers pay higher taxes to “cover the costs of local air pollution, global warming, and other economic damages.”

“Second, to encourage compliance by other countries,” Barbier continued, a tax should be imposed on carbon-intensive imports “to reduce the risk of unfair competition for their domestic industries.”

And third, “major democracies need to recycle the revenues saved or raised through reforming fossil fuel markets to fund additional green innovation, investments and protection.” Barbier calls for more “public investments” (i.e., government spending of taxpayer dollars) to target “‘smart’ electrical grid transmission systems, charging station networks, and making cities more sustainable.”

Barbier concedes that his scheme would lead to economic hardship for some (actually for most), but he has a plan for that, too. “Finally, additional measures may be necessary to offset any adverse economic or employment effects of a clean energy transition. This could include reducing payroll taxes, paying annual dividends, raising the minimum wage, compensating or retraining displaced workers, and allocating child tax credits to vulnerable households.”

In short, this is a redistribution of wealth and implementation of the platform of progressives in various countries, including the United States. It will result in a lower standard of living for most of the people of the world, as the energy produced by petroleum has probably done more to advance the standard of living than any other resource. Wind and solar simply cannot do that, at least under present technology.

While the WEF might protest that this article does not necessarily represent the views of the WEF, it certainly seems to be in line with the organization’s views.

The common theme is control of the general population by a global elite. Where did Klaus Schwab come up with these ideas that give control of the world population to a small oligarchy that meets at a wintertime resort in the Alps?

Schwab’s parents moved to Germany in the 1930s, so his father, Eugen Wilhelm, could become the director of Escher Wyss AG, which was a major supplier for the war effort of Adolf Hitler during World War II. The company supplied the National Socialist government with flamethrowers, and was heavily



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on July 11, 2022

---

involved in the research and development of turbines to produce heavy water for the creation of nuclear weapons for Germany.

While the son cannot be held responsible for the sins of the father, the lack of respect for the free enterprise system and liberty is a common denominator of both the Nazis and the globalist elites of the World Economic Forum.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.