



Seizing Everything: The Theft of the Global Commons – Part 2

In [Part 1](#) we explored the ongoing process of defining of the *global commons* and the claim of the [stakeholder capitalists](#) they they should be the "trustees" both of the commons and society. We are now going to look at how systems have been established to enable those *stakeholders* to seize them.

We should be mindful of what "*global commons*" means for the [Global Public Private Partnership](#) (GPPP). For them it means possession of everything: every resource on the planet, all land, all water, the air we breath and the natural world in its entirety, including all of us.

Principles of the Global Commons

The notion of the "*global commons*" sprang from an amalgam of two principles in International Law. The Tragedy of The Commons (ToC) and the Common Heritage of Mankind (CHM).

In his 1968 [paper on the ToC](#), the U.S. ecologist and eugenicist Garrett Hardin, building upon the earlier work of the 19th century economist William Forster Lloyd, outlined the population and resource problems as he saw them. He said "*a finite world can support only a finite population; therefore, population growth must eventually equal zero.*"

While logically this is ultimately true, if a whole raft of assumptions are accepted, the point at which zero population growth becomes necessary is unknown. The evidence suggests we are [nowhere near that limit](#). Eugenicists, like Hardin, have claimed and continue to claim that the Earth faces a population problem. There is no evidence to support their view.

Hardin theorised that when a resource, such as land, is shared in "*common*," people acting in rational self-interest will tend to increase their use of that resource because the cost is spread among all. He called this type of thinking a *tragedy* because, if all act accordingly, he maintained that the resource would dwindle to nothing and everyone suffer as a result.

Hardin insisted that this *tragedy* could not be averted. Therefore, as human beings were, in his eyes, incapable of grasping the bigger picture, the solutions were "*managed*" access to resources and "*population control*."

While Hardin's elitist ToC concept suggested regulated, enclosed (private) access to "*common*" resources, the Common Heritage of Mankind (CHM) rejected the idea of enclosure (privatisation). CHM instead advocated that a *special group* should be created by international treaty as "*trustees*" of the global commons. Seen as more "*progressive*," it was no less elitist than Hardin's concept.

The philosophical concept of CHM emerged onto the global political stage in the 1950's but it was [the 1967 speech](#) by the Maltese ambassador to the U.N., Arvid Pardo, which established it as a principle of *global governance*. This eventually led to the 1982 [U.N. Convention on Law of the Sea](#) (LOSC).

Citing the CHM, in Article 137(2) of the LOSC, the U.N. declared:

"All rights in the resources of the Area are vested in mankind as a whole, on whose behalf the Authority shall act."

That "*Area*", in this case, was the the Earth's oceans, including everything in and beneath them. The "*authority*" was defined in Section 4 as the [International Seabed Authority](#) (ISA). Article 137(2) of the LOSC is self contradictory.

The [legal definition](#) of "*vested*" implies that the whole of humanity, without exception, has an absolute right to access the *global commons*. In this instance, those commons were the oceans. While the legal definition speaks of ownership, "*vested*" seems to guarantee the no one can lay any individual claim to *ownership* of the oceans or its resources. Access is equally shared by all.

Supposedly, this alleged right can never be "*defeated by a condition precedent*." This is repudiated entirely by "*on whose behalf the Authority shall act*."

Who among the billions of Earth's inhabitants gave the ISA this alleged authority? When were we asked if we wanted to cede our collective responsibility for the oceans to the ISA?

This authority was seized by U.N. diktat and nothing more. It is now the ISA who, *by a condition precedent*, control, limit and license our access to the oceans.

This is the essential deception at the heart of GPPP's "*global commons*" paradigm. They sell their theft as stewardship of the resources vested in all humanity, while simultaneously seizing the entirety of those resources for themselves.

Seizing The Global Commons: The Oceans

When interpreted by International Law, the CHM appears to place the private ownership of the *global commons*, suggested by the ToC, beyond the reach of government stakeholder *partners*. They should have no more right to these riches than anyone else. Legal challenge to any claim should be a relatively straight forward process for any concerned individual or group minded to make one.

This is not even a remote possibility. International Law, as it pertains to the *global commons*, is a meaningless jumble of inconsistencies and contradictions that ultimately amounts to "*might is right.*" For anyone to challenge the GPPP's claim they would need to retain a legal team capable of defeating the U.N.'s and a judiciary willing to find in their favour.

The "*law*" is ostensibly designed to leave us imagining that we have "*protected*" rights and responsibilities towards these shared resources. Whereas, if subjected to any reasonable scrutiny, the legal notion of the *global commons* looks more like a diversion to facilitate a robbery.

If we look at the ISA's record of [stakeholder engagement](#) we quickly find their [Strategic Plan for 2019 - 2020](#). This succinctly outlines how the scam operates:

"In an ever-changing world, and in its role as custodian of the common heritage of mankind, ISA faces many challenges.. The United Nations has adopted a new development agenda, entitled 'Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.'.. Of most relevance to ISA is SDG 14 — Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources."

The shared resource - global commons - of the Earth's oceans are not freely accessible to humanity as a whole any more. Rather, the ISA determine who gets access to oceanic resources based upon Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Effectively they have turned access to the *global commons* into a new market.

The most vital questions we must ask is how these allocation decisions are made and by whom. This will reveal who controls these new highly regulated markets. The ISA state:

"States parties, sponsoring States, flag States, coastal States, State enterprises, private investors, other users of the marine environment and interested global and regional intergovernmental organizations. All have a role in the development, implementation and enforcement of rules and standards for activities in the Area"

In addition, the ISA will:

"Strengthen cooperation and coordination with other relevant international organizations and stakeholders in order to.. effectively safeguard the legitimate interests of members of ISA and contractors.. The rules, regulations and procedures

governing mineral exploitation.. are underpinned by sound commercial principles in order to promote investment.. taking into account trends and developments relating to deep seabed mining activities, including objective analysis of world metal market conditions and metal prices, trends and prospects.. based on consensus.. that allows for stakeholder input in appropriate ways."

The Global Public Private Partnership (GPPP) of governments, global corporations (other users of the marine environment), their major shareholders (private investors) and philanthropic foundations (private investors) are the *stakeholders*. They, not us, will have an *input* to ensure the *rules, regulations and procedures* will *promote investment* that will *safeguard their interests*.

In the space of a few short decades, broad concepts have evolved into principles of International Law which have subsequently been applied to create a regulatory framework for controlled access to the all the resources in the oceans. What was once genuinely a global resource is now the sole province of the GPPP and its network of *stakeholder capitalists*.

The Global Commons Are Global

We should be wary of falling into the trap of thinking the GPPP comprises solely of the western hegemony. The stories we are fed about the global confrontation between superpowers are often superficial.

While there are undoubtedly tensions within the GPPP, as each player jostles for a bigger slice of the new markets, the GPPP network itself is a truly global collaboration. This doesn't mean that conflict between nation states is impossible but, as ever, any such conflict will be fought for a reason absent from [the official explanation](#).

SDG's led to [net zero policies](#) and they stipulate, among a swath of enforced changes, the end of petrol and diesel transport. We are all under orders to switch to electric vehicles (EVs) which the vast majority won't be able to afford. In turn, this means a massive increase in demand for lithium-ion batteries.

Manufacturing these will require a lot more cobalt which is widely considered to be the [most critical supply chain risk](#) for producing EVs. The World Bank estimate that the growth in demand for cobalt between 2018 and 2050 will be somewhere [in the region of 450%](#). To say this is a "*market opportunity*" is a massive understatement.

The ISA have granted [5 cobalt exploration contracts](#) to JOGMEC (Japan), COMRA (China), Russia, the Republic of Korea and CPRM (Brazil). When located deposits become commercially viable, as they undoubtedly will, the corporate [feeding frenzy](#) can begin.

Corporations, such as the weapons manufacturer Lockheed Martin, with its wholly owned subsidiary [UK Seabed Resources](#) (UKSR), are also among the many ISA stakeholders. UKSR received their exploration license for the [South Pacific in 2013](#). As an ISA exploration *contractor*, UKSR stakeholders are free to submit their recommendations for amendments to the ISA regulations governing their own mining operations.

For example, the ISA stated that mining corporations should provide a financial guarantee that would cover "*unexpected costs, expenses and liabilities.*" Lockheed Martin didn't like this at all and so suggested a slight change. They [recommended the addition](#) of the following:

"The Guarantee is not to cover costs, expenses and liabilities incurred as a result of tortious liability for environmental damage."

This was presumably because, in their pursuit of SDG "*protection*" of the planet, Lockheed Martin don't wish to be liable for the environmental damage they will inflict upon it in the process. This risk of this is high because the proposed method for "*scraping the seabed*" will [almost certainly destroy it](#).

Fortunately for UKSR and other *stakeholders* like COMRA, the ISA's is committed to regulations which promote *sound commercial principles* and *safeguard their commercial interests*. Destroying the seabed is a risk worth taking but not if you have to pay for it.

When it comes to fighting *climate change*, human life is even cheaper. Nearly all cobalt is currently mined from Africa's copper belt and more than 60% of the world supply comes from the [Democratic Republic of the Congo](#). It is clawed from the Earth by [tens of thousands of child slaves](#).

This poisonous torture dramatically shortens the abject misery of their suffering on this Earth. However, it does mean other young people like Greta Thunberg can inspire more fortunate children to mobilise on social media, using [their fully charged devices](#), to save the planet.

Only the commercial viability of deep sea reserves seems capable of saving the cobalt mine slaves. Alas, it is difficult to envisage how deep sea reserves will become viable until land based reserves near exhaustion.

This openly condoned child abuse has been ongoing for years. A fact which the [world's media admits](#) but never mentions when it eulogises about the *green revolution*.

The estimated 94,000 tonnes of cobalt in the Clarion Clipperton Zone (CCZ) of the Eastern Pacific alone represents 6 times the known land based reserves. With total deep sea reserves estimated to be worth [between \\$8 - \\$16 trillion](#), as we progress towards a carbon neutral economy, deep sea mining [is an inevitability](#). Regardless of the environmental cost.

All the real environmental issues are to be ignored as the world embarks upon a transition to a new global economy based upon one highly questionable theory: namely anthropogenic global warming (AGW).

The Global Commons New Market(s)

This transition to the green economy will see myriad new markets created as the Earth's "*common*" resources are converted into proverbial investment gold mines. Cobalt scraped from the seabed is just one example, there are thousands more.

The GPPP will have exclusive access, and thus control, over these new, essential resources. The investment opportunities are endless. It is this prospect, not any concerns for the Earth or humanity, that is driving the seizure of the *global commons*.

The GPPP have recognised that if they can squeeze something into the "*global commons*" they can then control of it. Consequently, the list of alleged "*commons*" continues to grow, as the the GPPP seek more control over more of the planet and everything on it.

In 1996 the late John Perry Barlow, from the Electronic Freedom Foundation, presented a [Declaration for the Independence of Cyberspace](#) to the annual Davos conference of the World Economic Forum (WEF). It is perhaps seems odd that the GPPP wanted to hear this radical, libertarian call for governments around the world to leave cyberspace unregulated.

However, as I stress in [my book Pseudopandemic](#), the intent of ideas, political and economic philosophies or social doctrines is not what interests the GPPP. Rather, it is how those ideologies can be exploited to achieve their goals.

In making his address Barlow was, perhaps inadvertently, laying the groundwork to include cyberspace [as part of the "*global commons*."](#) As we shall discuss shortly, the GPPP already had a plan in place to appropriate everything defined as a *global commons*. It was this prospect which enthralled the assembled Davos (GPPP) crowd.

In their [2015 Davos executive summary](#) the WEF illustrated how the GPPP manipulate narratives to reshape the context of our daily lives. In this case, the objective was to institute the precepts for their claimed jurisdiction of cyberspace.

"What is clear is that we are confronted by profound political, economic, social and, above all, technological transformations.. resulting in an entirely 'new global context' for future decision-making.. The World Economic Forum's Annual Meeting provides an unparalleled platform for leaders to develop the necessary insights, ideas and partnerships to respond to this new context.. Based on the principle that a multistakeholder, systemic and future-oriented approach is essential in this new context, the issues to be addressed through sessions, taskforces and private meetings at the Annual Meeting 2015 include.. The inability to significantly improve the management and governance of critical global commons, most notably natural resources and cyberspace."

We have considered the example of the oceans and their resources, but the process for creating a regulated markets for all *commons* is the same. First something must be levered into the category of the *global commons*. Once declared to be among the "*shared resources all life relies upon*," some GPPP quango is appointed to oversee access to the new regulated market. This body will be formed to serve the *stakeholders capitalists* who will then have exclusive access to and control of that resource.

In accordance with the [U.N. definition](#) "*stewardship of the global commons cannot be carried out without global governance.*" Global governance is formally convened via the process of stealing the global commons. The entire operation is founded upon sustainable development.

The Agendas For Sustainable Global Commons

As mentioned previously, this plan has been in-place for decades. [Sustainable Development Goals](#) (SDGs) are set in [Agenda 2030](#) as way-points along the path to completion of the plan for the 21st century: [Agenda 21](#).

When GPPP stakeholders say they are committed to SDG's they mean Agenda 2030, in the short term, and ultimately Agenda 21. Agenda 21 has a lot to say about what it calls "*human settlements*." It lays out how they will be planned, constructed and managed by a public-private partnership. However, in constructing human settlements, human beings do not appear very high on the priority list.

Objective 5.29 states:

"In formulating human settlements policies, account should be taken of resource needs, waste production and ecosystem health."

Resource allocation, waste management and environmental protections are the prerequisites for "*human settlements*." Not the welfare of humanity.

The GPPP will oversee the construction or allocation of our settlements. Objective 7.30. d. states:

"Encourage partnerships among the public, private and community sectors in managing land resources for human settlements development."

All land, not just the *commons*, will be managed by the GPPP. Again, subsequent Agenda 2030 SDGs have provided the justification for the land grab.

Objective 10 of Agenda 21 states:

"The broad objective is to facilitate allocation of land to the uses that provide the greatest sustainable benefits and to promote the transition to a sustainable and integrated management of land resources"

Clearly this raises issues of private land ownership and use. Not just among householders but by industry, farmers, train companies or any other private land owner. The trick in holding on to land will be to secure its designation as having a "*sustainable*" purpose. This allocation will need to be agreed by the GPPP, so friends in high places will be key.

Agenda 21 demands, under "*Activities*" in section 7.29, that all nations must develop:

"A comprehensive national inventory of their land resources in order to establish a land information system in which land resources will be classified according to their most appropriate uses and environmentally fragile or disaster-prone areas will be identified for special protection measures."

If the place where you live is deemed to be *environmentally fragile*, and we are told the whole planet is, then the GPPP will follow section 7.30. h and implement:

"Practices that deal comprehensively with potentially competing land requirements for agriculture, industry, transport, urban development, green spaces, preserves and other vital needs."

This will involve the creation of *"protected areas."* Among many of their authoritarian powers, this means that the GPPP will have control of all drinking water. Water sources automatically become *"protected areas"* under Agenda 21, for the good of our *"health."*

Activity 18.50 it states:

"All States, according to their capacity and available resources, and through bilateral or multilateral cooperation, including the United Nations and other relevant organizations as appropriate, could implement the following activities:.. Establishment of protected areas for sources of drinking-water supply."

By exploiting the deception of *"sustainable development"* a planetary system of global governance, under the auspices of the GPPP, is currently being established. This is *"build back better,"* the *"Great Reset,"* the *"Green New Deal"* or whatever the GPPP choose to sell it as.

It means GPPP dominion over absolutely everything. We truly will own nothing, although it seems unlikely that many of us will be happy about it.

Those who do not understand, or do not wish to admit the reality of this global coup d'état, are quick to point out that Agenda 21 - and 2030 - are not legislation. Nation states are not compelled to go along with any of it. This observation fails to appreciate what *"global governance"* is.

Global governance is not the setting of either policy or legislation. It is the creation of policy agendas which individual nation states may or may not implement as policy or subsequent legislation. It can only have teeth if nation states comply.

The problem we face is that nation states are *"partner organisation,"* some might say junior partners, within the GPPP. While they remain sovereign entities they do not act as such. We only need look at how global markets are created by Agenda 21 to see how all nation states have willingly collaborated in the sustainable development scam.

In Agenda 21 the declared *"Basis for Action"* at section 8.41 states:

"A first step towards the integration of sustainability into economic management is the establishment of better measurement of the crucial role of the environment as a source of natural capital.. A common framework needs to be developed whereby the contributions made by all sectors and activities of society, that are not included in the conventional national accounts, are included.. A programme to develop national systems of integrated environmental and economic accounting in all countries is proposed."

The clearly stated plan, written in 1992, was to create *"natural capital"* to shift *"sustainability into economic management."* All sectors and all society will be involved in this effort to transform nature into economic capital.

This will include the oversight of the *"activities of society,"* such as our use of cyberspace, which are *"not included in the conventional national accounts."* The *global commons* in other words.

It doesn't matter if Agenda 21 (2030) has legislative authority or not. All that matters is the complicity of legislative authorities. They are in full compliance.

Agenda 21 proposed the development of "*national systems of integrated environmental and economic accounting in all countries.*" This was envisaged to complete the transformation of the Earth and all of its natural resources into a centralised system of economic control.

As Whitney Webb explored in her excellent article, [Wall Street's Takeover of Nature Advances with Launch of New Asset Class](#) that is precisely what has happened. By once again misusing the concept of the *global commons*, the GPPP has created Natural Asset Companies (NACs). These will allegedly:

"Preserve and restore the natural assets that ultimately underpin the ability for there to be life on Earth."

This allusion to caring for the *global commons* all sounds wonderful but when we consider its impact upon the oceans depths, for example, it is really just the creation of new markets. Concern for environmental destruction barely registers.

The Metrics of the Global Commons

Clearly, the objective of NACs is to secure GPPP stakeholder's exclusive access to resources which, hitherto, weren't "*owned*" by anyone. Michael Blaugrund, the Chief Operating Officer of the New York Stock Exchange, [admitted as much](#):

"Our hope is that owning a natural asset company is going to be a way that an increasingly broad range of investors have the ability to invest in something that's intrinsically valuable, but, up to this point, was really excluded from the financial markets."

To put this into perspective, the current, total [GDP of the whole planet](#) is approximately \$94 trillion. By converting the Earth into an asset portfolio, nature is [projected to be worth](#) \$4000 trillion. More than 40 times world GDP. Needless to say, this is one hell of an investment opportunity.

The transformation of the global economy is well underway. The entire GPPP is, understandably, committed to the project. What disagreements that exist only extend to who gets what. There is no opposition to the new global economic model. As Webb pointed out:

"The ultimate goal of NACs is not sustainability or conservation – it is the financialization of nature, i.e. turning nature into a commodity that can be used to keep the current, corrupt Wall Street economy booming under the guise of protecting the environment and preventing its further degradation."

NACs will enable investors to acquire assets primarily in developing nations, as multinational corporations and financial funds Hoover up former *global commons* and other resources. However the *financialization of nature* is global, transforming the Globe into a bull market.

This will be achieved using [Stakeholder Capitalism Metrics](#). Assets will be rated using environmental, social and governance (ESG) benchmarks for [sustainable business performance](#). Any business requiring market finance, perhaps through issuing [climate bonds](#), or maybe [green bonds](#) for European ventures, will need those bonds to have a healthy [ESG rating](#).

A low ESG rating will deter investors and the project or business venture won't get off the ground. A high ESG rating will [see investors rush](#) to put their money in projects which are backed by international agreements. In combination, financial initiatives like NACs and ESGs are converting SDG's into market regulations.

This centralises authority over the global economy, placing it in the hands of the GPPP. Speaking in July 2019, then Governor of the Bank of England (BoE) and soon to be U.N. special envoy for Climate Action, Mark Carney, simply stated:

"Companies that ignore climate change and don't adapt will go bankrupt without question."

Later, speaking at [the Green Horizons Summit](#) in November 2020, jointly hosted by The City of London Corporation, the Green Finance Institute and the World Economic Forum, Carney, acting in another role as UK Prime Ministerial Finance Adviser on COP26, said:

"Transition plans will reveal the leaders and laggards on the road to Glasgow.. We will not get to net zero in a niche, it requires a whole economy transition."

The *leaders* in the new global economy will be those selected by the GPPP through the appropriate rating of their issued securities. The *laggards* will be weeded out via the same mechanism. They *will go bankrupt without question*.

All business, not just global corporations, will be required to *"adapt"* to the new SDG based economic system. This isn't some projection of what the future global economy will look like, it has already happened. While the world has been obsessing over the *pseudopandemic* the GPPP has initiated a global revolution.

At the eventual COP26 summit in Glasgow, Mark Carney, allegedly speaking as the U.N. envoy - or perhaps as a [Board Trustee of the World Economic Forum](#), it's hard to say - launched something he called GFANZ:

"The architecture of the global financial system has been transformed to deliver net zero. We now have the essential plumbing in place to move climate change from the fringes to the forefront of finance so that every financial decision takes climate change into account ... [This] rapid, and large-scale, increase in capital commitment to net zero, through GFANZ, makes the transition to a 1.5C world possible."

The UK Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rishi Sunak, followed up Carney's statement with the declaration of the [Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero](#) (GFANZ). The plan is to initially *"align,"* (force) 40% of the world's current financial assets, amounting to \$130 trillion, to commit to the transition towards a *decarbonised* global economy. The UK government press release reported:

"The UK has convened over 30 advanced and developing countries from across 6 continents and representing over 70% of global GDP to back the creation of a new global

climate reporting standards by the IFRS Foundation to give investors the information they need to fund net zero."

All this is necessary, according to Carney, Sunak and all the other GPPP *leaders*, to control the Earth's climate. They really imagine, or rather want you to imagine, that they can tweak the temperature of the Earth by centralising their authority over the world's economy.

As Whitney Webb [accurately observed](#) on Twitter:

"If you are going to trust billionaires and bankers (who have created the environmental crises) to design a brand-new economic system because you think they care about the environment, you might as well hand them your brain in a bag."

Global Governance of Everything

GFANZ is largely based upon double accounting and [financial slight of hand](#). There isn't really any commitment to actually reducing GHG emissions. The major banks will still be [free to invest in fossil fuels](#) while it remains profitable.

Once again the mainstream critics, or at least those reported by the financial MSM, utterly fail to understand what they are looking at. They fantasise that it is all about "*saving the planet*" or creating a greener economy for the good of all.

It is not, and it never was. It is about centralising financial and economic power.

It doesn't matter if the numbers don't add up. The real environmental impact is totally irrelevant. All that matters is that a mechanism is created by which the upper echelons of the GPPP hierarchy can firstly rescue and then extend their authority and control. That is the primary objective and until the pet economists and media commentators grasp this, they will never see that which is staring them in the face.

Presumably they still believe it is just an incalculable coincidence that this transformation has occurred just in time to save the failed IMFS (international monetary and financial system.) The GPPP have simply struck lucky. Saving the planet just happens to require exactly the same economic and financial restructuring needed to cover up the complete collapse of their former control structure.

At the 2019 annual [G7 bankers symposium](#) in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, just four months before the first cases of COVID 19 were reported, the second largest investment management firm in the world, BlackRock, presented their report [Dealing With The Next Downturn](#) to the gathered G7 central bankers. They reported:

"Unprecedented policies will be needed to respond to the next economic downturn. Monetary policy is almost exhausted as global interest rates plunge towards zero or below. Fiscal policy on its own will struggle to provide major stimulus in a timely fashion given high debt levels and the typical lags with implementation.. Conventional and unconventional monetary policy works primarily through the stimulative impact of lower short-term and long-term interest rates. This channel is almost tapped out."

Unable to either spend or tax their way out of trouble, BlackRock admitted that, for the GPPP, the existing IMFS was a finished. This was the source of their power and therefore, if they were to retain their "authority," a new system was required.

Mark Carney, on this occasion speaking as the governor of the BoE, [affirmed BlackRock's assessment](#):

"Most fundamentally, a destabilising asymmetry at the heart of the IMFS is growing.. a multi-polar global economy requires a new IMFS to realise its full potential. That won't be easy.. the deficiencies of the IMFS have become increasingly potent. Even a passing acquaintance with monetary history suggests that this centre won't hold.. I will close by adding urgency.. Let's end the malign neglect of the IMFS and build a system worthy of the diverse, multipolar global economy that is emerging."

All agreed that a new IMFS was urgently needed. There was no time left to lose. In their paper BlackRock suggested that the new financial order could be created by "going direct:"

"Going direct means the central bank finding ways to get central bank money directly in the hands of public and private sector spenders.. enforcing policy coordination so that the fiscal expansion does not lead to an offsetting increase in interest rates."

This was a revolutionary concept. Central banks theoretically served solely as the bank for commercial banks and government. Their *official* role was to invest in government bonds and manage settlements between commercial banks using central banks reserves called "base money." The money you and I use every day is "broad money." It had always circulated in the economy separately from *base money*.

Base money had never before been used to directly stimulate or manipulate broad money markets (in theory). With their *going direct* plan BlackRock were suggesting a mechanism by which it could. Effectively placing central banks in charge (*enforcing policy coordination*) of government fiscal policy: government taxation and spending.

Going direct represents a fundamental change in the nature of our political systems. It suggests that elected governments are no longer in charge of spending. It appears to be the establishment of taxation without representation: the end of any notion of democracy.

BlackRock added that going direct would be required if an "*unusual conditions*" arose. The *center couldn't hold*, an extraordinary catalyst was needed to bring about the transformation.

In yet another remarkable and, for the GPPP, incredibly fortuitous coincidence, the U.S. "repo market" floundered [just a month later](#). This delivered the necessary *unusual condition*, triggering BlackRock's plan.

Things became extremely *unusual* just a few months later as the world was plunged into a global *pseudopandemic*. In response, by March 2020, *going direct* [went into overdrive](#).

BlackRock said that *going direct* would only be required while the "*unusual condition*" persisted, although the nature of the arrangement would require a "*permanent set-up*." Once fiscal policy objectives were achieved, which were also monetary policy objectives,

the temporary *permanent set-up* could then move on to the "*exit strategy*" placed on the "*policy horizon*".

We now know what that policy horizon is. It is the transformation of the IMFS, the seizure of the *global commons*, the *financialization* of nature and the establishment of a central financial body that rules it all. This process is more commonly referred to a "*sustainable development*" or the construction of the [green economy](#).

One Ring To Rule Them All

Prior to his GFANZ proclamation, in November 2020, Rishi Sunak stated that the UK intended to issue the world's first [sovereign green bond](#). The UK Government decreed that it would make reporting to the [Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures](#) (TCFD) mandatory for all UK businesses by 2025. Sunak added that this would *encourage* investment in new technologies "*like stablecoins and Central Bank Digital Currencies*".

The UK Government added:

"The UK will become the first country in the world to make Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) aligned disclosures fully mandatory across the economy by 2025 ... The UK will also implement a green taxonomy — a common framework for determining which activities can be defined as environmentally sustainable."

The UK government's pretence that it was in control of this initiative was comical. The *Stakeholder Capitalism Metrics* which determine ESG asset ratings, and the development of NACs, aren't managed by the UK, U.S. or any other elected government. These financial levers are firmly rooted in the private sector.

GPPP leaders like the [Bank for International Settlements](#), national central banks, BlackRock, Vanguard and WEF *partners* like Deloitte, PwC, McKinsey and KPMG are controlling these investment strategies. Governments are just junior, facilitating *partners* in the [Global Public-Private Partnership](#).

The TCFDs are evaluated in response to a company's "*sustainability report*." According to the [Financial Stability Board](#) (FSB), the sustainability report "*describes a company's or organization's impact on society, often addressing environmental, social, and governance issues*."

The TDFD assessment determines the ESG rating of its assets. This will be the deal maker, or breaker, whenever it wants to raise capital investment.

The *sustainability report* standards are set by the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) foundation. The IFRS foundation states that it is a non profit, public-interest organisation.

It sets agreed accountancy standards in 140 jurisdictions for both public and private organisations. Its jurisdictions include the U.S., the EU, the UK, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, China and Russia.

However its claim to operate in the "public interest" is not supported by its own statements. The IFRS foundation also reports:

"IFRS Standards are set by the International Accounting Standards Board and are used primarily by publicly accountable companies—those listed on a stock exchange and by financial institutions, such as banks."

The [International Accountancy Standards Board](#) (IASB) is a private-sector organisation. Currently 12 people supposedly decide upon the IFRS standards which stipulate the *sustainability report* requirements for businesses and other organisations, [including governments](#), across the planet.

Under the chairmanship of Mark Carney - he's a busy man - the Financial Stability Board (FSB) [created the TCFD in 2015](#):

"The Financial Stability Board (FSB) announced today it is establishing an industry-led disclosure task force on climate-related financial risks.. The Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) will develop voluntary, consistent climate-related financial risk disclosures for use by companies in providing information to lenders, insurers, investors and other stakeholders."

Five years later it was again Carney who, knowing that the "center cannot hold," announced the consolidation and unification of the whole system at the COP26 summit. In line with GFANZ, the IFRS announced the next step in the process, with the creation of its [International Sustainability Standards Board](#) (ISSB.) The head auditor at PwC, Hemione Hudson, said:

"The launch today of the International Sustainability Standards Board is an important step towards achieving a global common approach to ESG related disclosure standards. Harnessing the power of the financial markets to play a leading role in the transition to a net zero economy.. Reporting standards are a critical component to achieving this"

We can now see how the whole system will work.

Every business, every project they wish to embark upon, every initiative they plan and every policy they pursue must adhere to SDGs. Their compliance to the agreed agenda will be measured via their "sustainability report."

The Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) will judge their performance. Their ESG subcommittees, such as the International Sustainability Standards Board, will approve the relevant ESG rating for that business.

The private investment ratings agencies like Deloitte, who are "members" of the IFRS and, by definition, the GPPP, will effectively control every business's investment strategy and thus their operations. Deep sea mining, cybersecurity, digital currency innovation, exploitation of the *global commons* and anything else ordained as "sustainable" will receive the corresponding ESG rating.

All of this is centrally controlled through the TCFD system, operated by the FSB. They will be able to select who prospers and who doesn't. The FSB secretariat is "hosted" and funded by the [Bank for International Settlements](#) (BIS) and is based at BIS headquarters in Basel, Switzerland.

Not only are the central banks, under the authority of the BIS, *going direct* and funding global fiscal policy, they are intent upon controlling all business, all commerce and all finances. They are seizing the global commons, financializing nature and moving beyond the old IMFS to establish true global governance.

If we don't act. If we simply allow the puppets in our so-called governments to maintain their GPPP positions then the BIS, the central banks and other "*valued stakeholders*" are going to seize everything on this Earth. We will be beholding to them for the resources that "*all life relies upon.*"

If we allow that to happen then, just like the forgotten souls abandoned to the brutality of the cobalt mines, we will all be slaves.

If you value my work please consider [supporting In This Together](https://in-this-together.com/donorsupport/)

[Support page url - <https://in-this-together.com/donorsupport/>]

