Global Technocracy And The ‘Great Reset’ Is Coming Like A Bullet Train

This important book review by Steven Guinness (UK) reveals the same old language of ‘interdependence’, collaboration and cooperation that was heard from the Trilateral Commission in 1973. The then-and-now goal is Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy, and will result in the biggest resource grab in the history of the world. ▶ TN Editor

A few weeks after the World Economic Forum launched their ‘Great Reset’ initiative, it was followed up with the release of a new book titled, ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’, authored by the executive chairman of the WEF, Klaus Schwab, and Senior Director of the Global Risk Network at the institution, Thierry Malleret.

Having read the book I wanted to share with you some initial thoughts on the potential significance of the publication.

As touched upon in my last article, there are 5 planks to the Great Reset - economic, societal, geopolitical, environmental and technological - all
of which the book covers in detail. But I want to focus largely on the conclusion, as it is here where the author’s motivations and rationale for championing a Great Reset, in the wake of Covid-19, become clearer.

Schwab and Malleret characterise the future direction of the world as *The Post Pandemic Era*, a phrase that is repeated ad nauseam throughout. Rather than define it to a particular outcome, the authors opt instead to ask whether this new era will be marked by more or less cooperation between nations. Will countries turn inward resulting in the growth of nationalism and protectionism, or will they sacrifice their own interests for greater interdependence?

No firm prediction is made either way, but we do manage to gain a degree of insight into the authors’ way of thinking when they discuss what they call *the direction of the trend.* They write that concerns over the environment (primarily through the prism of climate change) and the advancement of technology (integral to the Fourth Industrial Revolution) were pervasive long before Covid-19 entered the picture. With the economic and health implications of the lockdowns now ingrained within society, Schwab and Malleret contend that long established worries amongst citizens ‘have been laid bare for all to see’ and ‘amplified’ because of the pandemic. In other words, if minds were not concentrated on the problems and threats the world faced before Covid-19, then they certainly are now.

And whilst the direction of these trends on the environment and technology may not have changed, with the onset of Covid-19 it ‘got a lot faster.’ It is why Schwab and Malleret believe that these two issues in particular ‘will force their way onto the political agenda’ due to increasing public pressure. A movement such as Extinction Rebellion is one example. Another is the rapid growth of the Fintech community which is leading people to question what constitutes money ‘in the digital age.’

As for where they see things going in the future, the suggestion is that current trends are pointing towards a world that will be ‘less open and less cooperative than before the pandemic.’
Effectively, the WEF have presented the world with two potential outcomes. The first is that the Great Reset can be achieved relatively peacefully with nations acquiescing to the objectives being pushed by global planners. The second outcome, they warn, would be far more disruptive and damaging. It would come about through countries failing to address the ‘deep rooted ills of economies and societies’, which could see a reset being ‘imposed by violent shocks like conflicts and even revolutions.’

And, apparently, we do not have much time to decide our fate. What we have now, according to the authors, is ‘a rare and narrow window of opportunity to reflect, re-imagine and reset our world’. If a ‘proper reset’ is to be realised, it can only occur through an increased level of collaboration and cooperation between nations. As Schwab and Malleret see it, the alternative is a world entrenched in perpetual crisis which would eventually lead to the disintegration of the post World War Two ‘rules based global order’ and a global power vacuum.

There is, therefore, a very real risk of the world becoming ‘more divided, nationalistic and prone to conflicts than it is today.’

One thing the authors do write on from a position of clarity is that never can the world return to normal. Or more to the point, be allowed to return to normal. Their view is that before Covid-19 took hold, a ‘broken sense of normalcy prevailed’. The situation now is that the virus ‘marks a fundamental inflection point in our global trajectory.’ In a very short space of time it ‘magnified the fault lines that beset our economies and societies’.

If it was not already obvious, then the authors confirm over the last few pages of the book that the United Nations’ Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development programme is intertwined with the Great Reset. This is evident when studying the WEF’s Strategic Intelligence unit. Sustainable Development and the Great Reset go hand in hand.

For Agenda 2030 to be implemented successfully, Schwab and Malleret offer an alternative to the possibility of countries failing to come together. As you might expect, it revolves around collaboration and
cooperation. In their eyes no progress can otherwise be made. Covid-19 offers the opportunity to ‘**embed greater societal equality and sustainability into the recovery**’. And, crucially, this would ‘**accelerate rather than delay progress towards 2030 Sustainable Development Goals**’.

But it does not end simply with the full implementation of Agenda 2030. Schwab and Malleret want to go further. Their aim is that the open exposure of weaknesses within existing global infrastructure ‘**may compel us to act faster by replacing failed institutions, processes and rules with new ones that are better suited to current and future needs**.’ To convey the importance of this statement, the authors state that this alone is ‘**the essence of the Great Reset**’. What they appear to be seeking is global transformation where systems and the age of the algorithm take precedent over political institutions. We are already beginning to see moves by major global institutions like the Trilateral Commission, the World Trade Organisation and the European Union to ‘**reform**’ and ‘**rejuvenate**’ both their work and membership. Covid-19 has undoubtedly straightened the hand of global planners and their quest for reformation.

As ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ was published, it was accompanied by an article written by Schwab and Malleret. Called, ‘**COVID-19’s legacy: This is how to get the Great Reset right**’, they stated plainly that not only will a lot of things change forever, ‘**the worst of the pandemic is yet to come**’:

> We will be dealing with its fallout for years, and many things will change forever. It has wrought (and will continue to do so) economic disruption of monumental proportions.

Indeed, no industry or business will be able to avoid the impact of the changes ahead. Either they adapt to fit in with the Great Reset agenda (assuming they have the resources to do so), or they will not survive. According to Schwab and Malleret, ‘**millions of companies risk disappearing**’, whilst only ‘**a few**’ e.g. corporate monoliths, will be strong enough to withstand the disruption. It is your smaller companies
and independent run businesses that are faced with ruin, opening the
door to a new era of mergers and acquisitions that will further erode
consumer choice and competition.

Schwab and Malleret tell us that the worst of the pandemic is yet to
come, and from an economic standpoint I would not doubt them. But
let’s look at the health aspect for a moment. Global media coverage of
Covid-19 has characterised it as a deadly virus that kills with impunity,
and without the antidote of a vaccine could devour communities whole.

Perhaps surprisingly, the authors offer up a little fact based logic. They
admit that Covid-19 is ‘one of the least deadly pandemics in the last
2000 years’, and barring something unforeseen ‘the consequences of
the virus will be mild compared to previous pandemics.’ At the time
the book was published, 0.006% of the global population were reported
to have died from Covid-19. But even this low figure is not altogether
accurate.

In the UK for instance the way the death rate has been calculated has
meant that people who have been diagnosed with the virus and then
succumbed to an accident within 28 days of being tested will have
their cause of death marked as Covid-19.

To quote Professor Yoon Loke, from the University of East Anglia, and
Professor Carl Heneghan, from Oxford University:

Anyone who has tested COVID positive but subsequently died at
a later date of any cause will be included on the PHE COVID
death figures.

Schwab and Malleret could not be clearer when they write that Covid-19
‘does not constitute an existential threat or a shock that will leave
its imprint on the world’s population for decades’. As it stands the
Spanish Flu and HIV/AIDS have a larger mortality rate.

It was not an uncontrollable spread of Covid-19 that caused governments
around the world to shut down their national economies, but the data
modelling of unaccountable technocrats like Neil Ferguson of Imperial
College London that predicted hundreds of thousands of people were at immediate risk of dying without the imposition of social restrictions, which we now know to be a combination of social distancing and lockdown measures.

When Schwab and Malleret talk about Covid-19 leaving its imprint on the world, the truth of the matter is that it is the measures imposed in the name of Covid-19 that have caused widespread economic destruction, not the virus itself. That distinction is one that mainstream outlets in particular refuse to engage with.

In summary, if we are to take the authors at their word, then they see a rise in nationalism and protectionism off the back of Covid-19 as a detriment to the quest for a Great Reset. The much coveted Sustainable Development Goals could even be at risk should nations turn inward. IMF Managing Director has said the world has a choice between the Great Reset or the Great Reversal (the Great Reversal being ‘more poverty, more fragmentation, and less trade’) I would argue that there is another way of looking at it.

In the book Schwab and Malleret describe how in an interdependent world – which is precisely the kind of world that global planners have been championing since at least the end of World War Two – ‘risks conflate with each other, amplifying their reciprocal effects and magnifying their consequences’. When nations are interdependent, ‘the systemic connectivity between risks, issues, challenges determines the future.’ It is the old cliche of dominoes falling. Once one falters it sets off a chain reaction, which was evidenced back in 2008 when Lehman Brothers collapsed.

The scale of change that globalists are calling for through the vehicle of a Great Reset, which by definition is global in nature, will in my view require the implosion of the current world order to lay the foundations for a new world order. The old must make way for the new. And the one method for how that could be achieved is through increased kickback against interdependence. Sustained crises offer many opportunities for global planners. The potential for a contested U.S. election, an upcoming no deal Brexit and warnings of ‘vaccine nationalism’ are three
eventualities that if brought to bear could be exploited and used to advance the cause for a Great Reset. I would say that the further the world appears from collaboration and cooperation, the more people are going to call for those very same things if they become increasingly desperate.

The authors say that there is only a narrow window of opportunity for the Great Reset. Let’s keep in mind though that so far it is only global institutions like the WEF that are promoting the initiative, not national administrations. When it starts to permeate politics is when you know the agenda is advancing. But what exactly will the economic and societal conditions be when the Great Reset becomes part of the global conversation? Has what we have seen up to now been enough to compel people to call for change on a global scale? Has there yet been enough degradation and material change to living standards for citizens to implore global institutions to take action? I would argue not.

Already ‘solutions’ like Universal Basic Income have been touted. But as yet there is not a widespread clamouring for change. But that time is coming. Whether it be in the name of Agenda 2030 (aka Sustainable Development), The Green New Deal or The Great Reset, it would amount to largely the same outcome – the subjugation once and for all of national sovereignty where the nation state is subordinate to global governance.

Read full story here...