



## **Weasel Words: ‘Sustainable’ Newspeak Coming By 2050**

When Technocrat-inspired pseudo-science is at risk of being discovered to be false, the standard solution is to gaslight their critics by reversing the language to mean the polar opposite. For example, “War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength.” □ TN Editor

George Orwell pointed out that one of the first casualties of socialism is language. The damage is not collateral, it is deliberate—designed to numb minds and render critical thought difficult or impossible. The instrument of this dumbing down in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was Newspeak, the official language of the English Socialist Party (Ingsoc). Newspeak was a sort of Totalitarian Esperanto that sought gradually to diminish the range of what was thinkable by eliminating, contracting, and manufacturing words. New words had a “political implication” and “were intended to impose a desirable mental attitude upon the person using them.” The meaning of words was often reversed, as was most starkly emphasized in the key slogans of Ingsoc:

*WAR IS PEACE*

*FREEDOM IS SLAVERY*

*IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH*

*Nineteen Eighty-Four* was written in 1949. Its nightmarish fictional world is now 36 years in the past, so one might reasonably conclude that Orwell was far too pessimistic, but his great book was less a prediction than a warning, and above all an analysis of the totalitarian mentality. Meanwhile, there is another significant date in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The book's Appendix on the principles of Newspeak stressed that the corruption of language was a multi-generational project whose fruition would not come until well into the present century. Ingsoc's objective was to render independent thought impossible by "about 2050."

Intriguingly, that is the same year that the world allegedly has to become "carbon neutral," or "Net Zero," to avoid climate Armageddon.

### **Weasel Words**

Twenty Fifty has become a key date for the UN's "Global Governance" agenda, which seeks nothing less than to oversee and regulate every aspect of life on the basis of a suite of alarmist projections. The main existential threat is claimed to be catastrophic man-made climate change. "Climate governance" has thus emerged as the "fourth pillar," of the UN's mandate, joining Peace & Security, Development, and Human Rights.

So far—as with the other three pillars—the UN's climate efforts have been spectacularly unsuccessful. It has held 25 enormous "Conferences of the Parties," or COPs, which have promoted a morass of uncoordinated national policies that have had zero impact on the climate.

COP 21 in Paris in 2015, for instance, was meant to hatch a successor to the failed Kyoto Agreement. But all it produced was a raft of hypocritical, voluntary, fingers-crossed "Nationally Determined Contributions." The failure of Paris, and of temperatures to rise in line with flawed models, led to a doubling down of "ambitions." One new commitment that seeped out of Paris was for the countries of the world to hold temperatures to 1.5 degrees Celsius above levels before the Industrial Revolution (The Original Climate Sin). Staying below that

level, UN policy wonks rapidly calculated, would require the world to become carbon neutral, or Net-Zero, by 2050.

In a video lecture to Chinese students earlier this year, UN Secretary-General António Guterres claimed that there was “No excuse” not to meet the Net-Zero emission target by 2050. “The time for small steps has passed,” he said. “What is needed now is transformational change.” For “transformational” read “revolutionary;” change that would involve the destruction of Western industrial society and freedom.

In fact, there is no climate “crisis” or “emergency.” However, as Orwell noted, the language of fear and panic is one of the main instruments of political control.

Today, just as in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the classical liberal concepts of liberty and equality(of opportunity) are under relentless attack, as are the values of reason and objectivity. Liberty and equality were classified in Newspeak as “Crimethink.” Objectivity and rationalism were “Oldthink.” A doomed Newspeak lexicographer named Syme tells the book’s equally doomed hero, Winston Smith, that even the party slogans will eventually become incomprehensible: “How could you have a slogan like ‘freedom is slavery’ when the concept of freedom has been abolished?”

Orwell was hardly the first observer to point to the political dangers of linguistic manipulation, which go back to discussions of sophistry in Plato. The great economist and philosopher Friedrich Hayek pointed in particular to the left’s use of “social.” He dubbed it a “weasel word” that not merely sucked meaning from words to which it was attached but often reversed meaning. Thus, by classical liberal standards, social democracy is undemocratic, social justice is unjust, and a social market economy is anti-market. We have a prime current example in the phrase “social license to operate,” which in fact means a potential veto on corporate activities by radical environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS), the stormtroopers of the Global Governance agenda. Private corporations were once socialism’s enemies; now they have been co-opted as its partners, agents of “Global Salvationism.” Nobel economist Milton Freidman pointed to the subversive, open-ended

nature of “Corporate Social Responsibility,” where “responsibility” represents another weasel word. CSR’s purpose is to force corporate executives to abandon their responsibility to their shareholders in favour of an endless list of “stakeholder” demands.

Like the word “social,” “sustainable” tends to vitiate or reverse the meaning of words to which it is attached. Thus “sustainable” development is development retarded by top-down control.

Friedman has been regularly and ritually subjected to the Two Minutes Hate ever since. The most recent example was a collection of overwhelmingly condemnatory essays in the *New York Times* to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the publication of Friedman’s essay on CSR. Typically, it grossly misrepresented Friedman and wrote off his alleged bottom line as “Greed is Good.”

The shackles of CSR have now been tightened by the concept of ESG (Environmental, Social, and corporate Governance). ESG is, like the neologisms of Newspeak, “intended to impose a desirable mental attitude” on executives, who often seem intellectually and morally defenceless in the face of NGO campaigns of lies and intimidation. Business schools certainly don’t appear to equip them to counter such assaults.

### **A Climate of Newspeak**

Perhaps the most significant new weasel word to have emerged from the UN’s equivalent of the Ministry of Truth is “sustainable.” Commitment to sustainability is now mouthed by every politician, bureaucrat, marketing executive, and media hack on earth. It sounds so benign, so reasonable, but what it actually means is “bureaucratically controlled and NGO-enforced within a UN-based socialist agenda.” Like most aspects of socialism, it is based on incomprehension and/or hatred of the nature and function of market capitalism, not least because markets—which signal scarcity, reward economy, and promote profitable innovation—are the only true source of sustainability. Projected catastrophic man-made climate change was enthusiastically embraced by global socialism because it was—in the words of Nicholas Stern, who was ennobled for

his manufacture of an egregiously skewed review of climate impacts for his political masters in the UK Labour Party—“the greatest market failure the world has ever seen.” The problem is that we haven’t actually seen it, except, that is, through the biased lens of “official” science and an alarmist crusading media.

Like “social,” “sustainable” tends to vitiate or reverse the meaning of words to which it is attached. Thus sustainable development is development retarded by top-down control, and whose effectiveness is further compromised by the insertion of a long list of cart-before-the-horse social policy objectives, from gender equity to “responsible consumption.”

Recently, “Sustainable Finance” has also bubbled up from the UN verbal swamp. What it means, not surprisingly, is *stopping* the financing of fossil fuels by browbeating banks and investors, and rigging the regulatory process. Its champion is that archetypal aspiring global governor Mark Carney, former governor both of the Bank of Canada and the Bank of England, and now UN special envoy for climate action and finance.

There are no dictionaries of sustainable Newspeak. Its mavens rely less on new words than on perverting or reversing the meaning of old ones. One recent clarion call heard echoing around the corridors of power is that recovery from the COVID crisis must be “resilient.” Insofar as that means forcing the use of more expensive, less reliable, and less flexible energy sources such as wind and solar, it will inevitably make economies less resilient. Thus it promotes the first energy “transition” in history that involves moving backwards. Typically, such backward movement is a key part of a “progressive” agenda.

Attempts to restrict thought and reverse meaning go well beyond the climate issue, which is just part of a broader socialist thrust. Another of Ingsoc’s slogans was “Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.” The new version is “Who pulls down statues controls the educational curriculum.”

The indoctrination of young people was a key strategy of Ingsoc.

Likewise, *Agenda 21*, the doorstep socialist wish list that emerged from the UN's Earth Summit at Rio in 1992, declared: "Students should be taught about the environment and sustainable development throughout their schooling." They should learn that "The world is confronted with worsening poverty, hunger, ill health, illiteracy, and the continuing deterioration of ecosystems on which we depend for our wellbeing." In other words, a catalogue of alarmism that has—or should have been—utterly discredited by the evidence of the intervening decades. However, we tend to see what we have been taught to believe. Walls may have ears but more important is that ears have walls. Building such walls was the specific purpose of Ingsoc's Crimestop, or "protective stupidity." The capture of academic institutions has virtually installed Crimestop as a compulsory course.

An entire generation of children has been miseducated on environmental issues and exposed to what might be called pre-traumatic stress disorder, not least by being forced to watch Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth*, and its sequel, which was filled with frightening untruths that have proved particularly convenient for serial power- and rent-seekers such as Gore.

Meanwhile not only did *Agenda 21* demand that children be indoctrinated, it demanded that the most indoctrinated among them be allowed into political fora to lecture their elders. This programme came to stunning fruition last fall at the UN, when Greta Thunberg, a bright, anxious, and thoroughly indoctrinated Swedish teenager, was elevated to the podium to paraphrase *Agenda 21*: "People are suffering. People are dying. Entire ecosystems are collapsing. We are in the beginning of a mass extinction, and all you can talk about is money and fairy tales of eternal economic growth. How dare you!"

One is reminded of the Newspeak Appendix: "A Party member called upon to make a political or ethical judgement should be able to spray forth the correct opinions as automatically as a machine gun spraying forth bullets."

Greta is a manipulated child spouting machine gun words designed to promote the ever-mutating yet never-changing socialist agenda: seeking

absolute power.

Meanwhile, the political establishment's current watchwords of inclusivity, diversity, and equity are all aimed at perverting truth and concealing real meanings. Inclusivity and diversity involve excluding white men and conservatives of either sex (although it is a "thoughtcrime" to suggest that there are fundamentally two sexes, as J.K.Rowling discovered). Equity falsely equates the inevitable inequality of outcomes in a free society with moral inequity. Everybody is invited to "join the conversation," except those who dare to disagree. Defenders of free—and accurate—speech are ignored, cancelled, or viciously attacked as "Racists" or "Deniers."

Read full story here...