



## WEF Orders World Governments To Begin 'Severely Rationing Meat and Fuel'

### Description

**The globalists at the World Economic Forum have instructed governments worldwide to begin severely rationing meat and fuel in an acceleration towards their Great Reset agenda.**

According to a [study](#) conducted by globalist-aligned academics, World War II-style rationing is the answer to the so-called climate crisis.

 Taylor & Francis Online

[Home](#) ▶ [All Journals](#) ▶ [Ethics, Policy & Environment](#) ▶ [List of Issues](#) ▶ [Latest Articles](#) ▶ [Rationing and Climate Change Mitigation](#)



**Ethics, Policy & Environment** >  
Latest Articles

[Submit an article](#) [Journal homepage](#)

454  
Views

0  
CrossRef  
citations to date

251  
Altmetric

  Listen 

Research Article

# Rationing and Climate Change Mitigation

Nathan Wood  , Rob Lawlor   & Josie Freear

Received 25 Jun 2021, Accepted 05 Jan 2023, Published online: 19 Feb 2023

[Download citation](#) <https://doi.org/10.1080/21550085.2023.2166342> [Check for updates](#)

[Full Article](#) [Figures & data](#) [References](#) [Citations](#) [Metrics](#) [Licensing](#) [Reprints & Permissions](#)

In this article

[ABSTRACT](#)

[1. Introduction](#)

[2. Methodology, Background and Context](#)

## ABSTRACT

In this paper, we argue that rationing has been neglected as a policy option for mitigating climate change. There is a broad scientific consensus that avoiding the most severe impacts of climate change requires a rapid reduction in global emissions. We argue that rationing could help states reduce emissions rapidly and fairly. Our arguments in this paper draw on economic analysis and historical research into rationing in the UK during (and after) the two world wars, highlighting

Thenationalpulse.com reports: The authors believe a rationing scheme would be more equitable than individual allowances, because unlike carbon taxes and carbon-credit schemes – both of which have been proposed in response to climate change – rationing would not allow the rich to “buy their way out”.

A rationing scheme could also have broader applications, the researchers claim. “The concept of rationing could help, not only in the mitigation of climate change,” says joint lead author Dr Nathan Wood, “but also in reference to a variety of other social and political issues – such as the current energy crisis.”

He added:

“The cost of living crisis has shown what happens when scarcity drives up prices, with energy prices rising steeply and leaving vulnerable groups unable to pay their bills. Currently, those living in energy

poverty cannot use anywhere near their fair share of energy supply, whereas the richest in society are free to use as much energy as they can afford.”

Although the study is nothing more than a piece of research at this stage, that could change very quickly, especially as we near 2030, a key date for the UN's Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Climate Accords. It is already clear that the world will not meet its commitments.

## 15 MINUTE CITIES.

New schemes are already being implemented to limit personal mobility and consumption, and there will surely be more to come. Recent proposals for so-called “15-minute cities” have drawn widespread criticism across the world, including in cities such as Oxford, where pilot tests are due to take place.

From 2024, Oxford will be divided into a series of six separate “neighbourhoods” by the local council, with car-travel between them heavily restricted and subject to fines if unauthorised.

Residents of the city will be able to apply for special permits to allow them to drive into other neighbourhoods for up to 100 days a year. Otherwise, they must use public transport, bike or walk in order to move from one neighbourhood to another.

At the same time, the anxiety and catastrophism about the effects of climate change is increasing, or being increased. At the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos a few weeks ago, “climate migration” was one of the main talking-points.

Here's Al Gore talking at the WEF in Davos yesterday about the coming wave of "one billion climate refugees" that will cause Western nations to "lose our capacity for self-governance". He says this as if it's a bad thing and not exactly what globalists like himself want. ?  
[pic.twitter.com/olCGeXDO6s](https://pic.twitter.com/olCGeXDO6s)

— RAW EGG NATIONALIST (@Babygravy9) [January 19, 2023](#)

Al Gore, in a blustering speech, suggested the West would soon be overwhelmed by 1.5 billion migrants fleeing the effects of climate change, who would make it impossible for individual nations to govern themselves normally. Some, [such as WEF-approved author Gaia Vince](#), are claiming that we must encourage these migrants to come here right now, to minimise their suffering.

There is also alarm about the prospect of private geoengineering, after an American startup, Make Sunsets, announced it had released helium balloons containing reactive gas in an attempt to cool the earth. A number of pilot releases took place in Mexico in April last year. Although the Mexican government has now moved to prevent further releases within its territory, Make Sunsets has vowed to continue with its crowdfunded project, and the technology it used is cheap and readily available, virtually guaranteeing that other groups will try to emulate it, with unknown consequences for the environment.

## HOW CLIMATE RATIONING COULD WORK.

The inspiration for the proposed measures comes from the rationing that took place during the Second

World War, especially in countries like Britain, where there were severe restrictions on consumption of a wide range of commodities and resources to aid the war effort. In Britain, rationing outlived the war, and only came to an end eight years later, in 1953.

Researchers note that compulsory food rationing was more popular than voluntary changes to behaviour when resources became scarce. Also, despite shortages, rates of malnutrition actually went down in Britain during the Second World War.

One of the main problems, according to the aforementioned new paper, is that people today just don't understand the scarcity they are facing in the way that Britons did seventy years ago. A world of instant gratification and consumer goods at the touch of a button is not conducive to a sense of deprivation or urgency about scarce resources.

Dr Rob Lawlor, joint lead author, said: "There is a limit to how much we can emit if we are to reduce the catastrophic impacts of climate change. In this sense, the scarcity is very real."

The authors of the study believe rationing wouldn't be the first step, however. An information campaign to promote the benefits of rationing, along with stricter regulations, would be required condition the public over further restrictions. Such a campaign appears to have already begun.

Initial regulation would focus on the "biggest polluters", such as international travel, the fossil-fuel industries, as well as farming. This would help to create scarcity in "products that harm the planet", and rationing could then gradually be brought in to meet people's basic needs in a "fair" manner.

Rationing could be regulated through the use of a carbon allowance, using "carbon cards" that function like bank cards but track and limit usage of all commodities. Or, alternatively, the government could simply ration particular goods, such as flights, petrol, and meat.

Rationing, they claim, could speed up the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy and sustainable lifestyles and infrastructure. Rationing petrol, for instance, might drive government investment in low-carbon methods of transport, such as rail and tram systems. Price controls on rationed goods would also "prevent prices from rising with increased demand, benefiting those with the least money," they say, in an almost total negation of the entire basis of market economics, and endorsement of state control of resources.

## WHAT CHOICE?

Once again, it seems choice won't be a factor in whether we change our lifestyles to suit the climate-change narrative. This is already particularly evident with regard to consumption of animal products, as plant-based alternatives and new proteins fail to attract consumers on the basis of their taste or the health claims made about them.

Alternative mechanisms to get people to stop eating meat, including enhanced social pressure, inflation and even direct government intervention – a meat tax? – are now the preferred methods of advocates of fake foods, rather than making their own products desirable or tasty or just not hideous.

Nobody will make rationing desirable, but it can be made necessary. Just look at what's happened to eggs as a result of the [ongoing "eggflation" saga](#). In many stores, purchases of eggs have had to be

limited, due to artificial scarcity, mainly as a result of punitive measures to combat avian flu but also due to a spate of mysterious fires and fertility problems affecting egg producers. There's no reason why artificial scarcity on a grand scale could not be created. Such an experiment is already being trialled on the Dutch farmers, who are being expropriated at a rate that would make Robert Mugabe blush.

Although the rationing scheme proposed in the new study is just that – a proposal – it's likely to be a matter of when and not if. Some form of personal carbon allowance will be introduced to curb our individual consumption: governments have been talking about them for nearly twenty years, at least. The real question we should be asking ourselves, then, is, how can we fight back? We will have to find a way to make our representatives realise that *they* are the ones with no choice, not us. And disregard our wishes at your peril.

by Sean Adl-Tabatabai

### **Category**

1. Main
2. NWO-Deep State-Dictatorship-Tyrrany
3. Politics-Geopolitics-Gov.-Events

### **Date Created**

03/02/2023