

Solution to the World's Carbon Problems: Compel Children to Eat Unhealthy Processed Vegetarian Alternatives to Wholesome Grass-fed Meats or Fresh Local Foods

By [John Klar](#)

Global Research, February 21, 2023

Theme: [Biotechnology and GMO](#),
[Environment](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name (desktop version)

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Touting a supposed "new study," mainstream media is unquestioningly advocating globalist prescriptions for climate change that would utilize existing public school lunch programs to compel children to eat unhealthy processed vegetarian alternatives to wholesome grass-fed meats or fresh local foods. The audacity and misinformation of these proposals reflect elitist disconnect from basic nutrition and soil health.

This supposedly salvific solution to the world's carbon problems is less a "study" and more of a globalist New World Order propaganda plug. The proposal is that school lunches "may be the key to changing our food systems worldwide." How is this to be achieved? - by sourcing artificial meats manufactured profitably by the new would-be food purveyors from chemical-saturated, environmentally-destructive agricultural production of soy and other GMO plants, to thereby wean children from having a palate for meats.

As [MSN.com proclaimed](#):

"Offering more plant-based protein such as vegan burgers and nuggets, and also beans and soy products like tofu could help to "shift social norms around meat consumption," reads the report.The shift would help to reduce heat-trapping gases and pollution generated by factory farms which produce most of the meat on the planet. Livestock farming accounts for 8% of these gases, the report notes."

The sins of factory farms are here employed to throw the cows out with the formaldehyde hoof-bath. Shifting farm critters back to rotational grazing would sequester more carbon than all the EV cars, solar panels, and soy-burgers combined. As Joel Salatin explains in *The Sheer Ecstasy of Being a Lunatic Farmer*:

“If every farmer in America practiced this prehistoric system, in fewer than ten years we would sequester all the carbon that’s been admitted since the beginning of the industrial age.One of the most environmentally-enhancing things that you can do is to eat grass-finished beef. That sequesters more carbon than soybeans or corn or any other annual.” (p. 28).

The so-called “study,” created by a biased ally of the World Economic Forum, claims this beneficent shift in diet to vat-hatched meats would avoid compulsion by simply [altering what kids desire](#):

“According to Mark Meldrum from Systemiq and co-author of the report, none of the recommended shifts are about banning the old ways.

“They are about supporting and lifting the new, to help them be as competitive and attractive as possible,” he says. “So we get to a place where we don’t need a ban, because everyone wants the new thing anyway.” ”

How un-scientific can a con-job get? Using public funds to process soy into fake-burger allocates profits to [patent holders like Bill Gates](#), while soaking kids’ guts with microbiome-killing glyphosate. [Soy farming](#) depends not just on GMOs (and thus glyphosate) but upon synthetic fertilizers and massive amounts of fossil fuels. Allowing cows to roam grasslands is organic, and uses far less energy. And grass-fed meats are healthy for children.

The January 19, 2023 “study” carries the cutesy think-tank title “[The Breakthrough Effect](#)”:

“The three super-leverage points are: mandates for the sale of electric vehicles, mandates requiring “green ammonia” to be used in the manufacturing of agricultural fertilisers, and public procurement of plant-based proteins. These changes could trigger a cascade of tipping points, leading to cheaper batteries to help solar and wind scale-up in the electricity sector, cheaper hydrogen opening up decarbonisation for the shipping and steel industries, and reduced pressure for deforestation.”

“Systemiq” is a “[partner](#)” of the WEF, together with [hundreds of bad corporate actors](#) determined to profit from food at the expense of human and ecological health. Bayer, Syngenta, Dow and Cargill all boast their involvement.

The proposed “New World Food Order” is in plain-if-[shameless sight](#): “Reducing emissions to net-zero by 2050 is possible if the right technologies are brought to commercial scale within the next decade.” These “right technologies” can’t compete without government compulsion. Never mind that the majority of the world’s food is provided by local peasant agriculture – more chemicals and magical (patented) technologies of the would-be corporate food-masters are proposed as the only way to save humanity.

The WEF’s Orwellian, earth-saving moniker is the “[First Movers Coalition](#)”: corporations offering to be the saviors from their own pollution:

“The First Movers Coalition’s unique approach assembles ambitious corporate purchasing pledges across the heavy industry and long-distance transport sectors responsible for a third of global emissions. For these sectors to decarbonize at the speed needed to keep the planet on a 1.5-degree pathway, they require low-carbon technologies that are not yet competitive with current carbon-intensive solutions but

must reach commercial scale by 2030 to achieve net-zero emissions globally by 2050.”

A better plan would be to reduce “heavy industry and long-distance transport sectors” by sourcing food locally and regeneratively. A better plan would employ cows to rebuild soils, sequester carbon, avoid synthetic fertilizers and chemicals, disperse profits equitably to local producers, and feed children food that doesn’t cause cancer, obesity, diabetes, and endocrine disruption.

Instead, the proposal is to increase dependency on corporate food provision using government compulsion and citizen tax dollars. The name coined to summarize this Shwabian malarkey is “[agritech](#)”:

““Agritech” is a natural evolution of precision agriculture, realized through the automated analysis of data collected from the field via equipment sensors and other sources. An emerging set of smart technologies, coupled with new digital skills and enhanced data control, can help foster more forward-looking decision making and positively shape the future direction of the value chains connecting farmers to consumers. This new paradigm calls for a comprehensive evolution from traditional to digital systems, in order to reduce costs, increase efficient production, and inject greater environmental and social sustainability into agricultural activity.”

Ah, the [utopian promises](#) of those who don’t read their own Kool-aid recipes! Technomystical faith in Big Ag to “feed the world” is the folly that has created the agricultural and health quagmire in which humanity is embroiled: now the same failed systems are paraded as cure. This will surely compound corporate hegemony, food insecurity, soil erosion, water depletion, and declining human health - all in the name of “data control,” “digital skills,” “automated analysis,” and “social sustainability.”

This is labeled a “new paradigm,” but it is just old glyphosate in shiny new globalist vessels, “evolving” in a forward-profit-looking fraud that will negatively shape humanity’s future. This is the expected [product of](#) “the views of a wide range of experts from the World Economic Forum’s Expert Network and is curated in partnership with the Smart AgriFood Observatory.”

Readers are told that this corrupt path will save the planet, and that it has been fashioned by [philanthropic stakeholders](#) who only seek the public good for meat-loving youngsters:

““Cooperation in a fragmented world” was chosen as the theme of the gathering of the great and the good at Davos this year.EU policies should not simply be aimed at securing access, but also at minimising critical raw material needs. They must examine ways to decrease the use of all materials, improve resilience and minimise the negative environmental, health and social impacts associated with the extraction, use and end of life of these resources.”

What would most minimize critical raw material needs would be to nurture local regenerative agricultural production, not increase scale, corporate domination, and long-distance transport. Minimizing glyphosate, synthetic fertilizers, and confinement feed operations would decrease toxic raw material use. Nothing would do that more than by restoring cows and other animals to rotational grazing. (And then there is the “end of life” of solar panels and EV cars....)

Janez Potocnik, partner at Systemiq, [ironically observes](#):

“...too few policymakers take the time to examine the root causes of a problem and to address the drivers and pressures behind it. They fail too often to see how our current system does not incentivise sustainable resource use, but encourages quite the opposite.”

Ain't that the truth! How about the world stops subsidizing destructive monocultures like soy and corn production; stops feeding children high fructose corn syrup and hydrogenated fats; and stops calling such barbaric and demonstrably harmful practices enlightened and world-saving?

Instead, these miscreants advise children to gobble more chemicals at school lunch tables. This is the “key to changing our food systems worldwide” ...for the worse.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

John Klar is an attorney, author, grass-fed beef and lamb farmer, and grandfather. John advocates for greater conservative leadership in conservationism and environmental policy through policy supports for regenerative, local agriculture. He is a regular contributor to [American Thinker](#), and pens a column for Vermont's conservative [True North Reports](#).

Featured image is from Pinterest/NaturalNews

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [John Klar](#), Global Research, 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [John Klar](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca